

2019

Parental Involvement and Academic Success During Emerging Adulthood

Michael V. Mendez
Eastern Illinois University

Recommended Citation

Mendez, Michael V., "Parental Involvement and Academic Success During Emerging Adulthood" (2019). *Masters Theses*. 4482.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4482>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

Thesis Maintenance and Reproduction Certificate

FOR: Graduate Candidates Completing Theses in Partial Fulfillment of the Degree
Graduate Faculty Advisors Directing the Theses

RE: Preservation, Reproduction, and Distribution of Thesis Research

Preserving, reproducing, and distributing thesis research is an important part of Booth Library's responsibility to provide access to scholarship. In order to further this goal, Booth Library makes all graduate theses completed as part of a degree program at Eastern Illinois University available for personal study, research, and other not-for-profit educational purposes. Under 17 U.S.C. § 108, the library may reproduce and distribute a copy without infringing on copyright; however, professional courtesy dictates that permission be requested from the author before doing so.

Your signatures affirm the following:

- The graduate candidate is the author of this thesis.
- The graduate candidate retains the copyright and intellectual property rights associated with the original research, creative activity, and intellectual or artistic content of the thesis.
- The graduate candidate certifies her/his compliance with federal copyright law (Title 17 of the U. S. Code) and her/his right to authorize reproduction and distribution of all copyrighted materials included in this thesis.
- The graduate candidate in consultation with the faculty advisor grants Booth Library the nonexclusive, perpetual right to make copies of the thesis freely and publicly available without restriction, by means of any current or successive technology, including but not limited to photocopying, microfilm, digitization, or internet.
- The graduate candidate acknowledges that by depositing her/his thesis with Booth Library, her/his work is available for viewing by the public and may be borrowed through the library's circulation and interlibrary loan departments, or accessed electronically. The graduate candidate acknowledges this policy by indicating in the following manner:

Yes, I wish to make accessible this thesis for viewing by the public

No, I wish to quarantine the thesis temporarily and have included the *Thesis Withholding Request Form*

- The graduate candidate waives the confidentiality provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U. S. C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) with respect to the contents of the thesis and with respect to information concerning authorship of the thesis, including name and status as a student at Eastern Illinois University. I have conferred with my graduate faculty advisor. My signature below indicates that I have read and agree with the above statements, and hereby give my permission to allow Booth Library to reproduce and distribute my thesis. My adviser's signature indicates concurrence to reproduce and distribute the thesis.

Graduate Candidate Signature

MICHAEL V. MENDER
Printed Name

CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY
Graduate Degree Program

Please submit in duplicate.

Faculty Adviser Signature

Wesley D. Allen
Printed Name

8-15-19
Date

Parental Involvement and Academic Success

During Emerging Adulthood

(TITLE)

BY

Michael V. Mendez

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Clinical Psychology M.A.

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2019

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

THESIS COMMITTEE CHAIR 8-15-19
DATE

8/14/19
/SCHOOL CHAIR DATE
OR CHAIR'S DESIGNEE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER 8/15/19
DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER _____
DATE

THESIS MEMBER 8/15/19
DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER _____
DATE

Parental Involvement and Academic Success During Emerging Adulthood

Michael V. Mendez

Eastern Illinois University

Abstract

Emerging adults are posited to experience their own life stage that differs from adolescents and adults in a variety of ways. This study explored the interaction between the parent-child relationship and emerging adult academic success. Participants were 275 university students who completed measures of their self-perception of adulthood including actual parental involvement and ideal parental involvement. These factors were examined among students who were academically at-risk and academically in good standing. Regardless of academic status, students indicated moderate to high levels of parental involvement, desired more parental involvement, and identified with the emerging adulthood stage more than any other life stage (i.e., adolescence and adulthood). Parental involvement and emerging adulthood constructs were not related to student academic success; however, subscales of parental interaction were correlated positively with several emerging adulthood factors.

Parental Involvement and Academic Success During Emerging Adulthood

The progression from adolescence to adulthood has widely been debated with regard to its inclusion as a possible new life stage of development. The notion of “becoming an adult” has evolved within the last few decades and continues to gain attention as many young adults prolong their eventual achievement of “adulthood.” Arnett (2000) coined the name for this new life stage as *emerging adulthood*. He signifies the time frame to be between the ages 18 and 24 years, when an individual neither meets the requirements for adolescence (parental tethering, living at home, told what to eat, have to follow rules of the household, have chores, etc.) nor full adulthood (financial stability, marriage or significant relationships, child bearing, career, etc.). Arnett (2004b) argues that there are several primary reasons for this change over the last half century: delayed marriage (and childbirth), increased college attendance, changing definitions of parent and child interaction, and striving for personally fulfilling jobs. Kloep and Hendry (2010) further describe this period as a time when individuals purposefully avoid commitments in both personal and relational settings, thus requiring additional support from their parents. They attributed this change to unemployment, prolonged education, and other societal influences (e.g., rising housing prices) that make adulthood less desirable for these individuals.

Many studies have explored the tenets of emerging adulthood and how individuals at this stage differ from those at other developmental stages with regard to ethnicity and culture (Atak & Çok, 2008; Cheah & Nelson, 2004; Nelson, Badger, & Bo, 2004; Syed & Azmitia, 2010), identity status (Dumas, Tieu, & Pratt, 2009), patterns of home leaving (Kins, Beyers, Soenens, & Vansteenkiste, 2009), and gender roles

(Eryilmaz & Atak, 2011). However, few have evaluated the relationship between emerging adulthood and academic standing; for example, do students who experience the emerging adulthood stage to a higher degree than their peers struggle academically? As emerging adults are said to make decisions that avoid adult responsibilities (Arnett, 2003), it could be theorized that those individuals may partake in activities that negatively affect their academic success.

Furthermore, although one of the main tenets of emerging adulthood is the prolonged dependence on parents, few studies have evaluated how individuals during this proposed life stage may differ regarding their desire for parental involvement and their parents actual involvement. Thus, this paper will review the available literature on emerging adulthood, parental involvement, and examine potential relationships with student academic success.

Emerging Adulthood Theory

Arnett (2000) described emerging adulthood as occurring due to cultural changes that have supported behaviors postponing adulthood. He indicated that, in the past, individuals with significant financial support from their parents were able to spend a longer time in an adolescent-type phase that allowed them to 'experiment' and delay adult responsibilities. For example, knowing that one can rely on one's parents financially may lead to students changing majors even though it will delay graduation. However, over time those behaviors of the upper social class have now expanded to become the norm in many industrialized nations. Arnett (2000) stated that individuals in late adolescence and early twenties no longer consider it normal to acquire long-term adult responsibilities (e.g., obtaining a job). Arnett (2000) credits the work of several

theorists as influential in establishing his conceptual framework, which helped in describing the characteristics of individuals as they move through the stages of development. Specifically, he references the work of Erikson, Levinson, and Keniston, who all describes features consistent with 'emerging adulthood' without necessarily distinguishing or naming the stage. Arnett attributes some of what prevented the identification of this stage of development due to misrepresenting labels (e.g., "youth" or "young adulthood"; Arnett, 2000).

Arnett (2004) has identified five primary features that distinguish the emerging adulthood stage. These are: (1) identity exploration, (2) age of instability, (3) self-focused age of life, (4) feeling in-between, and (5) the age of possibilities. He explains how each feature has characteristics that serve to postpone adulthood. This view of adulthood has been described as "the end to independence, the end of spontaneity, and the end of a sense of wide-open possibilities" (Arnett, 2004b, p. 6).

