COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT, SELF-REPORTED WELL-BEING, AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THEM

by

LACI LEGGITT WEEDEN

(Under the Direction of Laura A. Dean)

ABSTRACT

College and universities have seen a shift in parent and family involvement in their traditional-aged college student's experience. Generation Z members, born between 1995-2012, were born into a world with the Internet, smartphones, and social media (Twenge, 2017). As defined by Wartman & Savage (2008), parent involvement includes parents and families showing interest and concern for their students while at college and also providing support, encouragement, and guidance to help their students be successful. Numerous studies on factors that impact a college student's well-being have been conducted, including, but not limited to sleep, physical activity, personal relationships, stress, and alcohol and drug use (Ridner et al., 2016).

For this quantitative study, the researcher recruited first-year college students from a large-sized public institution in the Southeastern part of the United States to complete a survey. College students' perceptions of parent involvement and self-reported well-being were measured

through two previously created instruments, the Perceptions of Parents Scale (Robbins, 1994) and the Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Demographic information was also collected. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to examine responses on each scale. Data analysis focused on the impact of several independent variables - including gender, race, ethnicity, campus housing status, and primary caregiver's highest education level.

The purpose of this study was to examine how college students perceive the level of involvement of their parents and rate their level of well-being and determine if there was a relationship between them. Findings indicated a significant positive relationship between perceived parent involvement and reported well-being. Participants also reported a positive sense of their own well-being, with men reporting higher levels than women. Lastly, the differences when measuring perceptions in parent involvement and measuring self-reported well-being based on specific demographic characteristics including race and ethnicity and caregiver educational levels, were significant.

This study contributes to the growing landscape of college parent involvement literature. The findings highlight the need for colleges and universities to continue to discuss parent involvement and student well-being and the relationship between them in supporting today's college students**.**

INDEX WORDS: College students, Generation Z, IGen, First-year students, Parent involvement, Well-being, Schlossberg, Higher education, Student development

COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT, SELF-REPORTED WELL-BEING, AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THEM

by

LACI LEGGITT WEEDEN

Bachelor of Science, Appalachian State University, 1994

Master of Science, Indiana State University, 1996

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

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2022

COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT, SELF-REPORTED WELL-BEING, AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THEM

by

LACI LEGGITT WEEDEN

Major Professor:	Laura A. Dean
Committee:	Diane L. Cooper
	Kara L. Fresk

Electronic Version Approved:

Ron Walcott
Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2022

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to:

My mother, who encouraged me to shine like the sun from the time I was a child. I will always be your sunshine. To you and Bob – Thank you for your endless love and support throughout my life and for always believing I could do anything, especially when I did not believe in myself. Thank you for always being open 24/7. Love you!

My husband, who has always supported me in my decisions and choices. Thank you for listening and supporting me over the last few years while I went back to school, while both of us worked full-time, raised our son, and navigated life during a crazy pandemic. Time to celebrate in Asheville!

My son, who continually cheered me on every step of the way. Thank you for greeting me every night and taking my heavy backpack upstairs, the hugs and hive-fives, and how you spoke to others about my work with pride. You truly mean the world to me, and I am thankful for your caring heart and brilliant mind. I love you 3000.

All my family, thank you for all the words of encouragement, support, and cheers from the sidelines - I am thankful for my large cheering section!

Savitri, Karen, and so many other dear FRIENDS, who listened as I celebrated, vented, or cried during the highs and lows of the last three years. I really cannot thank you for your support. Love you!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As a first-generation college student, I always thought I was not smart enough to get my doctorate. Thank you to those who believed I could and helped me get to today. I especially want to thank the following people:

Dr. Dean, thank you for being my advisor, advocate, and listening ear. Thank you for supporting me, pushing me, and shaping me into the scholar I never knew I could be. Your guidance and support have been invaluable. I could not have done this without you. I will miss our weekly Zoom talks, but you know I will stay in touch!

Dr. Cooper and Dr. Fresk, thank you for serving on my committee and dedicating your time and energy to supporting me in my research, statistical analysis, and the entire journey.

Super SAL cohort, it has been an interesting journey going through this during a pandemic, but we learned to ask questions, help each other, and encourage and push each other toward our goals. Thank you for the laughs and support for the last three years. Thank goodness for all of you!

Dr. Penny Rue, my mentor, role model, and friend. Thank you for constantly encouraging me to reach and achieve more and lending support at every step in this process.

Dr. Barratt, for the past twenty-six years, you have always shared words of wisdom and advice. Thank you for writing my reference letter for the UGA program and for always having my best interest at heart,

To my UC San Diego Dream Team, I am so thankful for our special Triton family. You are amazing! Thank you for your support, tips, late-night study sessions, and laughs!

To my GT family, especially Dr. Colleen Riggle, Dr."B" Woods, Tyler, Emily, Cynthia, and the rest of the Yellow Jacket family, thank you for your support, encouraging words, gifs in Teams, emails, notes on my office door, treats, and texts. Thank you!

To my Wolfpack family, I am so thankful to be a proud member of the PACK since day one. Thank you for always having my back - much love!

To my University of Akron and UNC Charlotte families, you helped shape me as a professional and showed me how to be a servant leader. I have many fond memories (and stressful ones) from those days. Thank you for continuing to be dear friends over twenty-five years later.

To my current and former students, thank you for your encouraging messages and beautiful texts. I have learned so much more from you than you have from me, and for that, I am forever grateful. I am so proud of all of you. Thank you for letting me be part of your journey.

To my AHEPPP family, thank you for all the love and support. Thank you for the extra help with researching college parents, too. You all are truly amazing!

To the 1993-94 Gardner Hall Staff, who would have guessed that this 7th floor RA would earn her doctorate twenty-seven years later? You lit the spark that started my career at Appalachian State University, and that experience changed my life. I am thankful for my lifelong friends and your support. I think it is time for another reunion and trip up the mountain!

To my beautiful dog, Charlotte, who has been my walking buddy, cuddle bug, and therapy for the last few years. Thank you, sweet girl.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Thirty years ago, when college students were heading off to college, parents and families moved their students into the residence halls and typically would not return to campus until the end of the semester or their first year. Today, many families and their students visit campuses on college admission days, attend college orientation sessions together, participate in special activities for families during residence hall move-in days, and attend other special events for families, such as Family Weekend, during their college student's higher education journey. College and universities have seen a shift in parent involvement in their traditional-aged college student's experience. Seemiller and Grace (2019) stated that Generation Z views their parents as trusted mentors: "Eighty-eight percent say they are extremely close with their parents" (p. 94).

There are numerous reasons for this shift, including educational policies that encourage parent involvement at the K-12 level, technology changes that allow parents and families to communicate more frequently with their student, changes in the way society views adult development, and the rising cost of higher education (Carney-Hall, 2008; Wartman & Savage, 2008). In addition, "in the wake of 9/11, Hurricane Katrina, and the Virginia Tech tragedy, it is no surprise that concern for students' safety is the primary reason attributed to parents' involvement" (Merriman, 2008, p. 57). COVID-19 only heightened parents' concerns for their student's health and well-being. Kennedy (2009) explained four reasons why parent involvement has increased: a changing relationship between parent and child, a significant financial investment in their child's future, an ability to communicate in real-time, and the fact that parents

believe their intervention helps their student. It is understandable, then, why parents want to stay connected to their college students and support them on their higher education journey.

Parent Involvement

As defined by Wartman & Savage (2008), parent involvement includes parents and families showing interest and concern for their student while at college, learning more about their student's college and possibly building affinity for their student's college, and providing support, encouragement, and guidance to help their student be successful. When a student goes off to college, parents and families worry about various concerns. Even before COVID-19, families were concerned about Maslow's hierarchy of needs for their college students. Maslow (1968) highlighted a pyramid of needs, within which the first and second tiers address basic physiological needs like food, water, rest, and safety. For example, families may worry about their student's campus living arrangements, meal plans, and campus safety. The third and fourth tiers are psychological needs, including love and belonging and self-esteem. The final tier is self-actualization, where students reach their full potential.

Some college and university staff members think parent involvement is invasive and does not allow the student autonomy. The term "helicopter parent," which refers to a parent that is overly involved and who "hovers" over their college student, became popular in the media after Neil Howe and William Strauss' book, *Millennials Go to College* (2003). "In spite of both positive and negative implications of parent involvement, the media present unflattering characterizations of today's parents as "helicopter parents" hovering around the adult student prepared to intervene" (Carney-Hall, 2008, p. 3) LeMoyne and Buchanan (2011) examined "helicopter parenting" and found it was related to several negative outcomes in college students,

including that college students who reported that their parents were overly involved had lower psychological well-being and were more likely to take medications for depression and anxiety.

Other institutional programs reflect the belief that parents can be effective partners. Parental involvement assists students "with the encouragement they need to meet new challenges and grow academically" (Cullaty, 2011, p. 431). Shoup et al. (2009) communicated research results that show no evidence that high parental involvement is problematic for students. "Though faculty, campus student affairs professionals and the popular media may fret about an increase in parental contact and associated conflicts, the students seem to benefit from the additional support and encouragement they receive" (Shoup et al., 2009, p. 21). Campus departments that support parent programming send helpful communications and resources on physical health and nutrition, proper sleep, and, most recently, how to stay healthy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Today's parents ask about and expect a tangible return on their investment, including a clear path to a well-paying career upon their student's graduation (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

Generation Z

Generation Z members, born between 1995-2012, are also known as iGen because they were born into a world with the Internet, smartphones, and social media (Twenge, 2017). It is important to understand the current population of Generation Z members because they are leading the way to the future. As with past generations, the characteristics of a generation are shaped by significant events, technological advancements, and family and peers as they grow up. Generation Z descriptors are kind, fair, honest, creative, open-minded, hard-working, and motivated (Seemiller & Grace, 2019). Beall (2016) identified differences between Generation Z and Millennials, including that Generation Z is better at multi-tasking, more entrepreneurial, and

more global in their thinking, interactions, and relatability. Generation Z members are also more racially and ethnically diverse than any previous generation, they are the most well-educated generation, and they have the most college-educated parents (Pew Research Center, 2020).

Educational leaders need to know how to communicate effectively with Generation Z. "While the communication channel is important, the medium and content also matter as students experience information overload every day" (Beck & Wright, 2019, p. 25). Faculty and staff should keep messages short, concise, and include pictures because Generation Z students are used to Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, and other social media platforms. The COVID-19 pandemic made it abundantly clear that various resources and support are needed for society to function, including resources for Generation Z college students. The COVID-19 pandemic health crisis impacts both students' physical and mental health needs. Jeong et al. (2021) completed a study to determine the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on both first-generation college students and non-first-generation college students and found that all students need parental support, resources, and guidance to mitigate the academic, situational, and mental challenges and obstacles they may face while they are experiencing a crisis. They shared, "we suggest developing parent support programs to provide a wide range of benefits to parents, including ways to be more vigilant and supportive of their children" (Jeong et al., 2021, p. 11).

College Student Well-Being

Well-being is an important part of a college student's mental and physical health. The World Health Organization (1946) defined well-being by stating that health is a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not just the absence of disease. Numerous studies on factors that impact a college student's well-being have been conducted, including, but not limited to sleep, physical activity, personal relationships, stress, and alcohol and drug use (Ridner et al.,

2016). In 2019, the American Council on Education surveyed over 400 college presidents and found that eight out of 10 presidents reflected that mental health had become more of a priority on their campus, and seven of out 10 reported that they had allocated or identified additional funding resources to support students' mental health and well-being over the last three years (Chessman & Taylor, 2019). One president shared, "the issues facing students have become more complex and time-consuming for faculty and staff, and it involves multiple staff (student services, counseling, security, external resources, safety, and legal) to develop a comprehensive plan" (Chessman & Taylor, 2019, p. 7).

Knowledge of first-year college students' self-reported well-being will be helpful to college administrators so that they may better support students. "In a longitudinal study of first-year college students, a steep decline in their psychological and social well-being occurred between the start of college and halfway through their first-year" (Ridner et al., 2016, p. 116). The American Psychological Association found that only 45% of Generation Z described their mental health as very good or excellent, compared to 56% of Millennials, 51% of Generation X, and 70% of Baby Boomers (American Psychological Association, 2018). This study looked at the phenomenon of Generation Z college students' self-perceived parent involvement and self-reported well-being.

Theoretical Framework

Traditional-age college students go through several transitions on their higher education journey. The first transition is from high school to their first year in college. Support is important in student success, including support from parents and family members. Wintre and Yaffe (2000) concluded that students might benefit from the support of family and other campus resources during their transition to college and their first year. Because this research study explored

perceived parent involvement, college students' self-reported well-being, and the relationship between the two variables during their transition to the first year of college, Schlossberg's Transition Theory (Anderson et al., 2012) is an appropriate lens to apply. This research study focused on traditional-age college students, students typically between the ages of 18-24.

While many theories are discussed in student affairs research, Schlossberg's Transition Theory has more recently been researched as a viable theory for understanding college students. For example, Flowers et al. (2014) examined male transfer student-athletes and Schlossberg's Transition Theory. Ryan et al. (2011) applied Schlossberg's Transition Theory to American Veterans transitioning from military service to higher education. Patton and Davis (2014) used the theory for their study on how African American students constructed meaning of their multiple transitions during and following the Hurricane Katrina storm. Schlossberg's Transitions Theory (1984), categorized initially as a theory of adult development, provides a framework that offers key aspects to the transition experience. Schlossberg defined a transition as "any event or non-event, that results in changed relationships, routines, assumptions and roles" (Anderson et al., 2012, p. 39).

Applying the lens of Schlossberg's Transition Theory to this study of perceived parent involvement with first-year college students and the relationship to their self-reported well-being allowed the researcher to better consider the results of their study, just as other populations have been studied utilizing the Transition Theory. College administrators may be concerned that parents may delay or inhibit student development; however, highly involved parents support their students in completing psychosocial tasks such as identity creation and developing intimacy, provided parents allow their students opportunities to problem solve on their own before offering guidance (Taub, 2008). Taub (2008) also explained that parents and families

provide much-needed support during the transition to college life. Schlossberg identified four major sets of factors that influence individuals' ability to cope with transition: situation, self, support, and strategies known as the 4 S's (Goodman et al., 2006). Schlossberg's Transition Theory is a solid framework for examining college students' transition from high school to college and in the first year of college, especially when looking at the third factor, support, in her model.

Problem Statement

For decades, theoretical frameworks reflected a belief that for students to be successful and independent, they needed to separate from their families to truly experience student development (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Arnett (2015) argued that entry into college does not mark the entry into adulthood but instead marks the beginning of a new phase of development known as emerging adulthood. In the last thirty years, the college experience has changed for both students and parents because of generational shifts, differing parenting styles, rising costs of college, and changes in technology and communication (Sax & Wartman, 2010). The current generation of college students, Generation Z, is closer to their parents and families than past generations (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Over 90 percent of student affairs professionals reported an increase in interaction with parents in the early 2000s (Merriman, 2007). With parents and families more involved in their student's higher education experience and Generation Z experiencing higher rates of mental health and well-being issues, what is the relationship between them?

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between college parent involvement and self-reported well-being in college students, specifically Generation Z college

students in their first year of college. Using Schlossberg's Transition Theory (Anderson et al., 2012) specifically, the support factor related to family units, how does college parent involvement help or hinder the student's transition to their first year in college? Understanding this can contribute to better support of students' transition to college and in their first year. This research can assist college administrators in better understanding the relationship between college parents and students and the impact on the student's higher education journey. For this study, parents are defined as parents, caregivers, stepparents, grandparents, and other adults, and parent involvement is inclusive of all the previously mentioned categories.

Research Questions

The researcher sought to answer these questions:

1) Is there a relationship between perceived college parent involvement and self-reported well-being with college students?
2) How do college students perceive the level of involvement of their parent/caregiver, as measured by the Perceptions of Parents Scale (Robbins, 1994)?
3) How do college students rate their level of well-being, as measured by the Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995)?

The research questions are related to the theoretical framework by focusing on transition theory, parent involvement, and the well-being of Generation Z college students.

Methodology

In this quantitative research study, the researcher examined the relationship between the college students' perceived parent involvement and self-reported well-being as it relates to the college student's transition to their first year of college. Invited participants were first-year students at a large public research institution located in the southeastern United States. The first-

year students had to be at least 18 years of age and have completed at least 12 credit hours at that institution. The questionnaire, delivered using Qualtrics, was composed of parent involvement, college well-being, and demographic questions.