The "age of identity exploration" signifies a time when emerging adults are neither tethered to their parents nor to the responsibilities of adult life (e.g., mortgages, children, and careers; Arnett, 2004b). This stage allows emerging adults to explore love, work, and various ways of living without the repercussions they might face as full adults. The second feature is the "age of instability." Individuals in college often change majors, move away from home, live in a series of multiple residences, and return home either after graduation or dropping out which signifies an overall freedom to make changes that would be less likely at other stages of development. The third feature, "the self focused age," describes the lack of commitments that emerging adults maintain throughout this life stage. Arnett (2004b) states that, unlike during adolescence and adulthood, emerging

adults are able to make their own decisions on a day-to-day basis that might not be an option otherwise (e.g., deciding what to eat, if and when they will come home, and when they do their laundry). Furthermore, Arnett describes how the decisions of emerging adults often are based on their own needs and are generally self-focused (Arnett, 2004b).

Arnett (2000) mentions a period when emerging adults describe themselves as feeling like an adult in some ways but not in others, which he calls “the age of feeling in-between.” In fact, 60% of students responded “yes and no” to the question, “Do you feel that you have reached adulthood?” (Arnett, 2004b). He reports the top three criteria for adulthood as being able to “accept responsibility for yourself, to make independent decisions, and becoming financially independent” (Arnett, 2004b, p.15). Emerging adults are probably aware of these criteria and often feel “in between” because they do not satisfy the three requirements. Arnett (2004b) describes the final feature of emerging adulthood as “the age of possibilities” in which individuals are hopeful about their futures. However, their hopefulness and high expectations have not been tested in the real world, which may prevent the emerging adult from recognizing the difficulties that lie ahead. As emerging adults age, they typically gain additional knowledge that allows them to become more realistic about the likelihood that they will experience a positive outcome. Arnett (2004b) posits that emerging adults see this time as the last opportunity to seek endless possibilities and make choices that may result in a wide range of outcomes.

Emerging Adulthood in the Literature

Arnett (2000) supports his theory with several sets of data that signify a shift in development over the last thirty years. For example, he cited several changes over time in

data from 1997 collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census characterizing the typically high percentage of adolescents aged 12 to 17 years who lived at home (95%), were unmarried (98%), had no children of their own (90%), and were enrolled in school (95%). Additionally, there were a concomitant high percentage of 30-year-olds who were married (75%), had children (75%), and were not enrolled in school (90%) (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1997). The ages between these periods are both unpredictable and diverse as emerging adults postpone adulthood in ways that had not been present during the 70's and 80's. In 2010, the U.S. Bureau of the Census reported individuals under the age of 25 as predominantly never married (88%); whereas, 63% of their 30 year old counterparts reported as being married/divorced. Arnett attributes this shift to changing marriage values and delayed childbirth, an increase in higher educational attainment, and changes in the parental role (Arnett, 2000).

Likewise, Settersten and Ray (2010) stated:

Today, one-half of those between eighteen and twenty-four have not left their childhood bedrooms, let alone landed a job, married, or had children of their own. This is a 37 percent increase over 1970. And an even bigger jump in living at home has occurred for those ages twenty-five through thirty-four - a 139 percent increase since 1970. Some of these young people never left the nest, and others have boomeranged back. (p.12)

Brown (2019) notes that this period of development (individuals between the ages of 18 and 29) is more likely to occur in industrialized nations and is especially common in areas consisting of a more educated population. As the United States population's

percentage of individuals over 25 who have obtained at least a bachelor's degree steadily increases (that number hit an all-time high of 34.2% in 2016), one can posit the amount of people in this life stage will continue to grow, as well (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2017c). Furthermore, an important related sociocultural change is that the median age for marriage rose between 1970 and 2000, from 21 to 25 years for women and from 23 to 27 years for men. In 2009, those numbers rose to 26.5 years for women and 28.4 years for men (United States Census Bureau, 2009a; United States Census Bureau, 2009b). Arnett (2003) states that "education may last several more years, through an extended undergraduate program-the four year degree in five, six, or more years" (p.3). Similarly, it is now common for many emerging adults to finish college before seriously thinking about parenthood and marriage (Arnett, 2004b).

When Arnett (2000) first established the tenets of emerging adulthood, many researchers sought to identify how individuals who identified with this stage differed from adolescents and adults. Subsequent research has focused on differences amongst individuals in the emerging adulthood stage. For example, Padilla-Walker, Nelson, and Carroll (2012) examined how emerging adults differed based on varying levels of parental financial involvement. Likewise, Schwartz and colleague (2009) observed variations amongst perceived parental acceptance.

This growing literature on emerging adulthood has established that these "not quite adults" are allowed to postpone and delay adulthood due to continued parental support. As Nelson, Padilla-Walker, Christensen, Evans, and Carroll (2011) have stated, parents are continuing their parenting for years longer than did prior generations. The

authors further mentioned that little is known about the effects of that continued and prolonged interaction.

Nelson et al. (2011) examined the various aspects of the parent-child interaction during emerging adulthood, with the hypothesis that parents' practices are in response to the changes and behaviors evoked by their children's conduct and beliefs consistent with the emerging adulthood tenets. Parental behaviors are evaluated under the assumption that they are reacting to their children, not taking into consideration the parent's role in those changes. Overall, the authors suggest that one of the most central aspects that must be taken into consideration regarding parental involvement during emerging adulthood is the way in which the parent-child relationship changes over time. Specifically, how that relationship experiences change simply due to time; as a parent engages in parenting over time, their role evolves and must adapt to the changing needs of their offspring.

Padilla-Walker and colleagues (2012) stated that young people who received less financial assistance from their parents transitioned to adulthood more quickly than their peers who received more financial assistance. The ability for students to attend and continue college based on financial factors seems to be a recurring topic, especially when referring to whether the parents of emerging adults are willing and able to provide that financial support. If students who receive less financial support transition more quickly, they may also belong to the percentage of students who do not pursue higher education, amongst other potential outcomes. Conversely, Hamilton (2011) evaluated monetary support and its relation to emerging adults' behavior that relates to student failure. The author found that the greater the parental monetary support, the lower the students' grades. Further, the author attributed the finding to the students' use of any excess monies

from their parents on more enticing purchases outside the realm of education. Consistent with this finding, Settersten and Ray (2010) describe how some emerging adults may enroll in higher education in part to intentionally delay marriage and children. That is, a group of emerging adults may consciously decide to postpone adult responsibilities by opting to continue their education. Consequently, these authors propose that the group of emerging adults who do not make conscious decisions to attend higher education tend to be ill prepared for college and belong to the 70% of individuals ages 18 to 24 years in 2005 who had less than an Associate's degree. This research indicates that some factors keeping individuals from graduating may not be directly related to their cognitive ability to complete college.

Parental Involvement

One of the primary questions in this area concerns potential causality. Specifically, do parental behaviors shape their children's need for parental involvement or are the children shaping the parent's need to be involved? Parental attitudes have transformed over the last several decades reflecting a change in values, norms, and expectations. Traditionally, American middle-class parents tended to value the launching of their children; however, a large proportion of emerging adults' parents indicate a need to preserve their role for a longer period of time (Kloep and Hendry, 2010). Concurrently, the majority of 18 to 23 year olds indicate that they are not yet fully adults (Arnett, 2003). Kloep and Hendry (2010) found that parents may display a need to maintain the parental role due to their children not achieving full maturity. Additionally, the aforementioned parent-child experiences (parents believing their offspring is not ready to be an adult; young adults feeling they have not achieved adulthood) appear to be interwoven. The

modern parent and child are confronting changes to norms, values, and expectations and it is unclear how this interconnectedness is a product of societal pressure and its incentives or rather due to domestic motivation, or, perhaps, a combination effect.

Many research studies have evaluated the parent-child relationship during the transition to college, including parental expectations and the effects on college adjustment (Agliata & Renk, 2007), financial coping behaviors and the well-being of emerging adults (Serido, Shim, Mishra, & Tang, 2010), parent expectations of their students' autonomy (Kenyon & Koerner, 2009), parenting style effects on student goal orientation (Gonzalez, Greenwood, & WenHsu, 2001), and the contribution parenting style and current parental relationship have on the adjustment of college students (Wintre & Yaffe, 2000).