Significance of Study

Parent and family involvement at college campuses continues to be an area of interest for many in higher education (Carney-Hall, 2008; Dunn, 2015; Schiffrin et al., 2013; Taub, 2008; Wartman & Savage, 2008). In the two years during the pandemic, parent and family involvement grew, and so did institutions' interest in working with parents and families to keep students safe and healthy. This research may contribute to the existing literature about parent involvement and college students' well-being from a scholarly lens. From a practitioner lens, this study may provide support to higher education professionals to better understand the relationship between parent involvement and the well-being of today's students and, therefore, better support students and families.

Definition of Terms

Emerging adulthood: A newly defined life stage between adolescence and young adulthood, typically between the ages of 18-25, which involves adults having "longer and more widespread education, later entry into marriage and parenthood, and a prolonged and erratic transition to stable work" (Arnett, 2015, p. 8).

Generation Z: People born between the years 1995-2012 (Twenge, 2017). Also known as iGen, Beck and Wright (2019) noted, "iGen seems particularly poignant in that it pays homage to the historical significance of this being the first generation of true digital natives, digital technology having been so widely available since their birth" (p. 21). Gen Z or iGen is the current generation of traditionally aged college students.

Helicopter parent: A helicopter parent typically refers to a parent who is overly involved and who "hovers" over their college student. The term became popular in the early 2000s when Neil Howe and William Strauss highlighted it in their book, *Millennials Go to College* (2003). According to Wartman & Savage (2008), the term "helicopter parent" has quickly become part of the American vocabulary, and other subspecies of the helicopter now include Black Hawk parents (a parent who not only hovers, but their behavior is excessive), lawnmower parents (mowing down obstacles for their student, snowplow parents (plowing the way for their student), and stealth missiles (arriving under the radar to destroy any obstacles in their student's path).

Well-being: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2021) defines well-being as a global synthesis of physical and mental health that provides a more comprehensive outcome on which to base health promotion and disease prevention efforts. "There is no consensus around a single definition of well-being, but there is general agreement that at minimum, well-being includes the presence of positive emotions and moods (e.g., contentment and happiness), the absence of negative emotions (e.g., depression and anxiety), satisfaction with life, fulfillment, and positive functioning" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2021, "Well-Being Concepts" section).

Parent: For this study, the term "parent" represents any biological parent, adoptive parent, stepparent, guardian, caregiver, or another figure.

Parent Involvement: Parent involvement can be described as parents showing interest in the lives of their students in college, gaining more information about college, and knowing when and how to provide encouragement and guidance to their student (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

Traditional Aged College Student: Students who enroll immediately after high school and are typically between the ages of 18 to 24.

Transition: "Any event, or non-event, that results in changed relationships, routines, assumptions, and roles" (Goodman, Schlossberg, & Anderson, 2006, p. 33).

Role of the Researcher

My personal subjectivity is integral in situating myself as a researcher in this quantitative research design process. Understanding and acknowledging my personal and professional experiences related to this research study is important. I am a Director of a Parent & Family Programs office at a large public Research I Institution in the Southeast. I am a mother to a 14-year-old son. I grew up with numerous older siblings, but I was the first to graduate from college and graduate school. I attended college out-of-state in the early 1990s. As a first-generation college student from a lower socioeconomic background, I struggled academically and socially during my first few years in college. While my mother was supportive throughout my college career, she had no frame of reference to assist me when I was frustrated and confused. I am sure she felt helpless at times, and I was too embarrassed to ask for help from others. As a "latch-key kid" and member of Generation X, I was used to figuring out things on my own.

I have worked at several different institutions across the United States in my over 25 years in higher education. I have worked with parent programming, on three different campuses, within the last twelve years. I am an active member of the national association AHEPPP – Family Engagement in Higher Education and served on their Board of Directors for six years. As a student affairs administrator, I have served in various units, including housing and residence life, a women's center, and parent programming. My background in psychology has helped me listen to families and support them and their college students. My experience allows me to have a deeper understanding of the subject matter of college parents, the current college student

generation, and the evolution of the last twenty years. That knowledge was helpful when looking at the responses and data related to my research questions.

It is important to note that I am passionate about my work with college parents. I believe that parents and families can be partners with their student's college on their student's higher education journey. I also frown upon the term "helicopter parent" as it deters families from getting engaged because of the negative connotation. However, it is still widely used by parents, administrators, and the popular culture. I believe in supporting all families, treating them with respect, and listening to their concerns. I share the image of a tandem bicycle with new families at the beginning of each academic year and explain that while they were on the front of their student's bicycle until this point, it is time for them to switch seats with their students and let the student take the lead now. I also remind them that they are certainly still on the bicycle supporting their student's journey and recognize that some parents want their students to have their own bicycles. I believe my identities as a college parent program professional, first-generation college student, Generation X member, and mother to be the most relevant to my study. While I hold many other identities, I will look through these different lenses as I discuss the connections and implications of the statistics reported.

Summary of Chapter

College parent involvement, and programs and resources dedicated to parent involvement in higher education, have grown steadily over the last few decades. The current generation of college students, Generation Z, continues to be closer to their parents and families than past generations (Seemiller & Grace, 2019). Shoup et al. (2009) also reported that college students with highly involved parents reported greater personal competence and increased personal and social development. However, other research on parent involvement and college well-being

revealed that college students who reported that their parents were overly involved and controlling had lower psychological well-being (Lemoyne & Buchanan, 2011). In 2019, almost 90% of counseling center directors reported an increase in students seeking services, according to the Association for University and College Counseling Center Directors (AUCCCD) Annual Survey, and to meet those needs, about 44% of college counseling centers added staff (Abrams, 2020). With all this information in mind, it is important to explore parent involvement and its relationship to college students' well-being to further support college students and administrators. College student well-being was a focus prior to the pandemic in 2020, and now there is even more dedicated programming towards ensuring college students are growing and developing in a healthy way, both in and out of the classroom.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following chapter outlines research that explores the evolution of parent involvement in higher education. It also provides a deeper understanding of the current college generation, Generation Z, and today's college student's well-being. The chapter also provides an overview of Schlossberg's Transition Theory, which was used to consider some of the research findings.

College Parent Involvement

As discussed in Chapter One, some higher education administrators and popular media outlets believe that parents and families are too involved in their student's college experience. In 2007, Merriman revealed that over 93 percent of student affairs professionals reported an increase in interaction with parents over the previous five years. That was over ten years ago, and with the evolution of technologies, communication, and generational changes, parent and families are now even more engaged. Defined by Wartman and Savage (2008),

> The phenomenon of parental involvement includes parents' showing interest in the lives of their students in college, gaining more information about college, knowing when and how to appropriately provide encouragement and guidance to their student connecting with the institution, and potentially retaining that institutional connection beyond the college years. (p. 5)

History of College Parent Involvement

While many may think parents being formally involved in their college students' lives is new, it is over 100 years old. The first recorded college parent involvement in an organized

manner dates to at least 1916 at Miami University of Ohio (Beaman et al., 2010). In the 1920s, "Mothers' Clubs" and "Dads' Clubs" were part of the traditions at Texas A&M University, Southern Methodist University, Stanford University, and other higher education institutions (Beaman et al., 2010). The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign created a Dads Association in 1922 and a Mothers Association in 1923. Designed by the parents, such as Aggie Moms, formally known as Texas A & M University Mother's Clubs (Federation of Texas A&M University Mother's Club, n.d.). In 1921, a mother of a current student at Texas A&M University, Mrs. Ada Brooks Allen, was concerned about campus life after visiting campus and seeing "no entertainment, no culture, and a complete lack of women's influence on campus" (Federation of Texas A&M University Mother's Club, n.d.). Allen, along with other A&M Mothers, formed the Dallas A&M Mother's Club in 1922; their objective was "to contribute in every way to the comfort and welfare of the boys and cooperate with the faculty of the college in maintaining a high standard of moral conduct and intellectual attainment," and this mission still exists today (Federation of Texas A&M University Mother's Club, n.d.).

Many of these parent clubs, such as the Southern Methodist University Mother's Club, create special programming for students on campus and raise funds to help with scholarships and campus projects (SMU Mother's Club, 2020). The Stanford Mother's Club decided to raise funds for a men's and women's infirmary, which later became part of the student health facility, after taking care of ill students for two years in their own homes (Parents Club of Stanford, 2020). According to Wartman and Savage (2008), there is little evidence to suggest that parent involvement from the 1920s -1950s was problematic to campus administration. It was not until the 1960s and 1970s that having separate events for fathers and mothers seemed politically incorrect that many schools started canceling events altogether (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

The Rise of the Term "Helicopter Parenting"

The term "helicopter parent" has become part of mainstream culture in recent years, especially in the media, and it comes with a negative bias towards a style of over-parenting. "Helicopter parent" typically refers to a parent who is overly involved and hovers over their college student, and the term became popular in the early 2000s (Howe & Strauss, 2003). "We argue that helicopter parents are intrusive in a specific area of their child's life, primarily education and future competitiveness, because they believe this will give their children a later advantage" (LeMoyne & Buchanan, 2011, p. 402). LeMoyne & Buchanan (2011) shared data that predicted a relationship of helicopter parenting to the likelihood a person had a prescription for either anxiety or depression.

Not all research views helicopter parents negatively. While college administrators are concerned that helicopter parents inhibit student development, highly involved parents support their students in completing psychosocial tasks such as identity creation and developing intimacy, provided parents allow their students opportunities to problem solve on their own before offering guidance (Taub, 2008). Taub (2008) also shared that parents and families provide much-needed support during the transition to college life. "When we choose to believe the myth that all parents are helicopter parents, we reinforce that dominant, one-dimensional, cultural script. We deny families the space and the respect to write their own stories of lives with college student children" (Dunn, 2015, p. 13).

Diversity

College students come from diverse backgrounds and experiences, and so do the college student's parents and families. Chang et al. (2010) explained that in their study, college youth from all ethnic backgrounds worked together with their parents and families on their education

journey. In addition, Chang et al. (2010) stated, “The relatively high levels of perceived shared agency with parents (accommodation, support, and/or collaboration) might be a sign that youth are open to their parents’ advice, opinions, and cooperation due to the challenges of this important life transition” (p. 1301). Fu and Markus (2014) detailed the results of their research with European American (EA) mothers and Asian American (AA) mothers and found that while EA mothers may assume that too much maternal involvement can suppress motivation, AA mothers may assume parental involvement is beneficial for motivation. Therefore, Fu and Markus (2014) stated, “These findings underscore the importance of understanding cultural variation in how people construe themselves and their relationships to others” (p. 747).

Kiyama and Harper (2018) noted, “Parent and family involvement/engagement among first-generation and students of color represents an emerging area of research, contributing to a better understanding of the role parents play, particularly among Latino (Nunez & Kim, 2012; Strayhorn, 2010), African American (Strayhorn, 2010), and American Indian (Makomenew, 2014) families” (p. 373). Not only do race and culture play a role in the diversity of college families, but so do socioeconomics and education level. A first-generation student will not have the same mentoring and support from family members simply because they are the first ones to attend college. Chang et al. (2010) revealed that “College students from families with higher education levels of parental educational attainment reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction across all ethnic comparisons” (p. 1301).

Regarding inclusive family engagement in higher education, Kiyama and Harper (2018) concluded:

> As colleges and universities continue to develop parent outreach programs and family-friendly initiatives on campus, it is important to examine the extent to which the

> full diversity of parents and families are accounted for in policies, practices, research, and theory. Failing to do so risks further perpetuating parenting models fueled by media hype and reinforcing the needs of a privileged subset of parents. (p. 380)

Educational Policies

Wartman and Savage (2008) explained "In loco parentis was the predominant view of the relationship between the university and its students until the 1960s and 1970s, when, as a result, of the students' demands for more autonomy, a shift away from this model occurred" (p. 34). In June 1967, a committee composed of representatives from the American Association of University Professors, the United States National Student Association (now the United States Student Association), the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities), the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Student Affairs Administrators (now NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education), and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors (later named NAWE – National Association of Women in Education, but now defunct) formulated a joint statement, the "Joint Statement on the Rights & Freedoms of Students" (https://www.aaup.org/report/joint-statement-rights-and-freedoms-students). Then, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) was passed in 1974, placing restrictions on what information colleges could and could not share with parents and families without student permission (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

Parents and families consistently hear messages that parent involvement from K-12 grade levels is critical to student success (Kennedy, 2009). Therefore, this expectation to be engaged and involved in something that families are used to and may have created the desire for parents and families to stay engaged on the collegiate level. Wartman and Savage (2008) noted that the

literature on K-12 education is important because most of the literature on the framework of parent involvement comes from the K-12 context.

"Parental involvement is an important component of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which has had an influence on the education of today's traditional-age college students" (Wartman & Savage, 2008, p. 22). According to the United States Department of Education website:

> The No Child Left Behind Act represented a significant step forward for our nation's children in many respects particularly as it shined a light on where students were making progress and where they needed additional support, regardless of race, income, zip code, disability, home language, or background. The law was scheduled for revision in 2007, and, over time, NCLB's prescriptive requirements became increasingly unworkable for schools and educators. Recognizing this fact, in 2010, the Obama administration joined a call from educators and families to create a better law. Every Student Succeeds Act focuses on the clear goal of fully preparing all students for success in college and careers. (https://www.ed.gov/essa)

For over 20 years, parents and families have been encouraged to get involved in their child's K-12 experience. Dunn (2015) shared, "The K-12 education culture spends 13 years telling parents it is their duty and responsibility to know everything about their child's experience. Then they are told it is illegal for them to know almost anything not told to them by their children. Who wouldn't wonder why there's a disconnect?" (p. 13).

Campus Safety

Today's parents have grown up with safety in mind. From the time their children were little, parents have used safer car seats than previous generations, sanitized playground

equipment, and made sure that their children were closely supervised at every moment to keep them safe (Twenge, 2017). As students transition to college campuses, parents worry about their safety and security. The Virginia Tech tragedy, Hurricane Katrina, the pandemic, and other crises continue to raise safety concerns for college parents. “Parents want to know what is happening in their students’ community. Once an event has been identified that could affect the college or their student, concern and panic can ensue” (Merriman, 2008, p. 58). The deaths of students at Columbine and Virginia Tech (and other shootings that have followed) persuade parents to want to know more and control their student’s environment to decrease the chance that harm will come to their child (Somers & Settle, 2010). Some administrators criticize parental notification alert systems due to student autonomy, but after the Virginia Tech tragedy involving a student gunman, parents expect to know what is happening on campus and that their student’s college campus will communicate safety concerns (Carney-Hall, 2008). Communication is heightened when crises occur, and because both families and institutions care about student safety, this is a natural area of partnership when thinking of the well-being of students (Newman & Riester, 2020).

Technology and Communication

Compared to previous generations, today’s students can email, text, make phone calls, and use social media. “Texting has become the prominent mode for communication and is widely popular among Generation Z students due to the ability to send and receive messages frequently” (Seemiller & Grace, 2015, p. 71). Modern technologies have made it easier for families and students to stay connected to discuss everything from grades to relationships to extra-curricular activities. Hofer (2011) reported that students communicated an average of 13.5

times per week with their parents and that 75% of students in the study were satisfied with the frequency of parent communication.

Managing the Rising Costs of College

College costs continue to rise, which remains a major concern for both parents and students. “Results from a Sallie Mae study found that a third of students in 2017 took out student loans, contributing to the total national student loan debt…Twenty years ago, it was common for college students to work part-time and be able to cover their tuition. Now even working full-time while in school barely makes a dent in college expenses” (Seemiller & Grace, 2019, p. 82).

The cost of college today often means that parents and students are likely to be making the decision together as a family as to what college to attend and how that will impact the family. This, of course, is not universal as not all families are involved in decision-making or may not be involved at all in a student’s higher education experience. “It is important to note within the discussion of patterns of engagement across parents and families that it would be a mistake to conclude that the relationship between students and families is monolithic or static” (Kiyama & Harper, 2018, p. 374). Parents ask about and expect a tangible return on their investment, including a clear path to a well-paying career upon graduation (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

Cutright (2008) listed five actions that institutions should do to encourage parents and families to be involved with their student’s higher education journey without impeding their student’s development. The first action that Cutright (2008) suggested was that colleges and universities create a partnership with parents. The second action recommended was to pull parents into that partnership, cultivate that relationship, and support student success through events such as parent orientation and ongoing educational opportunities to share key information to support parents and, therefore, students. The third action highlighted was to print handbooks

and other materials for families to have access to valuable campus information and resources and have one central office responsible for parents' communications. The fourth action recommended was that campuses make parents aware of what office to contact with concerns or needs for their students. Lastly, the fifth action is helping families understand Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). According to Cutright (2008), "Family relationships involve deep emotional connections, rights to speak and be considered in decisions, an evolving maturity and focus based on time, and commitments to stick with one another through thick and thin" (p. 43).

The role of parents and families will continue to grow based on the history and information outlined in this section. Parent and family engagement is helpful for student success. As colleges and universities continue to work towards new ways to support diverse groups of students, they will need to keep parent and family engagement present in their planning, admissions, orientation, special events, resources, and other various other ways to build a partnership with families to benefit both the students and families.

Generation Z

Born from 1995-2012, Generation Z students began college around 2013, and they are the current generation of college students on campus; Twenge (2017), a generational researcher, shared that they represent 24 percent of the American population. She refers to the current generation as iGen because of their relationship with technology and the amount of time they spend in front of a screen. According to her research, they spend hours, and teens typically have a presence on social media using Instagram, Snapchat, LinkedIn, and sometimes Facebook, although that is generally used by their parents, grandparents, coaches, teachers, and mentors. I will refer to Generation Z, also known as Gen Z, iGen, Centennials, Homeland Generation, and

Post-Millennials, as Generation Z for consistency purposes (Rue, 2018). Strauss and Howe (1991) defined generations as people moving through time, and each group or generation of people presents a distinctive sense of self. Many often confuse today's college student generation with Millennials (born in the early 1980s through the mid-1990s), but Millennials have not been on campuses as students in a few years. "The fact is, the oldest Millennials are now well established in their careers, requesting flex schedules so they can take their kids to soccer practice in the afternoons" (Beck & Wright, 2019, p. 21).

Generation Z students are largely the children of Generation X, who came from families with higher divorce rates than previous generations. Some children were "latchkey kids" because more women entered the workforce and/or because they lived in single-parent homes (Rue, 2018). Beck and Wright (2019) commented that "it may not be surprising that the generation of 'latchkey' kids has not grown up to be 'helicopter' parents" (p.22). Gen Z students are used to having their parents and family around them and are comfortable joining them on social outings with friends (Beck & Wright, 2019). According to Schenarts (2019), "parents of Generation Z are also cognizant of the negative 'helicopter parents' in which parents of Millennials hovered and directed every aspect of their children's lives" (p. 248). "Helicopter parenting" is now being replaced with a parent being a trusted mentor, friend, or coach, and where only 29% of Generation X considered their parent's role models, 69% of Generation Z students do. (Schenarts, 2019).

Emerging Adults and Generation Z

Twenge (2017) argued that this generation is developing at a slower rate than past generations. Arnett (2015) shared that emerging adulthood can be defined as when a person, roughly age 18-25, experiences later entry into marriage and/or parenthood and a prolonged

transition to stable work. The theory was originally based on a sample of three hundred 18–29-year-olds from a wide range of social classes (Arnett, 2004). When thinking of the current generation, it is also important to include Arnett's Theory of Emerging Adulthood. "The concept of emerging adulthood provides a foundation to understand today's college student and their parent relationship" (Simmons, 2018, p. 35). Arnett described his theory of emerging adulthood to have five features: identity exploration, instability, self-focus, feeling in-between, and possibilities/optimism.

Emerging adulthood is typically a time when people become more independent of their parents but have not quite entered adult life (e.g., long-term job, marriage, and parenthood), which allows individuals to experience different choices (Arnett, 2015). "Although emerging adults become more focused and serious about their choices in love and work than when they were adolescents, this change takes place gradually" (Arnett, 2015, p. 10). This thought is in line with Twenge's (2017) finding that young adults are experiencing dating, relationships, and having sex later in their life than in previous generations. "By 2014, more 18-to-34-year-olds were living with their parents than with a spouse or romantic partner" (Twenge, 2017, p. 222). Programs such as Teach for America, AmeriCorps, and the Peace Corps are particularly appealing to emerging adults because emerging adults have more freedom to participate than they may have later in their lives. They also delay more permanent decisions about career choices while still supporting the march towards independence (Arnett, 2015).

Safety

This generation is safer than past generations in numerous ways because they have been protected by their largely Generation X parents, but also because they are developing more slowly and exhibiting independence later than previous generations. Fewer Generation Z

students have a driver's license, and when they do, they are safer drivers, as fewer high school seniors get into car accidents and get tickets than in the past (Twenge, 2017). Generation Z has less teen sex and teen pregnancy, which Twenge (2017) noted as another sign of slower development. They are not in a rush to go out on dates without their parents. They quite enjoy spending time with their families at home – even if that means they are on their phones in their rooms. "They seem to lack the motivation in separating from their parents. They are used to their parents having high visibility into their lives and are often comfortable having their parents accompany them on outings with friends or even dates" (Beck & Wright, 2019, p. 24). Fewer Generation Z members drink alcohol, and they are less likely to binge-drink at younger ages. "The number of 18-year-olds who binge drink has been cut in half since the early 1980s, but binge drinking among 21–22-year-olds has stayed about the same" (Twenge, 2017, p. 37). Interestingly, they use marijuana at the same rate as Millennials because it is legal in many states and because they feel it is safer due to its medicinal qualities (Twenge, 2017).

Technology

Generation Z views technology as their escape and their way to connect with peers, and they feel no pressure to get involved in activities that previously were considered gateways to freedom (e.g., learning to drive or getting a part-time job) (Beck & Wright, 2019). According to Twenge (2017), "iGen high school seniors spent an average of 2 ¼ hours a day texting on their cell phones, about 2 hours a day on the Internet, 1 ½ hours a day on electronic gaming, and about a half-hour on video chat, totaling six hours a day with new media – and that is just in their leisure time" (p. 51). One study found that 100 percent of Gen Z students are online at least one hour per day, 75 percent of those students are online the first hour they wake up, and many suffer from a FOMO – the fear of missing out (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Twenge (2017) also added:

> Overall, both boys and girls spend much more time online with electronic devices. Here's the thing: this time must come from somewhere – there must be something else that iGen teens are not doing that previous generations did. There are probably several, but one obvious candidate is all the other ways people used to communicate and entertain themselves. (p. 59)

Students today are not hanging out in person together; they spend less time talking on the phone because they are texting instead, and they are spending more of their leisure time alone (Twenge, 2017).

Diversity

According to Twenge (2017), Generation Z is the most diverse generation in U.S. history. They are more racially and ethnically diverse than any previous generation, they are progressive, and they think that having the country grow to be more diverse is a positive step forward for society and America (Pew Research Center, 2020). Seemiller and Grace (2016) noted, "Generations Z's beliefs about diversity and social justice are almost certainly influenced by their exposure to a wide range of people different from them" (p. 56). Gen Z students believe in equality and social justice issues, and they are concerned about the impacts of racism, sexism, and poverty (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Gen Z is more likely to say they personally know someone who prefers to use gender-neutral pronouns, with 35% saying so, compared to 25% of Millennials, 16% of Gen X, and 12% of Boomers (Pew Research Center, 2020). "Many high schools now have Gay-Straight Alliances and participate in National Coming Out Day, though there are geographical differences in these trends, with urban students having greater experiences with openly gay peers" (Rue, 2018, p. 7). Generation Z and Millennials view different races marrying each other as a good thing for society, and they feel less that a single woman raising

children on her own is a bad thing for society when compared to older generations (Pew Research Center, 2020).

Having a better understanding of the current generation of college students is critical to the development and support of those students. Generation Z are the future leaders of the world and our communities. Understanding how they communicate and best receive information, what is important to them and what they value, and what they are challenged by and struggle with will be important to meet them where they are and better support and celebrate them and their families.

College Student Well-Being

College student health and wellness continues to be a growing concern in higher education for campus administrators, faculty, and college families. Chessman & Taylor (2019) noted that "over 80 percent of college presidents indicated that student well-being is mentioned in their strategic plan, and over 40 percent of plans mention mental health specifically" (p. 8). The American College Health Association's national survey from spring 2021 found that over half of the undergraduate students surveyed felt moderate to severe psychological distress and over half shared they felt lonely. Rue (2018) found, "Counseling Centers are already responding to an increasing need for support among students, using wait lists for appointments and triage practices to assess severity. Given the extent to which members of Gen Z are on their mobile devices at all hours of the day, the existence of after-hours services is especially important" (p. 8).

Gen Z and Social Skills

Twenge (2017) shared that Generation Z (or iGen as she refers to the current student population) "is on the verge of the most severe mental health crisis for young people in decades"

(p. 93) and that "college students' mental health is deteriorating" (p. 103). Gen Z's use of technology has impacted their student development, which can be observed in the development of Gen Z's social skills, how they connect to peers and cultivate relationships, and how they manage conflict and their emotions. Therefore, it is not surprising that with all this alone time, social media use, and cell phone use, more Gen Z students are reporting that they are lonely and unhappy (Twenge, 2017). Rue (2018) shared, "Since communication is a key ingredient of relationship development, I fear that the establishing and deepening of human connection will be more challenging for this generation which could lead to greater loneliness and decreased mental health" (p. 7).

Bowman (2010) noted that during a student's first year of college, psychological well-being gains are positively related to several pre-college attributes, including being non-first-generation student, female, being older than the traditional college-age, and having high academic achievement. Additional positive outcomes in psychological well-being occur when a student has positive interactions with diverse experiences, develops meaningful relationships with other students, and has positive interactions with faculty (Bowman, 2010). Negative outcomes in psychological well-being include hostile or negative interactions with diverse experiences, drinking alcohol, and lack of social interactions/strong relationships with other students (Bowman, 2010).

Parent Involvement and Well-Being

From their study that took place in Spain, where family is a key element of daily life, Mendoza et al. (2019) found that "emerging adults who perceived higher levels of parental involvement, warmth, and support for autonomy, also reported higher levels of psychological well-being and lower levels of psychological distress" (p. 964). Therefore, parent involvement

and engagement were strongly linked to emerging adults' well-being and decreased distress. Mendoza et al. (2019) also found that young women perceived a higher level of parent involvement and warmth than young men. Emerging adults who felt controlled by their parents reported a higher level of psychological distress and lower levels of psychological well-being (Mendoza et al., 2019).

COVID-19

Jeong et al. (2021) reported that both first-generation college students and non-first-generation college students experienced slightly high or moderate levels of stress and depression during this pandemic. Not surprisingly, the pandemic is stressful for all college students. Jeong et al. (2021) suggested that college counselors continue to promote their services and work with academic units and student affairs/student activities to promote their services. In addition, colleges need to extend and continue their remote counseling and other mental healthcare services to students to continue to support their health and wellness (Jeong et al., 2021).

Schlossberg's Transition Theory

Schlossberg's psychosocial Transition theory (Anderson et al., 2012) describes how transitions create opportunities for growth and development, and this study provided a framework for understanding student development. It is important to note that while transitions may lead to growth, it is also possible for a decline or regression to occur. Schlossberg defined a transition as "any event or non-event that results in changed relationships, routines, assumptions and roles" (Anderson et al., 2012, p. 39). Non-events can be classified as personal (related to individual aspirations), ripple (felt due to a non-event in the life of someone close), resultant (caused by an event), and delayed (anticipating an event that may still happen) (Anderson et al.

2012). Transition theory states that a transition only exists if it is defined as such by the individuals experiencing it (Goodman et al., 2006).

Schlossberg identified four major sets of factors that influence an individual's ability to cope with transition: situation, self, strategies, and support, known as the 4 S's (Goodman et al., 2006). The first factor, "situation," refers to how an individual perceives their transition and their sense of control over what is occurring. The second factor is "self," which looks at what the individual brings to the transition. The third factor, "strategies," speaks to abilities to manage transitions through one's own behavior. There are three strategies to cope with transition, including modifying the situation, controlling the meaning of the problem, and aiding in managing the stress in the aftermath (Anderson et al., 2012). The fourth factor is "support," and that is the factor that plays the largest role in this study. Support includes these three facets: types, functions, and measurement. Social support is comprised of four types: intimate relationships, family units, network of friends, and institutions and communities (Anderson et al., 2012). Social support can be measured by identifying the individual's stable supports, supports that are to some degree role dependent, and supports that are most likely to change (Goodman et al., 2006). Dill and Henley (1998) stated that nontraditional-aged college students who received support from a parent or partner coped better with stressful academic experiences by enjoying success in different life roles.

An example of Schlossberg's Transition Theory being applied in research can be found in a student-veteran study. In their study with student-veterans, Ryan et al. (2011) shared, "by learning the strengths, needs, and challenges, of students-veterans as they transition from the military and matriculate through higher education, advisors armed with information from Schlossberg et al. (1995) framework will facilitate greater advocacy for student-veterans" (p.

61). Schlossberg's transition theory explains the transition process and factors that contribute to a person's ability to cope with various transitions they encounter.

The factor of support will be used when looking at the research data in this study involving the relationship between perceived parent involvement and self-reported well-being in first-year college students.

Summary of Chapter

For decades, parents and families have been involved in their children's education at the K-12 level and at the higher education level. Generations may have changed the way parents and families interact both in society and within higher education, but it is important to understand the role that parents, and families play in their college student's life. Using Schlossberg's Transition Theory, specifically the support factor, how does parent involvement impact the student's transition to college, through college, and beyond? The following study aims to understand how parent involvement is related to a college student's well-being during the transition to the first year of college.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Each fall, families send their students off to college and hope that they will be safe, do well academically, make some friends, and continue to grow in new ways. For many, the emotions are the same regardless of income level, race, ethnicity, or culture, or whether this is the first, last, or one and only student they are sending off to college. Depending on the campus community, families may be welcomed with open arms or asked to stay at arm's length. College parent involvement, and programs and resources dedicated to parent involvement and family engagement in higher education have grown steadily over the last two decades. According to Petree and Savage (2019), there has been a steady growth of parent and family programs on college campuses since the 1970s, with 71% of programs formed since 2000. Generation Z continues to be closer to their parents than past generations (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Generation Z also struggles more with mental health and well-being than past generations (Twenge, 2017). "While issues related to mental health affect all age groups, they are on the rise with Generation Z youth and college students" (Seemiller & Grace, 2016, p. 145).

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of college students' perceptions of parent involvement and their self-reported well-being related to the college student's transition to college and their first-year experience. An overview of the site, participants, procedures, data collection, instruments, and data analysis for this study is provided in this chapter.

Site

All participants were recruited from a large-sized public institution in the Southeastern part of the United States. The campus was a predominantly white institution with a primarily residential campus. The campus is a research university located in an urban area, with over 15,800 undergraduate students and a retention rate from the first year to the second year of 97%. Invited participants were first-year students (at least 18 years of age) who must have completed at least 12 credit hours at the institution to qualify for the study, which was conducted during the spring semester. With IRB and campus approvals, the University Registrar provided an email list of 2,961 first-year students who met these requirements.

Participants

For this study, all full-time first-year students who were at least 18 years of age and earned at least 12 credit hours at the institution were invited to participate. A full-time student was considered 12 or more credit hours. Students were recruited via email sent out to 2,961 first-year students in February 2022. This timing was intentional to allow new first-year students to get acclimated to their new environment for at least one semester before they were invited to participate in the study.

Procedures

A quantitative research survey relying on responses to a questionnaire was delivered using Qualtrics software. Data were collected and analyzed related to college students' perceived parent involvement, self-reported well-being, and demographics. Creswell (2018) articulated that quantitative research allows numerical data to be statistically analyzed to determine the relationships between different variables. College students' perceived parent involvement and college students' self-reported well-being were measured quantitatively through two separately

validated instruments; demographic information was also collected. IRB approval was received from the University of Georgia, and the site location granted IRB permission. Once IRB approval was given, the researcher requested permission from the Institute Survey Coordination Committee (ISCC) at the site location. Permission was granted from the ISCC for the survey to be distributed from February 2 – 15, 2022. The researcher also requested permission from the campus registrar to access first-year student email addresses. Permission was granted from the registrar, and the email addresses were generated and securely delivered to the researcher. The researcher then loaded the emails into the Qualtrics system. To ensure confidentiality of data, the email list was loaded from a work computer into the UGA Qualtrics system that was password protected. In addition, the data was stored on the researcher's cloud storage service that was password protected. The only identifying information was IP addresses, which were removed when the data was cleaned before data analysis occurred.