As individuals delay taking on permanent responsibilities and make deliberate choices to prolong emerging adulthood, there is an obvious need for increased parental involvement to support their, often financially dependent, children. Much of the research regarding parental involvement has been conducted on students during or prior to secondary education. There is support to indicate that increased parental involvement positively affects academic success for children and adolescents (e.g., Fehrmann, Keith, & Reimers, 1987). This research has shown that children and adolescents perform better academically when their parents are involved in their education. In a study by Osyerman, Brickman, and Rhodes (2007), the authors found that better academic outcomes are associated with increased parental involvement with adolescents; however, some studies have described parental involvement with negative connotations regarding college students. Often referred to as "helicopter parents," these individuals are said to be too

involved in their children's educational and professional life, causing detrimental consequences.

Manos (2009) described the increase of parental involvement during college in a negative manner, consistent with much of the research surrounding helicopter parenting (Howe, 2010; Manos, 2009; Rainey, 2006). The aforementioned researchers place blame on parents for the growing number of students who desire increased parental involvement and describe mothers and fathers as "overbearing" and over-involved. Also, the authors relate these escalations in parental involvement to problems associated with student academic success and student growth. Kouros, Pruitt, Ekas, Kiriaki, and Sunderland (2017) describe helicopter parenting as harmful for young adults when they attempt to achieve self-reliance and autonomy; however, these findings neglect to take into account the perception of the child and cultural implications. For instance, it is understandable to label one or more parental behaviors as not developmentally appropriate; conversely, those behaviors may be viewed by the offspring as fulfilling their needs. Additionally, Kouros and colleagues (2017) indicate that behaviors attributed to helicopter parenting negatively affect the child's well being; although they did not evaluate the child's desire for that "over-involvement."

Darlow, Norvilitis, and Schuetze (2017) evaluated the effects of parental involvement, referred to as 'overinvolvement,' while adjusting to college; contrary to prior research, the authors evaluated the student/child's desire for that involvement. They reported that as parental involvement increased to a degree they depict as overinvolvement, student's levels of social adjustment, self-efficacy, and academic adjustment decreased and levels of depression increased. Of course, it is not clear

whether the offspring's perceptions of parental involvement is accurate or indicative of what may constitute overinvolvement. For instance, one question obtained from the Helicopter Parenting Scale regarding parental supervision ("My parents supervised my every move growing up") might be described or defined by some children far differently than their peers or even their parents. It is possible that autonomy (as the aforementioned scale's question appears to examine) is a function of perception opposed to actual behaviors. Societal norms appear to be moving toward increased parental involvement; therefore, if normative levels of involvement have increased, how does one now indicate what is too much? Furthermore, there did not appear to be an assessment of what might be described as underinvolvement, which the current study analyzes.

Underinvolved parenting, often described as less-involved and in opposition to overinvolved parents, has been studied frequently among elementary school aged populations. However, little research on less-involved parents has been conducted at the secondary level (Jensen & Minke, 2017). Jensen & Minke (2017) describe negative outcomes for less-involved parents and call for an evaluation of adolescent perception of parental involvement. Nevertheless, few studies have evaluated the importance of a child's perception when considering the parent-child relationship (i.e., a child's perception of overinvolvement or underinvolvement could vary from person to person). One exception is a study by Schwartz and colleagues (2009); they evaluated how various college student behaviors are impacted by the child's perception of paternal acceptance. It is important to note that most studies conducted, in general, are an evaluation of the participants perception of any observable or nonobservable aspect of their life. Notwithstanding, it is salient that the researchers found that positive parental involvement

helped protect against health-risk behaviors. According to Arnett (2005), emerging adults are found to participate in health-risk behaviors at a high rate, which supports the discovery of protective measures which can be employed by parents through the relationship with their child.

Kenyon and Koerner (2009) studied the expectations of both emerging adults and their parents concerning future autonomous behaviors in college and whether or not the students and parents had similar beliefs. This study categorized autonomy into functional and emotional behaviors; that is, behaviors that are expected to occur (e.g., calling parents for help which is functional) as well as those that are affective in nature (e.g., “home sickness” which is emotional). They found that parents reported significantly higher expectations for both functional and emotional autonomous behaviors than did their children. This finding was contrary to the researchers’ expectations, as they thought emerging adults would have higher future expectations about autonomous behavior; meaning that emerging adults would expect less parental involvement in the future. In addition, the findings indicated that college students reported being emotionally dependent on their parents (e.g., being homesick, having difficulty leaving home after a vacation with family, and wishing their parents lived nearer).

In the aforementioned areas, emerging adults were more likely than their parental counterparts to endorse the items concerning parental attachment; that is, students desired more parental involvement. In addition, students indicated a desire for parental assistance with personal problems more so than their parents expected (Kenyon & Koerner, 2009). These results seem to support some of the data regarding helicopter parenting (Hoover & Supiano, 2008; Settersten & Ray, 2010) and the parental involvement studies previously

mentioned. These examples elucidate increases in observed student desire for additional and prolonged parental involvement. Consistent with these results, Pryor, Hurtado, Sharkness, and Korn (2007) conducted a survey for college freshmen that isolated the desire for increased parental involvement. Students were asked if they felt “too little,” the “right amount,” or “too much” parental involvement in their college decisions. For the item, “choosing college courses,” 24% of students reported “too little,” 72.5% reported “the right amount,” and 3.5% reported “too much.” The implication of this conclusion has been discussed in some studies as they evaluate the effects of these changes in level of parental involvement. This evaluation inspired the direction of the present study’s verbiage to evaluate the current University’s students’ parental involvement.

Cutright (2008) provides a different view of helicopter parenting and parental involvement, in general. He sympathizes with parents, especially those without formal education, who are involved in their children’s education. He attributed the negative anecdotes reported by researchers and those involved in higher education regarding helicopter parenting as a minority view when compared to the percentage of parents who are positively influencing their children’s education by maintaining close contact. Merriman (2007) expressed both positive and negative outcomes of helicopter parenting. Cutright (2008) further reported that the negative stories may be reduced if colleges did a better job of adapting to the change in the parent-child relationship or, in other words, finding ways to make parents allies.

Finding methods to involve parents in their children’s higher education might be better accepted if there were more secondary education institutions that utilized the positive aspects of parental involvement as described by Jansen and Minke (2017). They

indicate that high school completion rates and academic achievement as well as social and emotional outcomes are influenced by parental engagement. They expand upon their exploration and describe the negative effects in the academic setting from parents being both too little involved and too much involved. They further express that parents who are too involved limit autonomous development by adolescents. By detailing the two sides, under involvement and over involvement, Jensen and Minke (2017) posit the importance of understanding the need to balance parental involvement to help produce positive educational attainment outcomes. Additionally, as young adults 18 to 29 years exhibit continued adolescent (non-adult) behaviors and beliefs (Arnett 2003), it is noteworthy to consider employing methods which produce positive academic results for adolescents with emerging adults.

Lindell, Compione-Barr, and Illoren (2017) evaluated a longitudinal analysis which evaluated the parent-child relationship of college attending emerging adults. The authors described how emerging adults with positive parental relationships at Time 1 reporting feeling more like adults when evaluated again three years later when contrasted with individuals who reported negative parental relationships at Time 1. The authors forwarded the need for additional research to examine methods that might enhance emerging adults' transition to adulthood by incorporating parents. Moreover, the tenets of emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000) indicate that additional parental involvement may be linked to enhanced student development, which seems to be overlooked by most degree granting institutions. When emerging adulthood is recognized as a developmental stage, increased parental involvement can then be looked at as a normal function of this age

group, similar to how it is observed at earlier points in a child's life. Not all trends of emerging adulthood are supported across various ethnicities.

Ethnicity and Parental Involvement

Pryor, Hurtado, Sharkness, and Korn (2007) found that ethnic minority students were much more likely to report "too little" involvement by their parent or guardian, with Latino/a students being the group most likely to report "too little" involvement. For example, in response to the question concerning parental involvement and "choosing college courses," 43.5% of Latino students reported that their parents were involved "too little" while only 18% of white students indicated this. Ethnicity likely plays an important role in how individuals "parent" their offspring and, specific to this study, how they impact their college-age children.

Arnett (2004a) evaluated differences among minority groups with respect to emerging adulthood. A significant majority (70%) of individuals across ethnicities (i.e., white, African American, Asian, and Latino) endorsed two qualities as necessary to reaching full adulthood: independence from parents and becoming self-sufficient. However, ethnic minorities were found to endorse familial obligations more so than whites as necessary to achieving adulthood (e.g., supporting a family financially and keeping a family physically safe). Also, African Americans and Latinos were more likely to report having reached full adulthood among similar aged emerging adults.

Arnett (2004a) asserted that individuals who report reaching full adulthood at younger ages often come from low socioeconomic status (SES) groups as they do not experience the same benefits as the middle and upper classes. He states that minority

families accounted for most of the population of individuals collected from low SES, which may have attributed to the elevated findings for minorities.

Student Academic Success

Over the last decade, increased attention has been given to student academic success and factors that contribute to “success” or, ultimately, graduation; however, Wimshurst and Allard (2008) described the difficulty of finding research on why students fail is the reluctance some colleges and universities have about disclosing this information. The educational performance of college students is often evaluated by several factors, including student retention (i.e., returning students to the institution following their first semester), graduation rate (i.e., keeping students in a single institution through commencement) at both public and private colleges (Millea, Wills, Elder, & Molina, 2018), and grade point average (Brown, C., Brown, U., Beale, & Gould, 2014). Many (if not all) institutions initiate programs or policies to augment rates of retention and graduation including implementing low student/faculty ratios, student-life programs, first year experience programs (Millia et al., 2018), as well as the most popular, study skills and habit classes (Barclay, T., Barclay R., Mims, Sargent, & Robertson, 2018).

Following the first semester “melt” (a term often used for the departure of first semester freshman), a good indicator of academic performance and therefore potential graduation is the grade point average (GPA). Almost all universities have a minimum GPA required to obtain a degree, to receive financial aid, and to continue to remain in good academic standing (Brown et al., 2014). Several studies have examined retention of

incoming student who are high achieving with high levels of academic credentials as incoming students versus those who entered college with the indication of “at-risk.”

At-risk students are generally admitted when one or more of their academic credentials (e.g., ACT scores, GPA) are less than the university’s minimum standard, and they are often enrolled in a specified program to aid in retention (Barclay et al., 2018). Barclay and colleagues (2018) found that, when comparing high achievers and at-risk populations, the groups had very different self-perceptions of academic ambition, approaches to learning, levels of commitment, and internal versus external motivating factors. In almost every category, the high achievers scored higher or better than their at-risk peers. Furthermore, both groups achieved academic results that corresponded with their entrance credentials.

As described by Millea and colleagues (2018), the first obstacle for universities is to retain their newly enrolled freshman following the initial fall semester. According to a report on student retention (Habley, Valiga, McClanahan, & Burkum, 2010), a sample of community colleges (N=890) retained 55.9% of their freshman class, a sample of public universities (N=547) retained 73.9% of their freshman class, and a sample of private universities (N=1 144) retained 72.4% of their freshman class. Additionally, the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) reports the national averages each year for all public, private for-profit, and private non-profit institutions. The most recent national average was slightly higher than the aforementioned study with an average retention rate of 81% for all public, private for-profit, and private non-profit institutions (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2018b). Millea and colleagues (2018) tested three major facets of retention assisters: institutional factors such as student/faculty ratios,

student services and programs, as well as specific classes targeting student success; student attributes such as motivation, behaviors, and personal decisions during the academic process; and financial considerations such as constraints due to aid distribution, scholarships, grants, and available loans. The authors found that several factors contributed to student retention, including smaller class sizes and greater availability of financial assistance.

Other research has identified aspects which aid in retention, including socioeconomic status, high school GPA, test scores, self-confidence, and social support (Barclay et al., 2018), as well as agreeableness (Brown et al., 2014). It should be noted that Barclay and colleagues (2018) posit that universities have failed to operationalize those contributing factors, citing the continued stagnant graduation rates. Furthermore, universities tend to use the majority of their monetary resources on recruiting students as opposed to retaining them. Interestingly, these recent studies have found that factors which have been theorized to improve student retention actually may have no effect, including absenteeism, on-campus residence (Millea et al., 2018), and self-esteem (Brown et al., 2014).

Frequently intertwined with retention, graduation rate is often affected by the same factors as retention rates (Barclay et al., 2018). Graduation rate is often calculated when a student graduates within 150% of the “typical” time-frame or 6 years from initial full-time enrollment. The national average, according to the NCES (2018a), for 6-year graduation rate is 59.7%. That statistic has grown about 2 percentage points since 2000; however, it has remained consistent for each of the five cohorts spanning from 2006 to 2010, each achieving about 59%. Although not frequently cited in the literature, the

increased attention to retention and graduation rates can be credited to one primary source, money, which is important to both the producer (e.g., educational institution) and the consumer (e.g., student). Consequently, as the financial burden often does not fall solely upon the student/child, studies have shown that 1 in 2 parents provide between \$5,000 and \$30,000 in financial assistance each year (Padilla-Walker, Nelson, Carroll, 2011), indicating greater need for students requiring parental assistance.

Since 2000, the yearly cost for college attendance at almost every level (e.g., associate degree granting institution, bachelor degree granting institution, public, private) has doubled (while adjusting for inflation) when compared to the 2015-2016 enrollment year. Among 4-year institutions, the cost of enrollment has risen from \$12,922 in 2000 to \$26,120 in 2016 (NCES, 2016). The increase in costs associated with attending higher education has resulted in students (and their families) taking on greater loan debt each year. Between 2006 and 2016, outstanding student loan debt rose from 435 billion to 1.31 trillion and has become the greatest household debt besides mortgages (Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 2017).

The increase in annual college costs may impact two factors, fewer opportunities to attain a higher education and issues relating to student loan size and repayment for those who do attend (Lee, Kim, & Hong, 2018). The first issue is important to mention as, when cost becomes too great for a student to handle, the parents may be the only other source of funds to allow their children an opportunity at obtaining higher education. Furthermore, institutions that have trouble with retention will not keep the students' continued financial investment, therefore increasing the emphasis on retention and degree completion. In addition, the financial burden on the institution to recruit additional

students is another major motivating factor for increasing retention and graduation rates (Millea et al., 2018). Moreover, greater than 30 states currently provide performance-based funding to their public institutions, which suggests that a majority of the country's higher education programs have incentive to retain and graduate students in order to continue receiving state funding (Dougherty & Natow, 2015); further associating retention and student success with a monetary connection.

Students, their parents, and their future household are inherently connected to the success of completing higher education once enrolled full time for several reasons including future working earnings (Millea et al., 2018) and potential student loan repayment issues (Lee, Kim, & Hong, 2018). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2019), the median weekly earnings for the first quarter of 2019 for full-time workers aged 25 years and older who have a bachelor's degree outpace those with a high school diploma only by \$582. That average equates to a difference of about \$30,000 per year and supports the notion that graduating from college continues to demonstrate a financial benefit (Newport & Busted, 2013).

Individuals who do not complete their degree likely do not receive a return on that initial investment. As Millea and colleagues (2018) state, "the success of the university and the success of its students are intertwined" (pg.309). Concurrently, Padilla-Walker, Nelson, and Carroll (2011) found that parents were providing between \$5,000 and \$30,000 annually for their emerging adult childhood expenses, which, for some, appears to cover the average total yearly cost of attendance. For the individuals who are unable to receive financial assistance or less than \$5,000 annually (about 1 in 5), the financial

burden of loan acquisition looks very different for those who graduate and those who do not graduate.