Data Collection Methods

All eligible students to participate in the study received a recruitment email with an incentive listed (see Appendix A) on February 2, 2022, and email reminders were sent every few days until the survey closed on February 15, 2022. In addition, it should be noted that feedback was given to the researcher by current students, who tested the study before the study being released that adding a social media campaign would be beneficial, so a social media marketing component was added, with IRB approval. Gen Z students prefer to text, use social media, or even platforms such as Zoom to send and receive information over getting and sending emails (June, 2021). Therefore, students were recruited via campus social media channels during the same two-week period in February to increase the completion rate. Specifically, the Parent &

Family Programs Facebook and Instagram pages and other campus department and student organization pages were used for advertising the study.

When students agreed to participate in the study, they followed the link provided in the email to proceed to the online Qualtrics survey. The IRB approval information was included there, and students were provided an online consent for the survey. The University of Georgia-licensed Qualtrics software was used to collect the data. The instrument, delivered by Qualtrics link, was mobile-friendly and took 10-15 minutes to complete. Both were done to encourage student participation by first-year Generation Z college students. The first page of the survey provided a consent form to participants (see Appendix B). If an individual did not consent, they were taken to the end of the study and thanked for their time. When a participant consented by clicking the 'begin survey' button, they were taken to the survey's first question.

All students had the option to be entered into a drawing for one of ten $25 Target gift cards if they were interested in doing so. The drawing was completed at the end of the survey period, and all winners were contacted via email to receive their e-gift cards. Students could also enter the drawing directly without completing the survey. Emails from the drawing were not used for any other purpose and were kept separate from the survey responses. Each email provided was assigned a random number; a random number generator website was used to identify ten numbers and the corresponding email addresses. The ten people selected were notified and received their electronic gift card on February 17, 2022.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire was composed of items related to college students' perceptions of parent involvement, college students' self-reported well-being, and demographic questions. Participation in the study was voluntary, and participants were not required to answer all the

questions and could withdraw from participation in the online survey at any time. The questionnaire included three sections in which participants selected the best response using a 7-point Likert scale (Johnson & Christensen, 2017).

The first section of the questionnaire (see Appendix D – section one) included the instrument called the Perceptions of Parents Scale (POPS) (Robbins, 1994), renamed by the researcher the "Parent/Caregiver Relationship Scale" for the participant questionnaire. The instrument was designed as part of a doctoral dissertation entitled "An Assessment of Perceptions of Parental Autonomy Support and Control: Child and Parent Correlates" at the University of Rochester by Robbins (1994). Robbins (1994) provided preliminary evidence, including reliability and validity of the scale. A more recent longitudinal study by Niemiec, Ryan, and Deci (2009) added further reliability and validity to the scale. The Perceptions of Parents Scale (POPS) – College Student Version consists of twenty-one items rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (Robbins, 1994). There are three subscales: parental involvement, parental warmth, and parental autonomy support. The global Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .92. Mendoza et al. (2019) noted that high scores on the POPS instrument indicate the student's perception of high parental involvement, warmth, and strong fostering of autonomy. This researcher adapted the POPS survey from the original instrument to ask about only one caregiver as opposed to both a mother and father. Instead of asking 42 questions, 21 questions to a mother and 21 questions to a father, only 21 questions in total were asked of the participants. This change was made to be more inclusive of the possibility of different caregivers because the gender of the parent is not of interest in this study.

The second section of the questionnaire (see Appendix D – section two) included eighteen questions from the Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB) (Ryff & Keyes, 1995),

renamed by the researcher "College Student Well-Being Scale" for the participant questionnaire. There are three forms of the PWB inventory – long-form, medium form, and short form. This researcher chose to use the short form for this study because the length of the other two forms would likely have resulted in a lower completed return rate. In all the forms, six areas of psychological well-being are identified in statements under the following areas: Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, and Self-Acceptance. Seifert (2005) shared that the shortest version, which consists of eighteen items (three per scale), is used in a variety of large-scale national and international surveys and, in her research, found the short form to be a valid and reliable measure of psychological well-being.

Ryff & Keyes (1995) reported that "to accommodate time and cost restrictions of a national survey, we chose only three of the original 20 items to measure each construct" for each of the six constructs to total an 18-item scale (p. 720). "The shortened scale correlated from .70 to .89 with 20-item parent scales" (Ryff et al., 1995, p. 720). The 18-item scale has been used to study adults of all ages, including those from lower-income backgrounds (Curhan et al., 2014; Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The short form also has been used by Latinx college students (Gloria, Castellanos, Scull, & Villegas, 2009), as well as African Americans living in New York and Mexican Americans living in Chicago (Ryff, Keyes, & Hughes, 2003). "The 18-item short form of the Mandarin PWB is an instrument with good reliability and validity that is suitable to measure the level of PWB in clinical nurses in Taiwan" (Lee et al., 2019, p. 161). Ryff's model of PWB captures broad conceptions of self. "In fact, several of the dimensions associated with PWB closely align with established developmental outcomes in higher education" (Bowman, 2010, p. 180). It is important to note that while this short form is valid and reliable, this

researcher chose not to analyze the data by the six subscales since there are only three questions in each.

The third and final section of the questionnaire (see Appendix D – section three) includes four brief demographic questions asking about gender, race/ethnicity, campus housing status, and the primary caregiver's highest education level.

Data Analysis

The data was cleaned prior to data analysis and only completed survey responses were used. After the data was collected, the software system, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), was used to analyze the data. The data gathered through the Qualtrics survey were examined using descriptive and inferential statistics to ascertain how college students perceive the level of involvement of their parent/caregiver, how they rate their level of well-being, and the relationship between college students' perception of parent involvement and their self-reported well-being using the Perception of Parents Scale (POPS) (Robbins, 1994), the Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB) (Ryff & Keyes, 1995), and demographic questions. Descriptive statistics were used to examine responses on each scale, and independent T-tests, ANOVA, and Pearson's correlation were used to look for statistical significance between scores on the two instruments and to determine any significant differences between the results based on demographic characteristics. For this study, a p-value of less than 0.05 is considered statistically significant. The analysis also focused on the impact of several independent variables - including gender, race, ethnicity, campus housing status, and primary caregiver's highest education level. For the first instrument, the Perception of Parents Scale (POPS) (Robbins, 1994), the researcher determined a higher score represented positive perceptions; the total possible score was 147, and 73.5 was the midpoint of the scale; therefore, a score on or over the midpoint was determined to

be on the higher end of the range. For the second instrument, the Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB), higher scores equate to higher levels of psychological well-being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

Specific research questions and data analysis strategies used in this study included:

1) Is there a relationship between college parent involvement and self-reported well-being with college students?
    a) A Pearson's correlation test was used to measure the statistical relationship between college students' perceived parent involvement and self-reported well-being.
2) How do college students perceive the level of involvement of their parent/caregiver, as measured by an adapted version of the Perceptions of Parents Scale (Robbins, 1994)?
    a) Descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation were calculated.

Additional statistical comparisons were conducted using the following dependent and independent variables:

    b) An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare Perceptions of Parents Scale responses based on gender.
    c) A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Perceptions of Parents Scale responses based on race and ethnicity.
    d) A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Perceptions of Parents Scale responses based on campus housing status.
    e) A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Perceptions of Parents Scale responses based on caregiver's highest education level.
3) How do college students rate their level of well-being, as measured by the Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995)?

a) Descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation were calculated. Additional statistical comparisons were conducted using the following dependent and independent variables:

b) An independent t-test was conducted to compare Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on gender.

c) A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on race and ethnicity.

d) A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on campus housing status.

e) A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on caregiver's highest education level.

Summary of Chapter

This chapter discussed the research design and methodologies used in examining the research questions exploring the perception of parent involvement by college students, the self-reported well-being of college students, and the relationship between the two of them. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to answer the research questions. The researcher recruited first-year college students through a provided email list from the university registrar and through social media. The survey consisted of the combination of two separately validated instruments in addition to four demographic questions to gain an understanding of those represented in the sample.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

This quantitative study examined the perceptions of first-year college students regarding their parents' involvement in their life, their level of well-being, and the relationship between the two areas of study. The research questions that guided this study were the following:

1) Is there a relationship between college parent involvement and self-reported well-being with college students?

2) How do college students perceive the level of involvement of their parent/caregiver, as measured by an adapted version of the Perceptions of Parents Scale (Robbins, 1994)?

3) How do college students rate their level of well-being, as measured by the Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995)?

The previous chapter explained the data collection and analysis process. This chapter includes a breakdown of the demographics of the participants and the results of the research questions from the study. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data gathered through a 43-question Qualtrics survey, which was comprised of two existing instruments and demographic questions.

Participants

All first-year student participants at the institution that served as the research site who were eligible for the study received an invitation to participate. There were 472 participants who fully completed the survey, representing 15.94% of the 2,961 individuals who received the participation invitation.

Table 1

Demographics of First-Year College Student Participants

Demographic Variable	Frequency	%	Overall Site Population	%
Gender				
Man	197	41.7	1720	58
Woman	255	54.0	1243	42
Race/Ethnicity				
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	3	<1
Asian/Asian American	138	29.2	995	33.6
Black/African American	31	6.6	253	8.5
Hispanic/Latino(a)	19	4.0	273	9.2
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0
White	229	48.5	1259	42.5
Two or more races	41	8.7	131	4.4
Unknown	0	0	49	1.6
Housing Status				
Live on-campus	439	93.0		
Live off campus	19	4.0		
Live in Greek housing	6	1.3		
Live at home commuter	6	1.3		
Caregiver's Highest Education Level				
Some High School	9	1.9		
High School	37	7.8		
Associate/Trade School	29	6.1		
Bachelor's degree	140	29.7		
Master's degree	168	35.6		
Professional degree	82	17.4		

Table 1 provides descriptive information about the 472 participants. Of the 472 respondents to take the survey, over half were women, and nearly half were White, with Asian/Asian Americans making up almost a third of the participants. Almost all lived on campus, and most had a parent/caregiver with an undergraduate or advanced degree.

Relationship Between Parent Involvement and Well-Being

Is there a relationship between college parent involvement and the self-reported well-being of college students?

A Pearson's correlation test measured the statistical relationship between college students' perceived parent involvement and self-reported well-being. A correlation was used because the researcher wanted to determine the relationship, if any, between the Perceptions of Parents Scale and the Psychological Well-Being Scale.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Parents Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Perceptions of Parents Scale	116.66	21.90	472
Psychological Well-Being Score	94.28	14.16	472

Table 2 displays the results from the Perceptions of Parents Scale Score (M=5116.66, SD 21.90) and Psychological Well-Being Scale Score (M=94.28, SD 14.16). A Pearson' Correlation test revealed a positive correlation, r =.499. Therefore, there is a moderate positive relationship between Parent Scale Score and Well-Being Scale Score, r(.499), n = 472. This result indicated that college students' perception of parent involvement (Perceptions of Parents Scale) is positively correlated with their self-reported level of well-being (Well-Being Scale Score).

Table 3

Correlation of Perceptions of Parents Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale

		Perceptions of Parents Scale Score	Psychological Well-Being Scale Score
Perceptions of Parents Scale	Pearson Correlation	1	.499**

	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	472	472
Psychological Well-Being Scale	Pearson Correlation	.499**	1
	Sig (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	472	472

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

Perceptions of Parent Involvement

How do college students perceive the level of involvement of their parent/caregiver, as measured by an adapted version of the Perceptions of Parents Scale (Robbins, 1994)?

The first section of the questionnaire (see Appendix D – section one) was the Perceptions of Parents Scale (POPS) (Robbins, 1994). The survey included twenty-one questions on a 7-point Likert scale. The survey was adapted from the original instrument to ask about only one caregiver as opposed to both a mother and father. This change was more inclusive of the possibility of different caregivers and because the gender of the parent is not the interest of this study. Although the survey measured perceptions of college parents/caregivers using three subscales (involvement, autonomy support, and warmth), this study used only the total scale score for analysis.

Descriptive Statistics of Perceptions of Parents

Descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation were calculated. These statistics indicated how first-year students perceived their parents' involvement.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Parents Scale

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Perceptions of Parents Scale	116.66	21.90	472

Table 4 shows descriptive statistics for the Perceptions of Parents Scale, with r an overall mean score of 116.66 (SD= 21.90). Based on a Likert Scale of 7, with 21 questions and a total possible score of 147, a total mean score of 116.66, and a standard deviation of 21.90, first-year students responded with a total score on the higher end of the scale. Participants perceived the involvement of their parents/caregivers to be positive. As noted in Chapter 3, the researcher determined a higher score represented positive perceptions because the total possible score was 147 and 73.5 was the midpoint of the scale; therefore, a total score of 116.66 was considered a higher score.

Differences in Perceptions of Parents by Gender

To determine whether there is a significant difference between men and women in their perceptions of parent involvement, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare Perceptions of Parents Scale responses based on gender.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Parents Scale Based on Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Perceptions of Parents Scale	Man	197	117.65	20.56	1.50
	Woman	255	116.73	22.64	1.42

Table 6

Independent T-test for Perceptions of Parents Scale Based on Gender

		t	df	Sig (2-tailed)
Perceptions of Parents Scale	Equal variances assumed	.446	450	.656

Table 6 shows the results of an independent-samples t-test conducted to compare the difference between the scores of men and women in their perceptions of parent involvement. These results indicated that there is no significant difference between how men and women responded about their perceptions of parent involvement: Perceptions of Parents Scale for men (M = 117.65, SD = 20.56) and women (M = 116.73, SD = 22.64); t (450) = .45, p = .656 (see Table 5 and Table 6). These results suggested that first-year men and women in this study are not significantly different when measuring their parents/caregivers' involvement, support, and warmth.

Differences in Perceptions of Parents Based on Race and Ethnicity

To determine whether there is a significant difference based on race and ethnicity in the participants' perceptions of parent involvement, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Perceptions of Parents scale responses based on race and ethnicity.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Parents Scale Based on Race and Ethnicity

Source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Asian/Asian American	138	110.28	22.82	1.94
Black/African American	31	122.16	21.77	3.91
Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a)	19	116.74	23.91	5.50
White	229	119.40	20.25	1.34
Two or More	41	117.15	22.80	3.51
Total	458	116.53	21.83	1.02

Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics of means and standard deviation for the perceptions of parents by race and ethnicity.

Table 8

One-Way ANOVA for Perceptions of Parents Scale Based on Race and Ethnicity

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between groups	8274.11	4	2068.53	4.47	.001
Within groups	209544.17	453	462.60		
Total	217818.13	457			

Note. Df=Degrees of Freedom. SS=Sum of Squares. MS=Mean Square.

Table 8 shows the results of a one-way ANOVA used to examine differences in Perceptions of Parents Scale responses based on race and ethnicity [$F(4, 457) = 4.47$, $p = 0.001$]. There is a significant difference in Perceptions of Parents Scale responses based on race and ethnicity.

Table 9

TUKEY Difference in Perceptions of Parents Scale Based on Race and Ethnicity

Race and Ethnicity	Race and Ethnicity	Mean Difference	Sig.
Asian/Asian American	Black/African Am.	-11.88*	.045
	Hispanic/Latino(a) /Chicano(a)	-6.45	.736
	White	-9.12*	<.001
	Two or more	-6.86	.378
Black/African American	Asian/Asian Am.	11.88*	.045
	Hispanic/Latino(a) /Chicano(a)	5.42	.909
	White	2.76	.963
	Two or more	5.01	.864
Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a)	Asian/Asian Am.	6.45	.736
	Black/African Am.	-5.42	.909

	White	-2.66	.985
	Two or more	-.409	1.00
White	Asian/Asian Am.	9.12*	<.001
	Black/African Am.	-2.76	.963
	Hispanic/Latino(a) /Chicano(a)	2.66	.985
	Two or more	2.25	.972
Two or More	Asian/Asian Am.	6.86	.378
	Black/African Am.	-5.01	.864
	Hispanic/Latino(a) /Chicano(a)	.410	1.00
	White	-2.25	.972

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 9 shows a follow-up TUKEY's analysis of the statistically significant difference in the ANOVA. There was a significant difference in the responses on the Perception of Parents Scale based on race for the following groups: Asian/Asian American and White students (p =<.001) and Asian/Asian American and Black/African American (p=.045). The differences between other races and ethnicities of students on the Perception of Parents Scale were not statistically significant. Both Black/African American students and White students have a significantly higher score than Asian/Asian American students when responding to questions about parent/caregiver involvement, support, and warmth.