Considering the aforementioned statistics, the average yearly cost of attendance of \$26,120 over 6 years results in a total expense of \$156,720 (not adjusting for increased costs from year to year by the degree granting institution). Consequently, a portion of the 60% of students who will obtain their degree in 6 years (not factoring lesser cost for 4 and 5 year graduates) will pay at least \$156,720 under current estimates and averages. If that amount is comprised of a student loan accruing an average of 6% interest and if that graduate uses the additional monthly earnings based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics 2019 first quarter report of \$2,328, the loan will be paid off in under 7 years at a total of \$191,549 (assuming the loan was not accruing interest while the student was in school). If the payment is half of that cost at \$1,164 (or two weeks of additional pay compared to the average non-degree earner), the loan will be paid off in just under 19 years for a total of \$261,013 including all interest payments (assuming the loan was not accruing interest during the years of attendance). Additionally, if the graduate uses just one week of their additional earnings (compared with the non-degree earner), or \$582, their loan will never be paid off.

Inversely, the NCES (2016) indicates that 40% of students who begin post-secondary education do not obtain a degree within 6 years. Inevitably, 40% of students and/or their families (assuming they never return to finish) make a financial investment to a degree granting institution for at least one semester without obtaining a diploma. Lee, Kim, and Hong (2018) found that individuals who had obtained degrees in higher education had a larger amount of student loan debt and high loan payment-to-income

ratios but were less likely to have become delinquent on student loans than those without a degree (or those who did not achieve a degree). They further stated that very few student loan debt forgiveness options are available if they did not complete their degree or if they are unable to obtain a job in their program of study. The financial burden on the student and their family, the financial incentives for retaining students due to continued funds from subsequent years, and the increased interaction of state funding tied to performance for many universities appear to have pushed the initiative to improve student success (e.g., retention and graduation rates).

Due to the aforementioned factors, it is understandable why there have been initiatives from universities to find ways to help students succeed. Although determining why students do not graduate is difficult, a study by Johnson, Rochkind, Ott, and DuPont (2009) indicates that the leading source of college drop-out can be attributed to students having to work while attending college. Their study of 614 students sought to describe why students do not finish their post-secondary education. The participants all received at least some education and were divided into three groups: (1) students who finished a post-secondary degree (n=281), students who did not finish a post-secondary degree (n=200), and students currently enrolled (n=133). More than half (54%) of participants reported the *major* reason why they did not complete their program was due to “needing to work and make money;” and 17% reported it as a *minor* reason. The amount an individual must work often relates to how much monetary support the student has from his or her parent or guardian. Concurrently, the second leading reason why students reported that they did not finish college was not being able to afford tuition and fees; 31% of students indicated this was a *major* reason and 21% cited this as a *minor* reason

(Johnson et al., 2009). In addition, Torres, Gross, and Dadashova (2010) discussed the trend for traditional-aged college students (under 21) to work 30+ hours per week while being enrolled full time. King (2002) described working over 30 hours per week and taking 12 credit hours or more as a potentially harmful risk to graduating from college.

Parental Involvement and Academic Success

Perhaps one of the most valuable methods for understanding parental involvement and its impact on academic success is to review the literature concerning high school students. Two main reasons that support consideration of these studies are the specific factors within emerging adulthood and the limited research regarding college student academic success. Fehrmann, Keith, and Reimers (1987) evaluated the impact of parental involvement on high school student grades and found that an increase in involvement contributed to higher grades. A sample of 28,051 high school seniors selected from a longitudinal study on educational statistics completed surveys assessing the impact of parental involvement on grades. The results indicated that parents had a direct effect on time spent doing homework, and individuals who spent more time on homework achieved higher grades (Fehrmann, Keith, & Reimers, 1987). Gonzalez (2002) also discussed the impact of parental involvement and identified a direct relationship between parental involvement and high school students' academic motivation.

In recent years, increased parental involvement in the college setting has been discussed and evaluated (Darlow, Norvilitis, & Schuetze, 2017; Lindell, Campione-Barr, & Killoren, 2017; Kouros, Pruitt, Ekas, Kiriaki & Sunderland, 2017). As previously mentioned, helicopter parenting behaviors are one of the highly viewed and debated topics which observed and evaluated the evolution of the parent-child relationship in the

college setting (Rainey, 2006; Manos, 2009; Merriman, 2009; Howe, 2010). Regarding student academic success, Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo, Assouline, and Russell (1994) found that parental social support was related to higher grade point average in a university setting. Additionally, Kriegbaum, Villarreal, Wu, and Heckhausen (2016) found that, when parents and their children have shared academic goals and engage in achieving those goals (i.e., “agency”), students are more likely to perform well. In contrast, students who do not share the “agency” with their parents are more likely to perform poorly or achieve less academically (lower GPA). Consequently, Kriegbaum and colleagues (2016) describe parents as being an “underutilized resource” in the college setting for improving student academic achievement.

Current Study and Hypotheses

The relationship between students entering college and their families has evolved. Arnett (2004b) states that the prolonged “in-betweenness” that emerging adults experience is rooted in the changes of the parent-child relationship that take place throughout the ages of 18 to 23 years. Over the past decade, there seems to have been an increase in parental involvement. For instance, a study in 2006, encompassing 127 institutions around the United States, reported that 93% of student affairs professionals thought that there had been an increase in parental interaction over the previous five years (Merriman, 2007).

Concurrently, Hoover (2008) posits that a fairly large proportion of students desire an increased amount of parental participation. Pryor, Hurtado, Sharkness, and Korn (2007) found that about one quarter of college freshmen reported that their parents had “too little” involvement in choosing both college courses as well as their activities.

The present study explored this increase in parental involvement and assessed students' perception of parent interaction in a population of college students including both academically "in good standing" and academically "at risk." As emerging adults continue to prolong adult achievement and parents continue to become more involved in the college process, there is a need to continue exploring how these factors might affect student academic success.

This increase in parental involvement, while considering the characteristics of emerging adulthood, underscores the need to better understand the effects, both positive and negative, on college student education. With increasing demands for student success outcomes, it is important to observe what factors may limit or enhance positive academic results. Emerging adults seem to require additional and extended parental involvement until they begin to accept adult responsibilities and eventually assume the adult role. Several studies appear to intertwine money, family, and student success including the description of continued and seemingly perpetual financial investment by parents (Padilla-Walker et al., 2011), financial assistance being a major factor contributing to student success (Barclay et al., 2018; Millea et al., 2018), and evidence which supports student failure with an inability to afford college (Johnson, Rochkind, Ott, & DuPont, 2009). Conversely, Hamilton (2011) found that students with financial support exceeding their needs were found to perform poorly academically due to choices impacting their ability to achieve in the classroom. The interaction of parental support and academic success may provide insight to the variables that are helping students succeed or contribute to students' academic struggles.

Furthermore, recent studies have evaluated the relationship between parental involvement and college academic success during emerging adulthood. However, emerging adulthood factors have not been evaluated among groups of students who perform differently academically. In addition, previous research lacks information regarding the perception of parental interaction comparing ideal/desired involvement versus actual levels of involvement, despite the research that exists indicating each classification of underinvolved and overinvolved relationships. By developing the actual versus ideal interaction, it allowed the researcher to observe how individuals described their relationship with their parents and whether or not a discrepancy was present.

This study incorporated the aforementioned factors and addressed the role that the parent-child relationship plays in emerging adulthood and the differences present between college students who perform well academically and those who are at-risk. The literature seems to support that the parent-child relationship has encountered major changes over the past quarter century with few evaluating potential effects during higher education. Furthermore, the topic at-risk student retention has risen to the forefront of higher education with little research providing a solution to improve retention, regardless of factors that have been identified as common traits that successful students exhibit. The study which showed the highest correlation for academic failure or dropout (Johnson, Rochkind, Ott, & DuPont, 2009) described working while enrolled in college which could directly correlate with a lack of parental financial support. Therefore, the current study developed hypotheses related to the aforementioned interactions.