Differences in Perceptions of Parents Based on Campus Housing Status

To determine whether there is a significant difference in the participants' perceptions of parent involvement based on campus housing status, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Perception of Parents Scale responses based on campus housing status.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Parents Scale Based on Campus Housing Status

Source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
I live on-campus	439	116.70	21.44	1.02
I live off-campus	19	110.70	32.34	7.42
I live at home/commuter	6	124.83	11.51	4.70
I live in Greek housing	9	128.70	10.53	4.30
Total	470	116.71	21.82	1.00

Table 10 shows the independent variable, campus housing status, included four groups: live on-campus (M = 116.70, SD = 21.44, n = 439), live off-campus (M = 110.70, SD = 32.34, n = 19), home/commuter (M = 124.83, SD = 11.51, n = 6), Greek housing (M = 128.70, SD = 10.53, n = 9). The descriptive statistics listed above examined differences in Perception of Parents Scale score based on campus housing status.

Table 11

One-Way ANOVA for Perceptions of Parents Scale Based on Campus Housing Status

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between groups	1873.40	3	624.50	1.31	.270
Within groups	221369.70	466	475.04		
Total	223243.10	469			

Note. Df=Degrees of Freedom. SS=Sum of Squares. MS=Mean Square.

Table 11 shows the results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to compare the four subgroups (campus housing status: on-campus, off-campus, home/commuter, or Greek housing). The ANOVA examined the differences in Perceptions of Parents Scale

responses based on where participants indicated they lived. There was no significant difference in the Perception of Parents Scale based on campus housing status [$F(3, 469) = 1.31$, $p = .27$].

Differences in Perceptions of Parents Based on Caregiver's Education Level

To determine whether there is a significant difference in participants' perceptions of parent involvement based on the primary caregiver's education level, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Perception of Parents scale responses based on the primary caregiver's highest education level.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Parents Scale Based on Caregiver's Education Level

Source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Some High School	9	104.00	25.70	8.56
High School	37	115.49	18.58	3.05
Associate degree/Trade School	29	105.62	22.03	4.09
Bachelor's degree	140	117.32	23.50	1.99
Master's degree	168	122.03	17.31	1.33
Prof. degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., etc.)	82	111.40	24.81	2.74
Total	465	116.90	21.78	1.01

Table 12 shows the descriptive statistics of means and standard deviation for the perceptions of parents based on the primary caregiver's highest education level.

Table 13

One-Way ANOVA for Perceptions of Parents Scale Based on Caregiver's Education Level

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between groups	12204.95	5	2440.99	5.39	.000
Within groups	207987.90	459	453.13		
Total	220192.85	464			

Note. Df=Degrees of Freedom. SS=Sum of Squares. MS=Mean Square.

Table 13 displays the results of a one-way ANOVA used to examine differences in Perceptions of Parents Scale responses based on caregiver's highest education level [$F(5, 464) = 5.39$, $p = 0.000$]. These results indicated that there is a significant difference in responses based on the primary caregiver's highest education level.

Table 14

TUKEY Difference in Perceptions of Parents Scale Based on Caregiver's Education Level

Caregiver's Education Level	Caregiver's Education Level	Mean Difference	Sig.
Some High School	High School	-11.49	.695
	Associate/Trade	-1.62	1.00
	Bachelor's degree	-13.32	.454
	Master's degree	-18.03	.133
	Prof. degree	-7.40	.921
High School	Some High School	11.49	.695
	Associate/Trade	9.86	.423
	Bachelor's degree	-1.83	.997
	Master's degree	-6.55	.536
	Prof. degree	4.10	.927
Associate/Trade School	Some High School	1.62	1.00

	High School	-9.86	.423
	Bachelor's degree	-11.70	.078
	Master's degree	-16.41*	.002
	Prof. degree	-5.77	.809
Bachelor's degree	Some High School	13.32	.454
	High School	1.83	.997
	Associate/Trade	11.70	.078
	Master's degree	-4.71	.382
	Prof. degree	5.93	.342
Master's degree	Some High School	18.03	.133
	High School	6.55	.536
	Associate/Trade	16.41*	.002
	Bachelor's degree	4.71	.382
	Prof. degree	10.64*	.003
Professional degree	Some High School	7.40	.921
	High School	-4.10	.927
	Associate/Trade	5.77	.809
	Bachelor's degree	-5.93	.342
	Master's degree	-10.64*	.003

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 14 shows a follow-up TUKEY's analysis of the statistically significant difference in the ANOVA. There was a significant difference in the responses on the Perception of Parents Scale based on the primary caregiver's highest education level for the following groups: master's degree and associate degree/trade school (p =.002) and master's degree and professional degree (p=.003). Students whose caregivers had earned a master's degree have a significantly higher score when reporting their perceptions of parent involvement than students whose caregivers had earned an associate degree/trade school degree. In addition, students whose caregivers had

earned a master's degree had a significantly higher score than students whose caregivers had earned a professional degree.

College Students Self-Reported Well-Being

How do college students rate their level of well-being, as measured by the Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995)?

The second section of the questionnaire (see Appendix D – section two) asked the participants to respond to questions from the College Student Well-Being Scale, renamed for this study from the Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB, see Appendix E) (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The survey included eighteen questions using a 7-point Likert scale. As noted in Chapter 3, this is the shortest version of the Psychological Well-Being Scale, and the researcher chose not to assign value based only on three answers for the following subscales: Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, and Self-Acceptance (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

Psychological Well-Being Scale

Descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation were calculated. These statistics indicated how first-year students self-reported their well-being.

Table 15

Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Well-Being Scale

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Psychological Well-Being Scale	94.28	14.16	472

Table 15 displays descriptive statistics for the Psychological Well-Being Scale, which revealed an overall mean score of 94.28 (SD=14.16). According to Ryff & Keyes (1995), higher scores equate to higher levels of psychological well-being. With a possible high score of 126, a

total mean score of 94.28, and a standard deviation of 14.16, first-year students responded with higher scores indicating that participants in this study perceived they had a higher level of well-being.

Differences in Self-reported Well-Being by Gender

To determine whether there is a significant difference between men and women in their self-reported well-being, an independent t-test was conducted to compare Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on gender.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Well-Being Scale Based on Gender

	Type of Activity	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Psychological Well-Being Scale	Man	197	96.58	13.10	.93
	Woman	255	92.63	14.90	.93

Table 17

Independent T-test for Psychological Well-Being Scale Based on Gender

		t	df	Sig (2-tailed)
Well-Being Scale Score	Equal variances assumed	2.98	442.22	.003

Table 17 shows the results of an independent t-test conducted to compare the difference between men and women on their self-reported well-being. These results indicated that there is a significant difference in the scores between how men and women reported their well-being: Psychological Well-Being Scale for men (M = 96.58, SD = 13.10) and women (M = 92.63, SD =

14.90); t (442.22) = 2.98, p = .003. These results suggested that the Psychological Well-Being Scale score is significantly different between men and women in this study. First-year college men reported a higher level of their own sense of well-being compared to the first-year women in this study.

Differences in Self-Reported Well-Being Based on Race and Ethnicity

To determine whether there is a significant difference in participants' self-reported well-being based on race and ethnicity, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on race and ethnicity.

Table 18

Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Well-Being Scale Based on Race and Ethnicity

Source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Asian/Asian American	138	89.36	14.43	1.23
Black/African American	31	95.68	14.80	2.66
Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a)	19	98.10	14.81	3.40
White	229	96.35	13.28	.88
Two or More	41	95.02	13.41	2.09
Total	458	94.15	14.12	.66

Table 18 shows the descriptive statistics of means and standard deviation for the perceptions of parents based on race and ethnicity.

Table 19

One-Way ANOVA for Psychological Well-Being Scale Based on Race and Ethnicity

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between groups	4671.83	4	1167.96	6.12	.000
Within groups	86453.48	453	190.85		
Total	91125.30	457			

Note. Df=Degrees of Freedom. SS=Sum of Squares. MS=Mean Square.

Table 19 shows the results of a one-way ANOVA used to examine the differences in Psychological Well-being Scale responses based on race and ethnicity [$F(4, 457) = 6.12$, $p = 0.000$]. There was a significant difference based on race and ethnicity in the students' self-reported well-being.

Table 20

TUKEY Difference in Psychological Well-Being Scale Based on Race and Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Race/Ethnicity	Mean Difference	Sig.
Asian/Asian American	Black/African Am.	-6.31	.147
	Hispanic/Latino(a) /Chicano(a)	-8.74	.075
	White	-6.99*	<.000
	Two or more	-5.66	.145
Black/African American	Asian/Asian Am.	6.31	.147
	Hispanic/Latino(a) /Chicano(a)	-2.43	.975
	White	-.672	.999
	Two or more	.653	1.00
Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a)	Asian/Asian Am.	8.74	.075

	Black/African Am.	2.43	.975
	White	1.76	.984
	Two or more	3.08	.929
White	Asian/Asian Am.	6.99*	<.000
	Black/African Am.	.672	.999
	Hispanic/Latino(a) /Chicano(a)	-1.75	.984
	Two or more	1.32	.980
Two or More	Asian/Asian Am.	5.66	.145
	Black/African Am.	-.653	1.00
	Hispanic/Latino(a) /Chicano(a)	-3.08	.929
	White	-1.32	.980

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 20 shows a follow-up TUKEY's analysis of the statistically significant difference in the ANOVA. There was a significant difference in the responses on the Psychological Well-Being Scale for the following groups: Asian/Asian American and White students (p =.000) students. The differences between other races and ethnicities of students and the Psychological Well-Being Scale were not statistically significant. These results suggested that Asian/Asian American student participants rate their well-being at a lower level compared to White student participants.

Differences in Self-Reported Well-Being Based on Campus Housing Status

To determine whether there is a significant difference between their self-reported well-being based on campus housing status, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on campus housing status.

Table 21

Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Well-Being Scale Based on Campus Housing Status

Source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
I live on-campus	439	94.60	13.71	.65
I live off-campus	19	89.42	20.42	4.68
I live at home/commuter	6	91.33	18.18	7.42
I live in Greek housing	9	90.33	10.17	4.15
Total	470	94.30	14.055	.65

In Table 21, the independent variable included four groups: live on-campus (M = 94.60, SD = 13.71, n = 439), live off-campus (M = 89.42, SD = 20.42, n = 19), home/commuter (M = 91.33, SD = 18.18, n = 6), Greek housing (M = 90.33, SD = 10.17, n = 9).

Table 22

One-Way ANOVA for Psychological Well-Being Scale Based on Campus Housing Status

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between groups	639.96	3	213.32	1.08	.36
Within groups	92010.33	466	197.45		
Total	92650.30	469			

Table 22 shares the results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) that was conducted to examine differences in Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on campus housing status. . There was not a significant difference based on campus housing status on the Psychological Well-Being Scale [$F(3, 469) = 1.08$, $p = .36$].

Differences in Self-Reported Well-Being Based on Caregiver's Education Level

To determine whether there is a significant difference in the participants' self-reported well-being based on the primary caregiver's education level, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on the caregiver's highest education level.

Table 23

Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Well-Being Scale Based on Caregiver's Education Level

Source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Some High School	9	90.67	17.64	5.88
High School	37	93.46	13.96	2.29
Associate degree/Trade School	29	85.10	16.10	2.99
Bachelor's degree	140	96.03	13.66	1.15
Master's degree	168	95.82	13.27	1.02
Prof. degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., etc.)	82	92.37	14.02	1.53
Total	465	94.40	.14.02	.65

Table 23 shows the descriptive statistics of means and standard deviation for the self-reported well-being based on primary caregiver's highest education level.

Table 24

One-Way ANOVA for Psychological Well-Being Scale Based on Caregiver's Education Level

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between groups	3620.12	5	724.02	3.79	.002
Within groups	87608.52	459	190.87		
Total	91228.64	464			

Note. Df=Degrees of Freedom. SS=Sum of Squares. MS=Mean Square.

Table 24 shares the results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) that was conducted to examine differences in Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on the primary caregiver's highest education level [$F(5, 464) = 3.79$, $p = 0.002$]. There is a significant difference in college students' self-reported level of well-being based on the primary parent/caregiver's highest education level.

Table 25

TUKEY Difference of Psychological Well-Being Scale Bases on Caregiver's Education Level

Caregiver's Education Level	Caregiver's Education Level	Mean Difference	Sig.
Some High School	High School	-2.79	.994
	Associate/Trade	5.56	.899
	Bachelor's degree	-5.36	.869
	Master's degree	-5.15	.885
	Prof. degree	-2.00	.998
High School	Some High School	2.79	.994
	Associate/Trade	8.36	.145
	Bachelor's degree	-2.57	.916
	Master's degree	-2.36	.936
	Prof. degree	.788	1.00
Associate/Trade School	Some High School	-5.56	.899
	High School	-8.36	.145
	Bachelor's degree	-10.92*	.002
	Master's degree	-10.72*	.002
	Prof. degree	-7.57	.116
Bachelor's degree	Some High School	5.36	.869
	High School	2.57	.916

	Associate/Trade	10.92*	.002
	Master's degree	.207	1.00
	Prof. degree	3.36	.501
Master's degree	Some High School	5.15	.885
	High School	2.36	.936
	Associate/Trade	10.72*	.002
	Bachelor's degree	-.207	1.00
	Prof. degree	3.15	.537
Professional degree	Some High School	2.00	.998
	High School	-.789	1.00
	Associate/Trade	7.57	.116
	Bachelor's degree	-3.36	.501
	Master's degree	-3.15	.537

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 25 shows a follow-up TUKEY's data analysis of the statistically significant difference in the ANOVA. There was a significant difference in the responses based on the caregiver's highest education level for the following groups: master's degree and associate degree/trade school (p =.002) and bachelor's degree and associate/trade school (p=.002). Students whose caregivers had earned a master's degree have a significantly higher score on self-reported well-being than students whose caregivers had earned an associate degree/trade school degree. In addition, students whose caregivers had earned a bachelor's degree have a significantly higher score on self-reported well-being than students whose caregivers had earned an associate degree/trade school degree.

Summary of Chapter

This chapter provided the results of the study designed to explore whether there was a relationship between perceived parent involvement and the self-reported well-being of college students. The study was also developed to understand how college students perceived their

primary parent/caregiver level of involvement and support using the Perceptions of Parents Scale (Robbins, 1994). Lastly, the study provided first-year college students the opportunity to self-report their level of well-being using the Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

The analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between Parent Scale Score and Well-Being Scale Score, r(.499) = n = 472, p = .000. The perception of parent involvement positively correlates with the self-reported well-being of first-year college students. Additionally, first-year students responded with a higher score on the Perceptions of Parents Scale regarding parent involvement. There were differences in perceptions based on race and ethnicity, including Asian/Asian American and White students and Asian/Asian American and Black/African American. Both Black/African American students and White students had a significantly higher score than Asian/Asian American students when responding to questions about parent/caregiver involvement, support, and warmth. There were also significant differences in the responses on the Perception of Parents Scale based on the caregiver's highest education level for master's degree and associate degree/trade school and master's degree and professional degree. Students whose caregivers had earned a master's degree have a significantly higher score when reporting their perceptions of parent involvement than students whose caregivers had earned either an associate degree/trade school degree or a professional degree. There were no significant differences based on gender, suggesting that both first-year men and women in this study perceived that their parents/caregivers are involved, provide support, and provide warmth at a similar level. There also was not a significant difference in perceptions of parent involvement based on campus housing status.

Descriptive statistics for results from the Psychological Well-Being Scale revealed first-year students responded with scores indicating a higher level of well-being. . Higher scores equate to higher levels of psychological well-being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). It should be noted that there was a significant difference found between men and women in their reported well-being. First-year college men reported a higher level of their own sense of well-being over the first-year women in this study. There were differences in perceptions based on race and ethnicity, including Asian/Asian American and White students. White students have a significantly higher score than Asian/Asian American students when reporting their well-being. In addition, there was a significant difference in the responses based on the caregiver's highest education level and the Psychological Well-Being Scale for the following groups: master's degree and associate degree/trade school, and bachelor's degree and associate degree/trade school. Students whose caregivers had earned a bachelor's degree have a significantly higher score on self-reported well-being than students whose caregivers had earned an associate degree/trade school degree. There is no significant difference in self-reported well-being based on campus housing status. Discussion of the results, implications for practice, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research are outlined in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

As discussed in Chapter One, colleges and universities have seen a shift in college parent involvement over time. There are numerous reasons for this shift, including educational policies that encourage parent involvement at the K-12 level, technology changes that allow parents and families to communicate more frequently with their student, changes in the way society views adult development, and the rising cost of higher education (Arnett, 2015; Carney-Hall, 2008; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Today's student, a member of Generation Z, is also closer to their parents and families than in past generations, which plays a role in the shift in parent involvement and more engaged parents and families in higher education. Seemiller and Grace (2019) stated that Generation Z views their parents as trusted mentors: "Eighty-eight percent say they are extremely close with their parents" (p. 94).

Schlossberg's Transition Theory (Anderson et al., 2012) was used as a lens because this study deals with first-year students transitioning through their first year of college. In particular, the "support" factor involving family support was useful to apply. This highlights not only the utility of Schlossberg's Transition Theory and the need to understand the transition experience from high school to college for a first-year student but also how parents play a role as a family unit, as a partner with their student's institution, and as a source of support for their student's development during their transition. In addition, the American Psychological Association found that only 45% of Generation Z described their mental health as very good or excellent, compared

to 56% of Millennials, 51% of Generation X, and 70% of Baby Boomers (American Psychological Association, 2018).

The purpose of this study was to examine how college students perceive the level of involvement of their parents and rate their level of well-being and determine if there was a relationship between them. The researcher was particularly interested in understanding if there was a significant correlation between the two measures of parent involvement and well-being from the college student perspective. This final chapter shares a discussion of the results of the study presented in Chapter Four. This chapter begins with an overview of the purpose of the study and the research questions, then offers a discussion of results and key findings, limitations, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of Study

Through a quantitative study, the researcher surveyed 2,961 first-year college students at a large-sized public research institution located in the southeastern part of the United States to understand their perceptions of parent involvement and their self-reported well-being. The campus was a predominantly white institution with a primarily residential campus and was in an urban area, with over 15,800 undergraduate students. All first-year student participants at the institution that served as the research site who were eligible for the study received a recruitment email from an email list that was provided by the university registrar with required approvals. Student participants were also recruited via campus social media during the same two-week period to increase the completion rate.

There were 472 participants who fully completed the survey, representing 15.94% of the 2 961 individuals who received the survey. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data gathered through a 43-question Qualtrics survey, which was

comprised of three sections, including two existing instruments and demographic questions. The first section of the questionnaire is the Perceptions of Parents Scale (POPS) (Robbins, 1994) (see Appendix D – section one). The Perceptions of Parents Scale (POPS) – College Student Version consisted of 21 items rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (Robbins, 1994). There are three subscales: parental involvement, parental autonomy support, and parental warmth. The second section of the questionnaire is the Psychological Well-Being Scale, which asked the participants to respond to 18 questions (Ryff & Keyes, 1995) (see Appendix D – section two). The third and final section of the questionnaire contains four brief demographic questions asking about gender, race/ethnicity, campus housing status, and the primary caregiver's highest education level (see Appendix D – section three).

Of the 472 respondents to take the survey, over half were women, and nearly half were White, with Asian/Asian Americans making up almost a third of the participants. Nearly all lived on campus, and most had a parent/caregiver with an undergraduate or advanced degree. The researcher conducted statistical analyses to answer the three research questions. Pearson's correlation was used to determine the relationship between the mean scores on the Perception of Parents Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale. Descriptive statistics were used for both scale scores of the Perception of Parents Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale. Independent T-tests were used to compare the Perception of Parents Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale based on gender. ANOVA was used to independently examine the Perception of Parents Scale and the Psychological Well-Being Scale based on race and ethnicity, campus housing status, and the primary caregiver's highest education level.

Discussion of Findings

This study examined how first-year college students perceive their parents' involvement in their life, how they report their well-being and the relationship between the two areas of study. Through data analysis, several findings and significant results emerged in reference to the experiences of first-year college students and their perceptions of parent involvement and well-being. Overall, there is a significant positive relationship between perceived parent involvement and reported well-being. In addition, participants' perceptions of the involvement of their caregivers were relatively positive. The instrument used, the Perceptions of Parents Scale, had a 7-point Likert Scale with "1" equaling "not at all true," "4" equaling "somewhat true," and "7" equaling "very true." Of the 21 questions, eight questions were reverse scored. As noted in Chapter 3, the researcher determined a higher score represented positive perceptions because the total possible score was 147, with a standard deviation of 21.90, and 73.5 was the scale's midpoint; therefore, a total score of 116.66 was considered a higher score. Participants also reported a level of psychological well-being on the higher end of the scale, with men reporting higher levels than women. There were differences in perceptions based on specific demographic characteristics including race/ethnicity and caregiver educational level; these will be discussed in detail below.

Relationship Between Perceptions of Parent Involvement and Self-Reported Well-Being

The first research question examined whether a relationship between college parent involvement and self-reported well-being with college students existed. A Pearson's Correlation test was used to measure this relationship. Results indicated a moderate positive relationship between the Perception of Parents Scale Score and Psychological Well-Being Scale Score, $r(.499)$, $n=472$, $p = 0.000$, showing that college parent involvement (Perceptions of Parents

Scale) is positively correlated with college student's well-being (Well-Being Scale Score). College administrators may be concerned that involved parents may delay or inhibit student development; however, highly involved parents support their students in completing psychosocial tasks such as identity creation and developing intimacy, provided parents allow their students opportunities to problem-solve on their own before offering guidance (Taub, 2008). Taub (2008) also explained that parents and families provide much-needed support during the transition to college life.

First-Year College Students and Perceived Parent Involvement

The second research question was designed to measure how college students perceived the level of involvement of their parent/caregiver, as measured by an adapted version of the Perceptions of Parents Scale (Robbins, 1994). With a total possible score of 147, first-year students responded with a mean score of 116.66, indicating that they rated their perceptions of their parents' involvement on the higher end of the scale. On a 1-7 Likert scale, students' mean scores on the following statements reflected this positive perception: "my primary caregiver accepts me and likes me as I am," M = 5.94, and "my primary caregiver puts time and energy into helping me," M = 5.99. In contrast, these statements scored lower: "my primary caregiver tries to tell me how to run by life," M = 4.62, and "my primary caregiver insists upon my doing things their way," M = 4.64. This supports what the current literature reflects about Generation Z and parent and family involvement. Seemiller and Grace (2019) stated that Generation Z views their parents as trusted mentors: "Eighty-eight percent say they are extremely close with their parents" (p. 94). Given the last two years of COVID-19 and Gen Z's generally positive views with parents and families, these findings are not surprising. As noted in Chapter 2, Jeong et al. (2021) completed a study to determine the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on both first-

generation college students and non-first-generation college students and found that all students need parental support, resources, and guidance to mitigate the academic, situational, and mental challenges and obstacles they may face while they are experiencing a crisis.

Race and Ethnicity and Perceived Parent Involvement

A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Perceptions of Parents Scale responses based on race and ethnicity [$F(4, 457) = 4.47$, $p = 0.001$]. There was a significant difference between the Asian/Asian American and White students (p =<.001) and Asian/Asian American and Black/African American students (p =.045) when looking at scores on the Perception of Parents Scale. Both Black/African American students and White students have a significantly higher score than Asian/Asian American students when responding to questions about parent/caregiver involvement, support, and warmth. The profile by race and ethnicity of the 2 961 first-year students emailed for this survey from the site institution is as follows:8.5% Black, 9.2% Hispanic, 42.5% White, 33.6% Asian/Asian American, 4.4% Two or More, and 1.6% was unknown (Data requested from University Registrar, 2022). While Chang et al. (2010) shared that Asian Americans had "lower levels of parental support and accommodation as well as their higher levels of perceived parental directing, which explained their relatively lower levels of college adjustment." (p. 1301). It should be noted that the Asian/Asian American and Pacific Islander community is extremely diverse. While this study did not have responses from students who identified as Pacific Islander, the Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) community is exceptionally large. They are not a monolithic group but made up of dozens of sub-cultures, so it is important to be careful and refer to previously published research on the topics of parent involvement and the AAPI community. Therefore, caution should be exercised in making meaning of drawing conclusions from these results.

Caregivers' Education Level and Perceived Parent Involvement

A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Perceptions of Parents Scale responses based on the caregiver's highest education level [$F(5, 464) = 5.39$, $p = 0.000$]. There was a significant difference based on the caregiver's highest education level for the master's degree and associate degree/trade school (p =.002) and master's degree and professional degree (p=.003). Students whose caregivers have a master's degree perceive their involvement as being more positive than students whose caregivers have an associate degree/trade school degree or those who have a professional degree. Chang et al. (2010) revealed that "College students from families with higher education levels of parental educational attainment reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction across all ethnic comparisons" (p. 1301). Sax and Wartman (2010) noted Wartman's doctoral dissertation research from 2009 found that students who had parents and caregivers who had not attended a 4-year college did not connect to their student's institution, and the students instead served as the go-between linking the parent and the institution. The current study results indicated that parents with advanced degrees are perceived more positively in terms of involvement echo these findings; however, the difference identified between caregivers with master's degrees and those with professional degrees is not supported by prior literature and raises additional questions to be explored in the future.

First-Year College Students and Self-Reported Well-Being

The third and final research question was designed to measure how college students rated their level of well-being, as measured by the Psychological Well-Being Scale, with higher scores equating to higher levels of psychological well-being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). With a total possible score of 126, first-year students responded with a mean score of 94.28 and a standard deviation of 14.16, indicating that participants in this study reported a level of well-being on the

higher end of the scale. On a 1-7 Likert scale, students' mean scores on the following statements reflected this positive perception: "when I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out so far," M = 5.53, and "I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how I think about myself," M = 6.49. In contrast, these questions scored lower: "the demand of everyday life often get me down," M = 3.88, and "maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me," M = 4.27.

The finding of higher levels of well-being for college students in this sample contradicts some of the current literature about Generation Z's mental health and wellness. For example, Twenge (2017) stated that Generation Z (or iGen as she refers to the current student population) "is on the verge of the most severe mental health crisis for young people in decades" (p. 93) and that "college students' mental health is deteriorating" (p. 103). In addition, the American College Health Association's national survey from spring 2021 found that over half of the undergraduate students surveyed felt moderate to severe psychological distress and over half shared they felt lonely. However, Bowman (2010) was more in line with findings in this study, which found higher levels of well-being, as he noted that during a student's first year of college, psychological well-being gains are positively related to several pre-college attributes, including being non-first-generation student, female, being older than the traditional college-age, and having high academic achievement. Additional positive outcomes in psychological well-being occur when a student has positive interactions with diverse experiences, develops meaningful relationships with other students, and has positive interactions with faculty (Bowman, 2010). Even when taking gender into account, the respondents in this study scored 94.28 out of a possible score of 126, which is well above the median score. As noted, higher scores indicate higher well-being levels, according to Ryff & Keyes (1995). The site institution's profile of the

fall 2021 class reflects that 14% or fewer are first-generation students, and 97% of the students were in the top 20% of their graduating class (2021 Incoming Class Report, Fall 2021).

Gender and Self-Reported Well-Being

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on gender. The mean score for men was 96.58 with a standard deviation of 13.10, and the mean score for women was 92.63 with a standard deviation of 14.90, which reflected a significant difference, $t(442.22) = 2.98$, $p = .003$. These results suggested that the Psychological Well-Being Scale score is significantly different between the first-year college men and women in this study, with men reporting a higher level of their sense of well-being compared to the women. It should be noted that scores for both men and women reflected relatively high levels of well-being, but the men were slightly and significantly higher. This may be because women are sometimes more willing to acknowledge and report their emotions compared to men. Simon and Nath (2004) found that women report more frequent feelings of anxiety and sadness; when asked about the statement, "I keep my emotions to myself," women are more likely than men to disagree (p. 1162). The lower level of well-being for women at this site institution may also be related to the campus population and its STEM designation. The profile by gender of the 2 961 first-year students emailed for this survey from the site institution includes 42% women and 58 % men (Data requested from University Registrar, 2022). Dasgupta and Stout (2014) noted that women are outnumbered in college STEM classes by at least 3 to 1 and sometimes are the only ones in their class or team. Thus, the institution's focus and the academic environment may contribute to the difference in the well-being for men and women in this setting.

Race and Ethnicity and Self-Reported Well-Being

A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Psychological Well-Being Scale responses based on race and ethnicity [$F(4, 457) = 6.12$, $p = 0.000$]. There was a significant difference between the scores of Asian/Asian American and White students on the Psychological Well-Being Scale, with Asian/Asian American students reporting a significantly lower level of well-being compared to White students. Pennamon (2018) reported findings from a Harvard School of Education forum that shared Asian/Asian Americans were least likely to seek mental health care on campus and maintaining a "model minority" identity was difficult, especially if certain students did not have the academic or financial foundation compared to others. Other challenges that Asian/Asian American college students may face are misperceptions about language abilities and how easy academics/school is for them (Pennamon, 2018).

Caregivers' Education Level and Self-Reported Well-Being

A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences in Psychological Well-Being Scale based on the caregiver's highest educational level $F(5, 464) = 3.79$, $p = 0.002$]. There was a significant difference based on the caregiver's highest education level for the master's degree and associate degree/trade school (p =.002) and bachelor's degree and associate/trade school (p=.002) when looking at the Psychological Well-Being Scale. Students whose caregivers have a master's degree and those whose caregivers have a bachelor's degree both perceive their involvement as more positive than students with caregivers who have an associate degree/trade school degree. These findings are similar to prior research studies on families who have attended college and can support and guide their students through challenges and experiences. In contrast, a parent or caregiver who has not gone to or completed four years of college may not be able to share advice or know where to direct their student for support on campus. "Parents pass on

knowledge along with advice and emotional support that help their children when they encounter new challenges, such as the transition to college" (Palbusa & Gauvain, 2017, p. 107). Chang et al. (2010) found that "college students from families with higher levels of parental educational attainment reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction across all ethnic backgrounds" (p. 1301).

Limitations

This quantitative study focused on results from a survey distributed to first-year students at a large public research institution in the Southeastern United States. Three limitations must be noted. First, the sample size of 472 may have been impacted due to the timing that the survey went out, which occurred during the first round of exams in the spring semester. Second, the researcher received feedback that some first-year students did not want to start or complete the study since the Qualtrics platform displayed the campus logo and colors of the research site's rival institution (the researcher's doctoral institution). However, the question lingers if the reaction of potential participants to the rival school logo and colors could have impacted the completion rate. Lastly, it should be noted that this study occurred in the spring of 2022, two years after COVID-19 affected the United States. Students and parents had spent more time significantly together than usual due to COVID-19. This may have impacted students' perceptions of parent involvement (i.e., scores inflated) as well as their reported well-being (i.e., mental health and wellness due to COVID-19).

Implications and Recommendations for Practice

With the shifting trend in parent involvement over the last 20-25 years, colleges and universities have created opportunities to engage and support college parents and families (e.g., college admissions events, orientation, move-in activities, and other special events for families,

such as Family Weekend) during their college student's higher education journey. Knowledge of the significant finding of parent involvement and first-year college students' self-reported well-being and how the two are positively correlated will help college administrators continue to support Generation Z students transition to college and through their first year, as well as support their families through this transition. Taub (2008) shared that parents and families offer much-needed support during the transition to college life. As reported from the first research question, the findings suggest that the students in this study positively perceive parent involvement.

As Generation Z is the most diverse generation to date (Twenge, 2017) and colleges continue to recruit more diverse groups of students, it will be important to understand the cultural differences of the populations that are being served for both students and their families.

As colleges and universities continue to develop parent outreach programs and family-friendly initiatives on campus, it is important to examine the extent to which the full diversity of parents and families are accounted for in policies, practices, research, and theory. Failing to do so risks perpetuating parenting models fueled by media hype and reinforcing the needs of a privileged subset of parents. (Kiyama & Harper, 2018, p. 380)

The findings from this study have implications for faculty, student affairs professionals, and administrators in higher education and how they can better partner and support parent and family engagement. "When we choose to believe the myth that all parents are helicopter parents, we reinforce that dominant, one-dimensional, cultural script. We deny families the space and the respect to write their own stories of lives with college student children" (Dunn, 2015, p. 13). Therefore, my first recommendation is to encourage faculty, staff, students, parents, and caregivers to continue to be educated on the significance of parent and family engagement and the positive impact that engagement can have on today's current generation of college students

and their students' well-being. Through recent research on parent/family engagement, current trends, webinars, and presentations, I would encourage campuses to learn and share more about family engagement in their community and its role in student success and well-being.