It was predicted that the discrepancy of actual versus ideal parental involvement would be related positively to poor academic performance. For example, a student with

very involved parents who desired uninvolved parents would have just as much academic difficulty as a student with uninvolved parents who desired very involved parents. To further illustrate, either example would have academic difficulty more often than a student whose parental involvement matched their desired parental involvement whether very involved or uninvolved (congruent).

Hypothesis 1 examined the relationship between parental involvement and the concept of emerging adulthood. One of the main factors described by Jeffrey Arnett (2004b) that serves as a foundation to the emerging adulthood stage is the support of their parents. Without that support, 18 to 23 year olds might take a path similar to that which was common 30 years ago. This path would consist of moving out, starting a long-term job or career, getting married, and starting a family, all of which are examples of events many young people presently postpone until their late twenties (Arnett, 2004b). In this study, parental involvement was operationalized in three different ways (i.e., actual involvement, ideal involvement, and the computed actual versus ideal involvement discrepancy). Thus, for Hypothesis 1, it was hypothesized that students who reported greater actual parental involvement would have higher scores on emerging adulthood subscales than their peers with less actual parental involvement. Furthermore, students who indicating greater ideal parental involvement would have higher scores on emerging adulthood subscales than their peers with less actual parental involvement.

For Hypothesis 2, we examined factors associated with poor student academic performance. The reasons why students fail are complex, however, several studies have found that increased parental involvement in adolescence is related to academic success (Fehrman, Keith, & Reimers, 1987; Gonzalez, 2002). Hypothesis 2a predicted that

students with a parental involvement discrepancy score demonstrating high incongruence between their actual and ideal perceived parental involvement would perform poorly (e.g., lower GPA) more often than students with optimal parental involvement (i.e., a low incongruence between actual and ideal perceived parental involvement). Parental involvement was operationalized in three different ways; (1) actual amount of involvement, (2) ideal amount of involvement, and (3) the computed actual versus ideal parental involvement discrepancy (i.e., “too little”, “too much”, or “optimal”). Also, academic success was operationalized in two different ways; student grade point average (GPA) and student standing (i.e., good standing/never “at risk”, currently in good standing/history of being academically “at-risk”, and currently “at-risk”). GPA ranges from 0.1 to 4.0, with 4.0 being the equivalent to straight As. At the University where this study took place, students who drop below a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or who do not pass 9 hours are placed on academic probation and considered academically at-risk. If their cumulative GPA continues to stay below 2.0 after a second consecutive semester, then they are at risk for dismissal or loss of financial aid. Two groups of students were compared by student status. Good academic performance and history was indicated by (1) currently earning a self-reported GPA of 2.0 or higher and (2) never having taken a remediation course (LRC 102: Study Skills Development); whereas poor academic performance and history was indicated by (1) previously or currently earning a self-reported GPA of 2.0 or below or (2) previously or currently enrolled in a remediation course (LRC 102: Study Skills Development).

Hypothesis 2b examined the relationship between academic standing measures and emerging adulthood factors. Individuals who are considered emerging adults often

make choices that postpone their adult achievement (Arnett, 2004b). College students were evaluated by degree which they identify with the emerging adulthood factors. Although this issue had not been previously examined, it was hypothesized that students in good standing without a poor history of academic performance will identify less with emerging adulthood (i.e., score furthest from the mean emerging adulthood score) whereas those who had a poor academic performance history would identify with the emerging adulthood stage to a greater degree.

Hypothesis 3 examined whether parental involvement moderated the relationship between emerging adulthood and academic success (see Figure 1). That is, did differences in degree of parental involvement impact the strength of the relationship between emerging adulthood and academic success. Emerging adults are hypothesized to delay adulthood and, in order to do so, often require additional parental involvement (Arnett, 2004b). Individuals with additional parental involvement may, therefore, be able to experience the benefits of emerging adulthood without the consequences that may be experienced by individuals who must rely on themselves as adults do; subsequently, they will also be able to experience the consequences that may be associated with individuals who postpone adulthood. It was hypothesized that parental involvement would moderate the relationship between emerging adulthood and academic success. Namely, varying degrees of actual or perceived involvement will alter the relationship between emerging adulthood and academic success.

Hypothesis 4 examined whether demographics interacted with academic success, emerging adult factors, and parental involvement. With respect to ethnicity, Pryor, Hurtado, Sharkness, and Korn (2007) indicated that ethnic minority students were much

more likely to report “too little” involvement by their parent or guardian, with Latino/a students being the most likely to report “too little” involvement. Also, Arnett (2003) evaluated differences among minority groups with respect to emerging adulthood and found that African Americans and Latinos were more likely to report having reached full adulthood among similar aged emerging adults. The current study hypothesized that minorities will be more likely to perceive their parents’ involvement as being “too little.” Also, they will be more likely than their non-minority peers to view themselves as adults by scoring lower on emerging adulthood factors.

Finally, two exploratory analyses will be examined. Although there is little research concerning gender differences in identification with emerging adulthood factors and academic success, allowing no specific direction of our hypothesis. Thus, male and female students will be compared on two factors of parental involvement (present interaction and future planning) and emerging adulthood factors. Finally, students who work more than 30 hours per week have been found to experience less successful academic performance and are more likely to drop out (Johnson, Rochkind, Ott, & DuPont, 2009). Therefore, we examined whether students who work more hours will have less perceived parental involvement and will be more likely to struggle academically.

Method

Participants

Data was collected from 279 students (aged 18 years and above) at a small liberal arts college located in southwestern Illinois who participated in a three part questionnaire. Completed responses were obtained for 275 students (98.6%) of the initial pool of

participants. The final sample of 275 students were divided into two groups: history of or currently at-risk ($N = 59$) and always in good academic standing ($N = 216$). In the at-risk population, 25 students reported being on academic warning or academic probation (9%), 37 indicated that they had been enrolled in a remediation course (I.RC 102: Study Skills Development) (13%), and 4 students out of the 172 who indicated their fall GPA specified they had achieved a 2.0 or less (2%). No students reported having a cumulative GPA of less than 2.0 of the 184 who noted the average. The aforementioned individuals were grouped and labeled “history of at risk or currently at risk,” totaling 59 students (21%).

In the non-at risk population, 250 students indicated they had never been on academic warning or probation (91%), 238 students indicated never being enrolled in LRC 102 (87%), 168 students indicated they had a fall GPA of over 2.0 (97%), and 184 students reported having a cumulative GPA of over 2.0 (100%). This group of individuals were indicated as “always in good academic standing” consisting of 216 students (78.5%). 103 students did not report their fall GPA (37%) and 91 students did not report their cumulative GPA (33%).

In terms of demographics, participants consisted of 133 males (48%) and 142 females (52%). Participants reported being in the following levels: 148 freshmen (54%), 67 sophomores (24%), 32 juniors (12%), 25 seniors (9%), 2 graduate students (<1%), and 1 ‘fifth’ year student (<1%). Underclassmen (freshmen and sophomores) were grouped together ($N = 215$, 78%) and upperclassmen consisted of 60 students (22%). Students ranged in age from 18 to 39 years old ($M = 19.60$), with 97% identifying as under 24 years old. Two groups were created from the sample: Group 1 consisted of 266

individuals ranging from 18 to 24 years of age (97%) and Group 2 consisted of 9 individuals aged 24 and up (3%).

In terms of race/ethnicity, 74% percent of students identified as White/Caucasian ($N = 203$), 14% identified as African American ($N = 38$), 5% identified as Caucasian and Hispanic ($N = 14$), 1% identified as Asian/Pacific Islander ($N = 3$), and 6% identified as mixed race ($N = 17$). Participants included 266 Single/Never Married participants (97%), 7 Married (2%), 1 Divorced (<1%), and 1 did not specify their marital status (<1%). With regard to parental status, 269 individuals indicated they were not a parent (98%), 5 identified as being a parent (1%), and 1 did not specify their parental status (<1%).

Finally, participants were asked to provide information about their work; 107 students (39%) indicated that they did not work. Among student who worked, 264 individuals indicated that they worked less than 30 hours per week (96%) and 11 indicated working more than 31 hours per week or more (4%). To break it down further, 32% noted that they worked between 1 and 10 hours per week ($N = 89$), 15% indicated working between 11 to 20 hours per week ($N = 42$), 9% specified working between 21 and 30 hours per week ($N = 26$), and 4% designated working 31 hours per week or more ($N = 11$).

Procedure

Students completed the three-part questionnaire at the beginning of seven participating college classes, which included three sections of Introduction to Psychology, two sections of Introduction to Business, one section of Introduction to Biology, and one section of Psychology of Sports. The details of informed consent were provided verbally, and each participant signed and returned a written consent form slip.

Students were then given a packet containing the demographics form, the Inventory for the Dimensions of Emerging Adulthood Questionnaire (IDEA), and the Parental Involvement Discrepancy Scale (PIDS). Half of the Parental Involvement Discrepancy Scales were given with the “ideal” portion first and half were given with the “actual” portion first to prevent possible order effects. After participants completed the surveys, the researcher discussed the written debriefing form. Students were offered a chance to win a gift card from a local store.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire. Participants were asked a variety of questions about their demographic information including age, sex, ethnicity, education level, family income level, first generation student status and parent education level (See Appendix A).

Student Academic Success. Academic success was operationalized in two different ways, student grade point average (GPA) and student standing (i.e., good standing/never “at risk,” currently in good standing/history of being academically “at-risk”, and currently “at-risk”). Participants were asked to report both their Fall GPA and their cumulative grade point average (GPA) [see Appendix A]. In addition, the GPA question was used to identify whether or not a student was currently “at-risk.” If a student reported a GPA less than 2.0, then that participant was categorized as being on academic warning or probation; whereas, a student with a score of greater than or equal to 2.0 was categorized as being in academically good standing. Furthermore, the student was asked if they have ever been on academic probation or academic warning, indicating a current or previous classification of “at-risk.” Moreover, the students were asked to report if they had ever been enrolled in LRC 102: Study Skills Development (a class students are

required to take the first time their GPA falls below 2.0) indicating that they have been or are currently academically at-risk (See Appendix A). By asking students whether they have taken the aforementioned class in the past, the researcher was able to address a potential confound which may occur due to the university providing additional support for students once they become at-risk. Ultimately, students were coded into two groups always in good academic standing and previously or currently academically at-risk.

Emerging Adulthood. The Inventory for the Dimensions of Emerging Adulthood Questionnaire (IDEA) is a 31-item measure (see Appendix C) which assesses respondents' identification with transition to adulthood themes based on Arnett's (2000) concept of "emerging adulthood" (Reifman, Arnett, Colwell, 2007). The measure consists of five features central to the theory of emerging adulthood (i.e., identity explorations, experimentation, possibilities, negativity/instability, self-focus, and feeling in-between) and one additional scale (other-focus). Items are rated using a four-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." The five features are evaluated by six subscales. Each subscale is scored separately by summing item responses within each scale. Greater subscale scores indicate individuals who strongly identify with the emerging adulthood developmental stage except for the additional scale, other-focus, which a low score represents someone identifying with emerging adulthood to a greater degree. Research has found strong internal consistency and test-retest reliability for the scale, although high correlations were found between subscales (Reifman, Arnett, & Colwell, 2007). Strong levels of internal consistency were found as reliability coefficients ranged from .70 to .85. Test-retest reliability was examined over a period of one-month.

Correlations ranged from .64 to .76. The “feeling in-between” subscale deviated from this range with a coefficient of .32.

It should be noted that few studies have used The Inventory of the Dimensions of Emerging Adulthood (IDEA) as a predictor of behavior. Davis, Dumas, Briley, and Sussman (2017) attempted to do so by predicting substance use of emerging adults, though were unable to utilize the IDEA as a predictor. However, they did find that emerging adults who reported at least 50% college attendance differed from their similar aged peers with no college attendance. College attendees identified to a higher degree with the subscales experimentation, other-focus, and self-focus than their non-college counterparts. Inversely, both groups were very similar in the subscales of negativity/instability and feeling in-between. The current study will evaluate if students of varying classifications as previously described will vary significantly amongst the emerging adulthood subscales.

Parental Involvement. The Parental Involvement Discrepancy Scale (PIDS) was developed for this study. The researcher reviewed the literature on parent/child interaction for college-age individuals and identified a missing link between parental involvement which is occurring (actual) versus what is desired (ideal). Thus, a pilot study was conducted whereby the researcher interviewed college students about their parental relationship. Among individuals academically at-risk, there was no identifiable common theme. Academically at-risk student varied in their parental involvement to a similar degree with those who were not academically at risk; some students described very involved parents and some highly uninvolved. Further discussion seemed to suggest that, although some students had highly involved parents and some uninvolved parents, each

of these parent-interactions can be described in an entirely different manner. That is, of two students who describe having parents highly uninvolved would have an entirely different experience if one should have desired very uninvolved parents and the other desired very involved parents.

After listing a number of questions adapted from two surveys explained below, the researcher interviewed 2 coworkers and 3 students to assess whether opportunities to identify a discrepancy were possible. The researcher asked, "How would you describe your parents involvement in you deciding college?" and several responded differently with their involvement as is common, however, several described parents who were uninvolved which was contrary to what was desired (somewhat to very involved). Contrarily, two responded that their parents were also uninvolved which was their preference based on their knowledge of what college they wanted to attend. Numerous discussed how parents went on every visit with them and they were very involved describing it as helpful, while one mentioned their parents made them go on many visits which was not their preference. Several questions produced a similar result and the ideal and actual approach was solidified. A total of 15 questions were ultimately selected as most salient and were eventually selected to evaluate the actual versus ideal discrepancy. Each question assesses actual parental involvement over 15 constructs followed by the same 15 questions describing the student's ideal parental involvement.

Two parallel surveys (see Appendices C and D) were designed to evaluate participants' actual (see Appendix C) and ideal (see Appendix D) perceived parental involvement. Each survey consists of 15 questions on a five-point Likert scale (i.e., "Uninvolved" to "Very Involved"). The first six items for each of the parental

involvement scales (see Appendices C and D) were adapted from the Freshman National Norms survey, which evaluated parental involvement norms at Universities and Colleges across the United States (Pryor, Hurtado, Sharkness, & Korn, 2007). Items seven through fifteen (see Appendices C and D) were adapted from the Adolescent Perceptions of Parental Pro-Educational Attitudes and Behaviors Scale's (APPEABS) behavioral factor items to account for parental involvement during college (Herlickson et al., 2009).

The "actual" parental involvement questions asked students to rate their parent or guardian's actual involvement during their college education (i.e., "How involved were your parent/s [or legal guardian/s] in your:") [see Appendix C]. Higher scores indicate that the participant's parents were actually very involved in a specified event or activity. The "ideal" parental involvement questions asked students to rate their ideal level of involvement (i.e., "IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s [or legal guardian/s] to be in your:") [see Appendix D]. Higher scores indicate that the participant ideally would have liked a very involved parent/guardian for a specified event or activity. Each of the 15 questions asked the participant to report their parents' involvement for a specified event or activity during their college experience (e.g., "Decision to Go to College"). The participant's actual-ideal difference in perception of their parent or guardians' involvement will be calculated from these two scores.

Finally, participants who indicated they had taken LRC 102: Study Skills Development were asked to evaluate whether or not they thought their parents' involvement changed during the semester they were they were on academic warning. Item responses are indicated using a three-point Likert scale with *1 = Less Involved*, *2 = The Same Amount*, and *3 = More Involved*. The following question was used to screen

for a confound regarding change in parental involvement unaccounted for by the other variables assessed due to poor academic performance (See Appendix A).