A second recommendation is for college campuses to create parent/family programming offices if they do not already have one. This will allow one location to serve as a central hub for parents to go for questions and concerns, but it will also allow one source on campus to share helpful information and resources with families. Due to budget concerns, some campuses may not have the funds for a standalone parent office, but on-campus campuses and staff members in Dean of Students offices tend to serve in this role to help families. It was very evident when COVID-19 started two years ago that some campuses were not sure how to contact families, how to share information with them or partner with them to make sure students were staying safe, how to move things out of their residence halls quickly, and how to pivot to online learning. Jeong et al. (2021) shared, "we suggest developing parent support programs to provide a wide range of benefits to parents, including ways to be more vigilant and supportive of their children" (p. 11). As noted in Chapter 4 from the results of the second research question, participants perceived the involvement of their parents/caregivers to be positive. It is important for those that work with college families to understand this, as the research on Generation Z already points to as well, so that colleges can work in partnership with families to support student success since students already see their parents and families as mentors and look to them for guidance.

A third recommendation is for this campus, and others, to research what the needs of their community are to better understand the results found in this study. Currently, the site institution has deployed a campus climate study, so hopefully there will be rich data in those results. Researchers and administrators should specifically look at college student well-being and

how gender and race, and ethnicity play a role in a students' overall wellness. With 33.6% of the site institution's first-year class identifying as Asian, programmatic resources, culturally competent mental health services, and academic support for the Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander community are recommended. Campuses should review the resources currently available to identify any gaps related to serving the large and highly diverse Asian community.

The results of this study showed that women reported a lower sense of well-being than men. A final recommendation is for institutions, particularly those with a strong STEM focus like the study site, to consider the resources available to support women in what can be a challenging environment. Although it should be noted that the women's score was still on the higher end of the well-being scale, it was still statistically different from, and lower than, the men's score. With only about 42% of the first-year class at the site institution being women, the results related to well-being may be impacted by the fact that women at STEM institutions face challenges in the classroom, which may include being one of the few women in a class and lacking women faculty and mentors on campus.

Future Research

Given the statistical significance related to race and ethnicity for both perceived parent involvement and self-reported well-being future research focused on how cultural differences impact perceived parent involvement and self-reported well-being is highly recommended. Kiyama and Harper (2018) argued that "it is important to examine the extent to which the full diversity of parents and families are accounted for in policies, practices, research, and theory" (p. 380). This study also could be replicated at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), or a large public institution in a different location in the United States. It would be helpful to have additional research from different campuses to

compare the results of families and students of various diverse backgrounds to add to the growing literature on parent involvement and differences in families of color. This information would be helpful to ensure campuses are supporting diverse families appropriately both for student success and to encourage family engagement.

While this study established that there is a relationship between perceived parent involvement and reported well-being, it was beyond the scope of this study to find a causal explanation for those differences. There is no way to know if parent involvement in a colleges student's higher education journey leads to higher well-being or if students who have higher well-being have better relationships with their parents and families. There could be other factors and influences that impact both. A qualitative study could be developed, however, to add more data. This would allow researchers to collect stories from first-year students to share their own perceptions of parent involvement and the report on their own well-being student's well-being.

While I discussed cultural differences, gender differences, parent involvement, and self-reported well-being results in more detail due to their significant findings, one of the other findings that I was curious about was related to the caregiver's highest level of education. A significant result was that college students perceived lower involvement with caregivers with a professional degree when compared to a master's degree. Is that because those family members with a terminal degree have very demanding jobs and are too busy to engage and support their college student as much as the student would like them to? This could be a third area of future research because it does not parallel the other results that students whose caregivers have earned a master's degree have a higher perceptions of parent involvement when compared to an associate degree/trade school degree.

Conclusion

College and universities have watched parents and families engage at higher rates and in various ways over the last few decades. There are numerous reasons for this shift, including educational policies that encourage parent involvement at the K-12 level, technology changes that allow parents and families to communicate more frequently with their student, changes in the way society views adult development, and the rising cost of higher education (Carney-Hall, 2008; Wartman & Savage, 2008). That shift supported the rapid growth of college parent and family relations offices. Petree and Savage (2019) reported there had been a steady growth of parent and family programs on college campuses since the 1970s, with 71% of programs having formed since the year 2000. This trend of college parent involvement does not seem to be going away soon. The current student population, Generation Z, embraces parent and family engagement. Seemiller and Grace (2019) stated that Generation Z views their parents as trusted mentors: "Eighty-eight percent say they are extremely close with their parents" (p. 94).

This quantitative study highlights the need for colleges and universities to continue to discuss the relationship between parent involvement and well-being with today's college students**.** This study revealed a positive correlation between perceived parent involvement and self-reported well-being. This has implications for student affairs professionals and institutions who work with college students and their families. Mental health and wellness concerns were already on the rise when COVID-19 started two years ago; Generation Z had to navigate through their higher education journey with these challenges, among others and had to rely on more support from parents and families.

In addition to the finding above, first-year college students in this study reported having a positive perception of parent involvement. Differences were reported in perceptions of parent

involvement based on specific demographic characteristics including race/ethnicity and caregiver educational level. Both Black/African American students and White students had a significantly higher score than Asian/Asian American students when responding to questions about parent/caregiver involvement, support, and warmth. As Generation Z is the most diverse generation to date (Twenge, 2017), it is important for colleges and universities to think about how to address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion for students and families. Cultural differences are significant from one community to the next, but also within each community. Therefore, cultural parenting differences exist, and it is important to recognize that.

This study also revealed that participants reported a positive sense of their own well-being, with men reporting higher levels than women. Campuses should consider what current resources are available to support women and advocate for additional faculty, staff, or resources if needed. Another finding was that Asian/Asian American students reported a significantly lower level of well-being compared to White students. Campuses should review the resources currently available to identify any gaps related to serving the large and highly diverse Asian community.

In closing, given the current literature that, Generation Z students are closer to their parents than past generations (Seemiller & Grace, 2016) and the growing concern by college presidents about college students' mental health and well-being (Chessman & Taylor, 2019), this research study is timely. As noted in the previous section, there is no way to know if parent involvement in a colleges student's higher education journey leads to higher well-being or if students who have higher well-being have better relationships with their parents and families. However, these results can encourage college administrators to learn more and seek support for

students in the areas of health and wellness; diversity, equity, and inclusion; and family engagement.

References

Abrams, Z. 2020. A crunch at college counseling centers. *American Psychological Association*. *51*(6), 1-8. https://www.apa.org/monitor/2020/09/crunch-college-counseling

American Psychological Association. (2018). *Stress in America: Generation Z.* https://apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2018/stress-gen-z.pdf?mod=article_inline.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (1967). *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students.* https://www.aaup.org/report/joint-statement-rights-and-freedoms-students

Anderson, M. L., Goodman, J., & Schlossberg, N. K. (2012). *Counseling adults in transition: Linking Schlossberg's theory with practice in a diverse world* (4th ed.). Springer.

Arnett, J. J. (2015). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Beall, G. (2016, November 5). *8 key differences between Gen Z and Millennials*. Huffington Post. Post updated 2017, November 6. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/8-key-differences-between_b_12814200

Beaman, C., Bell, J., Bench, C. O., Hardendorf, N., Hrdlicka, S., Kepler, D., Savage, M., Stevens, L., & Stewart, K. (2010). The Denver manifesto: A document supporting intentional programs designed to serve parents and families of undergraduate college and university student. *AHEPPP Journal, 1*(1), 2-13.

Beck, L., & Wright, A. (2019). iGen: What you should know about post-millennial students. *COLLEGE and UNIVERSITY*, *94*(1), 21-22, 24-26.

Bowman, N. (2010). The developmental of psychological well-being among first-year college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*(2), 180-200.

Carney-Hall, K. C. (2008). Managing parent partnerships: Maximizing influence, minimizing interference, and focusing on student success. *New Directions for Student Services*, No. 122, 3-14. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.271

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Health-related quality of life (HRQOL) well-being concepts. http://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/wellbeing.htm. Updated March 6, 2013. Accessed July 21, 2021.

Chang, E., Heckhausen, J., Greenberger, E., Chuansheng, C. (2010). Shared agency with parents for educational goals: Ethnic differences and implications for college adjustment. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 39,* 1293-1304. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9488-7

Chessman, H. & Taylor, M. (2019, August 12). Re: College student mental health and well-being: A survey of presidents. *Higher Education Today*. https://www.higheredtoday.org/2019/08/12/college-student-mental-health-well-survey-college-presidents/

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

Christopher, A.N. (2017). *Interpreting and using statistics in psychological research*. SAGE.

Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Cutright, M. (2008). From helicopter parent to valued partner: Shaping the parental relationship for student success. *New Directions for Higher Education, 144,* 39-48.

Dasgupta, N., & Stout J. (2014). Girls and women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics: STEMing the tide and broadening participation in stem careers. *Policy*

Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, *1*(1),21-29. http://doi.org/10.1177/2372732214549471

Dill, P. L. & Henley, T. B. (1998). Stressors of college: A comparison of traditional and non-traditional students. *Journal of Psychology*, *132*(1), 25-32. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223989809599261

Dunn, M. S. (2015). On being a parent. *About Campus*, *20*(3), 8–14. https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.21193

Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. (1974). 20 U.S.C. 1232g, 1974.

Goodman, J., Schlossberg, N. K., & Anderson, M. L. (2006). *Counseling adults in transition: Linking practice with theory* (3rd ed.). Springer Publishing Co.

Grolnick, W. S., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (1991). The inner resources for school performance: Motivational mediators of children's perceptions of their parents. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *83*, 508-517.

Federation of Texas A&M University Mothers' Club. (n.d). *History of the Federation of TAMU Mothers' Clubs*. https://aggiemoms.org/

Flowers, R. D., Luzynski, C., Zamani-Gallaher, Eboni M. (2014). Male transfer student athletes and Schlossberg's transition theory. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, *8*(2), 99-120. https://doi.org/10.1179/1935739714Z.00000000021

Fu, A. S. & Markus, H. R. (2014). My mothers and me: Why tiger mothers motivate Asian Americans but not European Americans. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* *40*(6), 739-749. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167214524992

García Mendoza, M. D. C., Sánchez Queija, I., & Parra Jiménez, Á. (2019). The role of parents in emerging adults' psychological well-being: A person-oriented approach. *Family Process*, *58*(4), 954-971. https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12388

Georgia Tech Admissions. (2021). Georgia Tech's Incoming Class Report. https://admission.gatech.edu/images/pdf/2021GTIncomingClassProfile.pdf

Hofer, B. K. (2011). Student-parent communication in the college years: Can students grow up on an electronic tether? *The Bulletin, 79*(2). www.acui.org/publications/bulletin/article.aspx?issue=28134&id=14773

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

Jeong, H. J., Kim, S., & Lee, J. (2021). Mental health, life satisfaction, supportive parent communication, and help-seeking sources in the wake of COVID-19: First-generation college students (FGCS) vs. non-first-generation college students (non-FGCS). *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, Null*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/87568225.2021.1906189

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2017). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Sage.

June, S. (2021, July 10). Could Gen Z rid the world of email? *The New York Times.* *https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/10/business/gen-z-email.html*

Kennedy, K. (2009). The politics and policies of parental involvement. *About Campus, 14*(4), 16–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.297

Kiyama, J. M., & Harper, C. E. (2018). Beyond hovering: A conceptual argument for an inclusive model of family engagement in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 41*(3), 365-385. doi:10.1353/rhe.2018.0012

Lee, T., Sun, H. F., & Chiang, H. H. (2019). Development and validation of the short-form Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale for clinical nurses in Taiwan. *Journal of Medical Sciences, 39*(4), 157-162.

LeMoyne, T., & Buchanan, T. (2011). Does "hovering" matter? Helicopter parenting and its effect on well-being. *Sociological Spectrum, 31*, 399-418. https://doi.org/10.1080/02732173.2011.574038

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being* (2nd ed.). Van Nostrand.

Murphy-Shigematsu, S., Sein, K., Wakimoto, P., & Wang, M. (2012). Asian American student stress: The other side of achievement. In E. K. Shrake & E. W.-C. Chen (Eds.), *Asian Pacific American experiences: Past, present, and future* (pp. 204–219). Kendall Hunt.

Merriman, L. S. (2007). Managing parents 101: Minimizing interference and maximizing good will. *NASPA Leadership Exchange, 5*(1), 14-19.

Merriman, L. S. (2008). Managing parent involvement during crisis. In K. C. Carney-Hall (Ed.) Managing parent partnerships: Maximizing influence, minimizing interference, and focusing on student success. *New Directions for Student Services*, No. 122, 57-66. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.275

Newman, A., & Riester, K. A. (2020) Crisis communication: Keeping parents and family members of students in the loop. *ACPA Developments*, (2), 1-13. https://developments.myacpa.org/crisis-communication-keeping-parents-and-family-members-of-students-in-the-loop-written-by-anne-newman-kathy-adams-riester/

Niemiec, C. P., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2009). The path taken: Consequences of attaining intrinsic and extrinsic aspirations in post-college life, *Journal of Research in Personality*, *43*(3), 291-306, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.09.001

Palbusa, J. & Gauvain, M. (2017). Parent-student communication about college and freshman grades in first-generation and non-first-generation students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *58*(1), 107-112.

Parents' Club of Stanford University. (2020). *Our history and purpose*. https://www.stanfordparentsclub.org/information-our-history.html

Patton, L. D., & Davis, S. (2014). Expanding transition theory: African American students' multiple transitions following Hurricane Katrina. *Journal of College Admissions*, 22, 6-15.

Pennamon, T. (2018, May 3). Let's Talk Mental Health: Shedding light on Asian American and Asian students' mental health needs. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*. *35*(7), 19.

Petree, C., & Savage, M. (2019). *Survey of college & university parent/family programs.* https://www.rit.edu/studentaffairs/parentsandfamilies/sites/rit.edu.studentaffairs.parentsandfamilies/files/images/2019%20National%20PFP%20Survey%20Report.pdf

Pew Research Center. (2020). *On the cusp of adulthood and facing an uncertain future: What we know about Gen Z so far*. https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2020/05/14/on-the-cusp-of-adulthood-and-facing-an-uncertain-future-what-we-know-about-gen-z-so-far-2/

Ridner, S. L., Newton, K. S., Staten, R. R, Crawford, T. N., & Hall, L. A. (2016). Predictors of well-being among college students. *Journal of American College Health*. *64(*2), 116-124.

Rue, P. (2018). Make way, millennials, here comes Gen . *About Campus, 23*(3), 5-12. https://doi.org.10.1177/1086482218804251

Robbins, R. J. (1994). *An assessment of perceptions of parental autonomy support and control: Child and parent correlates* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]., University of Rochester.

Ryff, C., & Keyes, C. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *69*, 719-727.

Sax, L., & Wartman, K. (2010). Studying the impact of parent involvement on college student development: A review and agenda for research. In Smart, J. (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research,25*, . Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8598-6_6

Schlossberg, N. K. (1981). A model for analyzing human adaptation to transition. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *9*(2), 2-18.

Schiffrin, H. H., Liss, M., Miles-McLean, H., Geary, K. A., Erchull, M. J., & Tashner, T. (2013). Helping or hovering? The effects of helicopter parenting on college students' well-being. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 23***,** 548–557. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-013-9716-3

Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2016). *Generation Z goes to college*. Jossey – Bass.

Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2019). *Generation Z: A century in the making*. Routledge.

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.

Simmons, C. W. (2018). *Exploring the identity development of emerging adults with involved parents* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Georgia.

Simon, R. & Nath, L. (2004). Gender and emotions in the United States: Do men and women differ in self-reports of feelings and expressive behavior? *American Journal of Sociology, (109)*5, 1137-1176.

SMU Mother's Club. (n.d.). *Club history*. https://www.smumomsanddads.org/history

Somers, P., & Settle, J. (2010). The helicopter parent: Research toward a typology. *College and University: The Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, 86*, 18-27.

Taub, D. J. (2008). Exploring the impact of parental involvement on student development. In K. C. Carney-Hall (Ed.), *Managing parent partnerships: Maximizing influence, minimizing interference, and focusing on student success*. *New Directions for Student Services*, No. 122, .15-28. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.272

Twenge, J. (2017). *iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy, and completely unprepared for adulthood*. Atria.

United State Department of Education. (n.d.) Every Student Succeeds Act. https://www.ed.gov/essa

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), Jossey-Bass.

Wintre, M. G., & Yaffe, M. (2000). First-year students' adjustment to university life as a function of relationships with parents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *15*(1), 9-37.

World Health Organization. (1948). *Preamble to the Constitution of the World Health Organization*, June 19-22, 1946.

https://apps.who.int/gb/bd/pdf_files/BD_49th-en.pdf?fbclid=IwAR1AYnTeTGhpqfZSXI1Isr3a39XTndy7vtzWkobXoxi8BIC6UGC0hr-Pfl4#page=6

APPENDIX A

Participant Recruitment Email

Dear First-Year Georgia Tech Student,

My name is Laci Weeden, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Counseling and Human Development at the University of Georgia under the supervision of Dr. Laura Dean. I am also working with Dr. Brenda Woods, Director of Research and Assessment for Student Engagement and Well-Being at Georgia Tech, as my secondary Principal Investigator. I am inviting you to take part in a research study entitled "The Relationship between Parent Involvement and Well-Being with Generation Z College Students." The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between parent involvement and psychological well-being in college students. As a first-year student at Georgia Tech, we ask you to participate in this study.

Please consider supporting me in this important study. To be eligible to participate, you must be at least 18 years of age and in your first academic year at Georgia Tech and have completed 12 credit hours.

Your participation will involve completing an online survey by February 14. The survey should take 10-15 minutes. You may also elect to enter a drawing to win one of ten $25 Target e-gift cards. Your feedback and participation are important and valuable to understand how families are involved and support their college students and how college campuses can continue to provide support to students and families to assist with their student's well-being.

Please click this link to access and participate:
https://ugeorgia.ca1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9LyWtgFMlUHK95Y

You may also enter the drawing for the Target e-gift cards, without completing the survey, by clicking this link https://ugeorgia.ca1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_4U9tYUv7wurokS2 during the time the survey is open.

This study has the approval of both the UGA IRB and GT IRB. If you would like additional information about this study, please feel free to email me at laci.weeden@uga.edu.

Thank you for your time and participation!

Sincerely,

Laci Weeden
University of Georgia Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX B

ONLINE CONSENT LETTER
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENT/FAMILY INVOLVEMENT AND WELL-BEING OF GENERATION Z COLLEGE STUDENTS

Dear Participant:

My name is Laci Weeden, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services under the supervision of Dr. Laura Dean at the University of Georgia. I am inviting you to take part in a voluntary research study.

The purpose of this study is to understand the relationship between parent/family involvement and the well-being of Generation Z college students. The survey will explore your relationship with your parent/caregiver and their involvement in your life at college. The survey will also ask about your self-reported psychological well-being.

> **Definition of Well-Being:**
> The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2021) defines well-being as a global synthesis of physical and mental health and provides a more comprehensive outcome on which to base health promotion and disease prevention efforts.

You will be asked to complete a 10–15-minute online questionnaire. Participation is voluntary. You can refuse to take part or stop at any time without penalty. Your decision to participate will have no impact on your academic or co-curricular involvement on campus. There are questions that may make you uncomfortable. You can skip these questions if you do not choose to answer them. Your participation is valuable to understanding how parents/families are involved and support their college students and how college campuses can continue to provide support to students and families to assist with their student's well-being.

All identifiers for responses provided will be removed before proceeding to analyze data. There is a possibility that the de-identified, aggregated results will be used in professional trainings, presentations, or publications.

Principal Investigator:
Dr. Laura Dean
Department of Counseling and Human Development Services
University of Georgia
ladean@uga.edu

Secondary Principal Investigator at Georgia Tech:
Dr. Brenda Woods
Director of Research and Assessment for Student Engagement & Well-Being
Georgia Institute of Technology
brenda.woods@studentlife.gatech.edu

Co-Investigator/Principal Researcher:
Laci Weeden
Doctoral Candidate, Ed.D. in Student Affairs Leadership
University of Georgia
laci.weeden@uga.edu

Study Details:
Your participation will involve completing an online survey and should only take 10-15 minutes. You will also be entered into a drawing to win one of ten $25 Target e-gift cards. You may also enter the drawing for the Target e-gift cards, without completing the survey, by clicking this link https://ugeorgia.ca1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_4U9tYUv7wurokS2 during the time the survey is open. Your feedback and participation are important and valuable to assist in improving support for college students and their families.

Privacy/Confidentiality:
The research involves the transmission of data over the internet. Every reasonable effort has been taken to ensure the effective use of technology; however, confidentiality during online communication cannot be guaranteed. Your IP address may be recorded when you participate, however it will not be retained after the data have been downloaded. You will not be asked to disclose your name, email address, or other similar identifying information. Data from this survey may be used in publications, presentations, etc. Any information utilized will be in aggregate form and individual responses will not be utilized.

Voluntary Participation:
Participation is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or stop at any time without penalty. Your decision of whether to take part in the research or not will have no effect on your grades or class standing. If you do decide to stop participation, the information collected from you to that point will be kept as part of the study and may be analyzed. To permanently delete your response please contact the principal investigator.

If you have questions, or would like further information, please contact **laci.weeden@uga.edu**. If you have any complaints or questions about your rights as a research volunteer, contact the IRB at 706-542-3199 or by email at IRB@uga.edu.

I have read the above informed consent document and have had the opportunity to ask questions about this study. I have been told my rights as a research participant, and I voluntarily consent to participate in this research study. By selecting, "Agree," I agree to participate in this research study.

_____ Agree _____ Decline UGA IRB Approval Number: PROJECT00004203
<CONTINUE BUTTON>

APPENDIX C

Georgia Tech First-Year Student Participants Needed for Research

We are conducting a research study that will look at the relationship between parent involvement and well-being in Generation Z college students. This research is designed to better understand college parent involvement and student well-being.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE?

- Must be at least 18 years of age
- Scan QR code below to access survey
- Or use this link:
- https://ugeorgia.ca1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9LyWtgFMlUHK95Y
- Take 10-15-minute online survey

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY

This research is being conducted from the Department of Counseling and Human Development at the University of Georgia under the supervision of Dr. Laura Dean, Principal Investigator. Dr. Brenda Woods, Director of Research and Assessment for Student Engagement and Well-Being at Georgia Tech, is the secondary Principal Investigator.

Questions?

Please contact Laci Weeden, doctoral candidate at UGA, with any questions - laci.weeden@uga.edu.

When you complete the survey, you can enter a drawing to win enter one of ten $25 Target e-gift cards or you may enter the Drawing directly by visiting this link: https://ugeorgia.ca1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_4U9tYUv7wurokS2

Mary Frances Early College of Education
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

APPENDIX D

Participant Survey Instrument

Section One

Parent/Caregiver Relationship Scale
Adapted from (Robbins, 1994)

Instructions: For Section One, choose one primary parent/caregiver to think about as you answer the following questions. Which parent/caregiver you select is up to you. You may choose who your primary caregiver is (a mother, a father, a stepparent, a grandparent, or other adult). Please answer each question with that SAME caregiver throughout the survey.

Please use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all true			somewhat true			very true

First, questions about your primary caregiver.

1. My primary caregiver seems to know how I feel about things.
2. My primary caregiver tries to tell me how to run my life.
3. My primary caregiver finds time to talk with me.
4. My primary caregiver accepts me and likes me as I am.
5. My primary caregiver, whenever possible, allows me to choose what to do.
6. My primary caregiver doesn't seem to think of me often.
7. My primary caregiver clearly conveys their love for me.
8. My primary caregiver listens to my opinion or perspective when I've got a problem.
9. My primary caregiver spends a lot of time with me.
10. My primary caregiver makes me feel very special.
11. My primary caregiver allows me to decide things for myself.

12. My primary caregiver often seems too busy to attend to me.
13. My primary caregiver is often disapproving and unaccepting of me.
14. My primary caregiver insists upon my doing things their way.
15. My primary caregiver is not very involved with my concerns.
16. My primary caregiver is typically happy to see me.
17. My primary caregiver is usually willing to consider things from my point of view.
18. My primary caregiver puts time and energy into helping me.
19. My primary caregiver helps me choose my own direction.
20. My primary caregiver seems to be disappointed in me a lot.
21. My primary caregiver isn't very sensitive to many of my needs.

Section Two

College Student Well-Being

Adapted from (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

Instructions: For Section Two, indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. The questions will measure your well-being. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2021) defines well-being as a global synthesis of physical and mental health.

Please use the following scale:

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	A little agree nor	Neither agree	A little agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

1. I like most parts of my personality.
2. When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out so far.
3. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.
4. The demands of everyday life often get me down.
5. In many ways I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.

6. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.
7. I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future.
8. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.
9. I am good at managing the responsibilities of daily life.
10. I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life.
11. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.
12. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how I think about myself and the world.
13. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.
14. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago.
15. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.
16. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.
17. I have confidence in my own opinions, even if they are different from the way most other people think.
18. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.

Section Three

Demographic Questions

Instructions: For Section Four, indicate your answer to the following demographic questions.

Please use the following scale:

1. What gender do you identify as? (Please only answer if you feel comfortable in doing so)

- Man
- Woman
- Non-binary, genderqueer

- Self-identify: _____

2. Please specify your race/ethnicity (Select all that apply)

- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian/Asian American
- Black/African American
- Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a)
- Middle Eastern
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- White
- Two or More
- Other/Unknown
- Prefer Not to Share

3. What is your housing status?

- I live on-campus
- I live off-campus
- I live at home/commuter student
- I live in Greek housing.

4. What is your primary caregiver's highest education level?

- Some High School
- High School
- Associate degree/Trade School
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Professional degree (e.g., PhD, EdD, MD, JD, etc.)
- Prefer Not to Share

APPENDIX E

Survey Instrument (with the Scoring Instructions)

Parent/Caregiver Relationship Scale
Adapted from (Robbins, 1994)

Instructions: For Section One, choose one primary parent/caregiver to think about as you answer the following questions. While you may be close to both of your parents or family members/caregivers, please only select one to focus on for the following questions. Which parent/caregiver you select is up to you. The questions will measure parent/caregiver involvement, support, and warmth.

You many choose who your primary caregiver is (a mother, a father, a stepparent, a grandparent, or other adult). Please answer each question with that SAME caregiver throughout the survey.

Please use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all true			somewhat true			very true

First, questions about your primary caregiver.

1. My primary caregiver seems to know how I feel about things.
2. My primary caregiver tries to tell me how to run my life.
3. My primary caregiver finds time to talk with me.
4. My primary caregiver accepts me and likes me as I am.
5. My primary caregiver, whenever possible, allows me to choose what to do.
6. My primary caregiver doesn't seem to think of me often.
7. My primary caregiver clearly conveys their love for me.
8. My primary caregiver listens to my opinion or perspective when I've got a problem.
9. My primary caregiver spends a lot of time with me.
10. My primary caregiver makes me feel very special.

11. My primary caregiver allows me to decide things for myself.
12. My primary caregiver often seems too busy to attend to me.
13. My primary caregiver is often disapproving and unaccepting of me.
14. My primary caregiver insists upon my doing things their way.
15. My primary caregiver is not very involved with my concerns.
16. My primary caregiver is typically happy to see me.
17. My primary caregiver is usually willing to consider things from my point of view.
18. My primary caregiver puts time and energy into helping me.
19. My primary caregiver helps me choose my own direction.
20. My primary caregiver seems to be disappointed in me a lot.
21. My primary caregiver isn't very sensitive to many of my needs.

Scoring Information:

- First, scores on the following items must be reverse scored: 2, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21. To do that, subtract the response from 8 and use the result as the item score.
- Then form subscale scores by averaging the scores of the items on that subscale, shown below.
    - Primary Caregiver Involvement: 3, 6(R), 9, 12(R), 15(R), 18
    - Primary Autonomy Support: 1, 2(R), 5, 8, 11, 14(R), 17, 19, 21(R)
    - Primary Caregiver Warmth: 4, 7, 10, 13(R), 16, 20(R)
- An (R) after an item number serves as a reminder that the item needs to be reverse scored before being averaged.

Survey Instrument (with Scoring Information)

College Student Well-Being
Adapted from (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

Instructions: For Section Two, indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. The questions will measure your well-being. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2021) defines well-being as a global synthesis of physical and mental health and provides a more comprehensive outcome on which to base health promotion and disease prevention efforts.

Please use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	A little agree	Neither agree nor	A little disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree

1. I like most parts of my personality.
2. When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out so far.
3. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.
4. The demands of everyday life often get me down.
5. In many ways I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.
6. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.
7. I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future.
8. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.
9. I am good at managing the responsibilities of daily life.
10. I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life.
11. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.
12. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how I think about myself and the world.
13. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.

14. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago.
15. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.
16. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.
17. I have confidence in my own opinions, even if they are different from the way most other people think.
18. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.

Scoring Information: (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

- Original Scoring - Questions 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, and 18 should be reversed-scored. Reverse-scored items are worded in the opposite direction of what the scale is measuring. The formula for reverse-scoring an item is the number of scale points plus 1 – respondent's answer. For example, Q1 is a 7-point scale. If a respondent answered 3 on Q1, you would re-code their answer as: (7+1) – 3 = 5. Therefore, the score for Q1 is 5.
- To calculate subscale scores for each participant, sum respondents' answers to each subscale items. Higher scores equate to higher levels of psychological well-being. Both instruments have scoring scales (see Appendix E) to score each instrument. It is important to note that the researcher reversed the Likert scale for the Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB) for consistency in instruments. Therefore, the opposite numbers were reversed scored when scoring the data. Questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, and 16 were reversed scored. The formula for reverse scoring an item stayed the same (an item is the number of scale points plus 1 – respondent's answer. For example, Q1 is 7-point scale. If a respondent answered 3 on Q1, you would re-code their answer as: (7+1) – 3 = 5. Therefore, the score for Q1 is 5.
- The Autonomy subscale items are questions 15, 17 and 18.

- The Environmental Mastery subscale items are questions 4, 8, and 9.
- The Personal Growth subscale items are questions 11, 12, and 14.
- The Positive Relations with Others subscale items are questions 6, 13, and 16.
- The Purpose in Life subscale items are questions 3, 7, and 10.
- The Self-Acceptance subscale items are questions 1, 2, and 5.

APPENDIX F

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Tucker Hall, Room 212
310 E. Campus Rd.
Athens, Georgia 30602
TEL 706-542-3199 | FAX 706-542-5638
IRB@uga.edu
http://research.uga.edu/hso/irb/

Human Research Protection Program

EXEMPT DETERMINATION

November 12, 2021

Dear Laura Dean:

On 11/12/2021, the Human Subjects Office reviewed the following submission:

Title of Study:	The Relationship between Parent Involvement and Well-Being in Generation Z College Students
Investigator:	Laura Dean
Co-Investigator:	Laci Weeden
IRB ID:	PROJECT00004203
Funding:	None
Review Category:	Exempt 2(ii)

We have determined that the proposed research is Exempt. The research activities may begin 11/12/2021.

Please note: this determination only covers researchers from the University of Georgia. Non-UGA collaborators from other institutions cannot participate as researchers (e.g., data analysis of identifiable data) unless their institution's IRB has issued their own determination for the collaborating researcher. You must update the main study on our portal with the determination or approval letter from your collaborator's IRB by using the "Add Public Comment" button before engaging in research activities with any non-UGA researchers.

Additionally, please note that the following changes should be made to the consent document before use:

- Remove references to survey responses being 'anonymous', as this is not possible to guarantee to participants with internet-based surveys, even when researchers follow best practices.

APPENDIX G

RE: Additional Research Personnel - non-GT faculty

Sims, Carolyn <carolyn.sims@oria.gatech.edu>
on behalf of
VPR Institutional Review Board <irb@gtrc.gatech.edu>
Fri 11/19/2021 1:01 PM

To: Weeden, Laci L <laci.weeden@studentlife.gatech.edu>; VPR Institutional Review Board <irb@gtrc.gatech.edu>; irb@gatech.edu <irb@gatech.edu>

Cc: Woods, Brenda A <drbwoods@gatech.edu>; ladean@uga.edu <ladean@uga.edu>

Thank you, Laci.

Based on your described recruitment plans and the UGA approval, the GT IRB has no objection to your research plans moving forward, as described. This email serves as our acknowledgement and approval of your UGA approved research efforts. I wish you success in your research and if you have any other questions, please don't hesitate to ask.

--

Carolyn Sims, MPA, CIP
Research Associate
Office of Research Integrity Assurance
Georgia Institute of Technology
Cell (preferred): 404.335.8810
Phone: 404.894.6944
(she/her/hers)
carolyn.sims@oria.gatech.edu | **oria.gatech.edu** | **about IRBs**