Results

The means (M), standard deviations (SD), and correlations among all variables were computed and can be found in Table I.

Emerging Adulthood

The 31-item inventory for the dimensions of emerging adulthood (IDEA) was utilized to evaluate the sample's identification with the proposed life stage-emerging adulthood. Means of the six subscales were calculated and can be found in Table 2. Reifman, Arnett, and Colwell's (2007) means are also presented in that Table for comparison. The current study's means identified with emerging adulthood constructs to a greater degree than the aforementioned study on four of the six subscales: identity versus exploration, experimentation versus possibilities, self-focused, and feeling in-between.

Parental Involvement - Measurement Model

Prior to conducting tests on the data, the researcher performed principal component analyses on the Parental Involvement Discrepancy Scale (PIDS) to reduce the dimensions of the questionnaire. All "ideal" questions were evaluated first by extracting Eigenvalue scores and observing the scree plot. Based on the scree plot, the natural break for factor loading appeared to be most effective at two. Once the two-factor model was adopted, the test was re-initiated with a fixed number maximum likelihood of two. Finally, the rotation method for each test was completed with the Oblimin with Kaiser normalization. The Oblimin rotation was chosen due to the researchers expectations that

the factors would be oblique. Results indicated by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (.895) and Bartlett's test ($p < .001$) that there was sufficient evidence for the two-factor loading ($\chi^2 2162.688$; $df 105$). The first factor accounted for 44% of all of the variance, and the second accounted for 11%. Furthermore, Eigenvalues were reported for each factor as 6.7 and 1.7, respectively. The Eigenvalue of a third factor was > 1 which may suggest reason to adopt a third factor, however, when an exploratory analysis for the additional factor was conducted, loading strength for several questions dropped significantly. Concurrently, correlations within each factor were conducted and each reported strong relationships with the majority between .40 and .70; see Table 3 and Table 4. Cronbach's Alpha for each factor was calculated and each appeared strong: Factor 1 for Actual = .853; Factor 2 for Actual = .887; Factor 1 for Ideal = .830; Factor 2 for Ideal = .839).

After evaluating the structure matrix, correlation matrix, and suppressing small coefficients below .4, two primary sets of questions appeared to be most effective. Table 5 shows the extraction strengths for questions which loaded strongest for each factor. Although question number 6 ("how involved...Choosing Extracurricular College Activities...") did not surpass the .4 threshold for either factor, it identified strongest with factor 1 (.278). Furthermore, when evaluating each factor for reliability statistics, Cronbach's Alpha was strong both including and excluding question 6. Factor 1 was later labeled as "Future Planning" while factor 2 was labeled "Present Interaction" based on the content of each question (See Appendices C and D).

The two constructs Actual and Ideal are made up of two factors as mentioned above. The third construct was calculated by subtracting Actual Future Planning by Ideal

Future Planning and Actual Present Interaction by Ideal Present Interaction. The two groups, Future Planning Discrepancy and Present Interaction Discrepancy, were then separated into three groups. Individuals who produced a negative result, that is, the amount of Actual Involvement was less than participants desired Ideal Involvement (less than zero) were coded into group 1 or “Too Little.” Group 2 included individuals whose parental involvement was “Optimal” or exactly zero. Finally, Group 3 included all individuals whose Actual Parental involvement was more than their desired ideal involvement or, therefore, “Too Much.” Table 6 lists the number of participants in each of the stated groups.

Main Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: The relationship between parental involvement and emerging adulthood. Correlations were performed for scores on the subscales of the Inventory for the Development of Emerging Adult (IDEA) and the Parental Involvement Discrepancy Scale (PIDS). The first relationships that were evaluated were emerging adulthood factors amongst individuals who reported too little, optimal, and too much parental involvement. Experimentation and Possibilities was positively correlated with perceived actual involvement, however, accounted for only 5% of the variance ($r = .23$) for Future Planning ($p < .001$) and less than 3% of the variance ($r = .16$) for Present Interaction ($p = .008$). The Feeling In-Between subscale was correlated positively with Parental Involvement (Actual) Future Planning though only accounted for 2.5% of the variance ($r = .16$, $p = .008$). Thus, although there appeared to be partial support for a relationship between actual parental involvement and emerging adulthood factors (Hypothesis 1), due to the low levels of variance accounted for, predictive conclusions cannot be made.

Five of the six emerging adulthood constructs were found to be correlated positively with the Future Planning (Ideal) factor for parental involvement achieving statistical significance, however, not one construct accounted for more than 10% of the total variance and therefore a predictive relationship could not be assumed. The following constructs were found to have a positive relationship. Identity versus Exploration accounted for 3% of the total variance ($r = .19, p = .001$), Experimentation versus Possibilities achieved 9% of the total variance ($r = .30, p < .001$), Negativity and Instability also accounted for 9% of the variance ($r = .30, p < .001$), Self-Focused only accounted for 3% of the variance ($r = .17, p = .005$), and Feeling In-Between accounted for 5% of the total variance ($r = .24, p < .001$). The second parental involvement factor, Present Ideal Interaction, was not correlated with any of the emerging adulthood factors. Furthermore, none of the four iterations of parental involvement (future/present - actual/ideal) were correlated with the emerging adulthood construct other focused. Given the results, although statistically significant results were found, the relationship between parental involvement and emerging adulthood factors did not account for high enough variance to achieve predictive attributes. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2a: Student success and parental involvement. Two independent samples t-tests were conducted comparing student success as measured by Fall GPA and Cumulative GPA. Group 1 - Future included individuals whose parental involvement responses equated to “too little” and “too much” (non-congruent), and Group 2 - Future included those whose actual and ideal parental involvement were essentially the same or “optimal” (congruent). There was no significant difference between fall GPA for Group 1 ($N = 140$) - Future ($M = 3.37; SD = .52$) and Group 2 ($N = 28$) - Future ($M = 3.45; SD =$

.48) ($t = .81, p = .42$). Likewise, there was not a significant difference between cumulative GPA for Group 1 ($N = 148$) – Future ($M = 3.35; SD = .47$) and Group 2 ($N = 31$) – Future ($M = 3.24; SD = .60$) ($t = 1.15, p = .27$).

Similar groups were formed for “present planning,” with Group 1 – non-congruence and Group 2 congruence. There was no significant difference between GPA for Group 1 ($N = 143$) – Present for fall GPA ($M = 3.39; SD = .50$) and Group 2 ($N = 127$) – Present fall GPA ($M = 3.35; SD = .50$) ($t = -.35, p = .73$). Likewise, there was no significant difference for cumulative GPA between Group 1 ($N = 151$) – Present ($M = 3.34; SD = .50$) and Group 2 ($N = 30$) – Present ($M = 3.30; SD = .50$) ($t = .44, p = .66$).

Finally, a Chi-Square Test of Independence was performed to examine the relationship between an individual’s parental involvement congruence group for each factor and their history of academic success. The relationship between future planning congruence and academic success variables was not significant, $\chi^2(2, 271) = 1.16, p = .45$. Furthermore, the relationship between present interaction and academic success was not significant, $\chi^2(2, 273) = .51, p = .53$. These tests suggest that parental involvement congruence does not affect a student’s academic success. In sum, the data does not suggest student academic success interacts with parental involvement as evaluated by this research study and does not support the predictions.

Hypothesis 2b: Student success and emerging adulthood. Correlations were performed for the subscales for the Inventory for the Development of Emerging Adult (IDEA) with student academic performance as measured by fall and cumulative GPA. None of the subscales of the IDEA correlated with fall GPA or cumulative GPA. Next, T-tests compared both academic groups (history of “at-risk” and “always good” academic

standing) with the emerging adulthood factors. Six independent samples t-tests were conducted comparing emerging adulthood factors as measured by its six constructs. Each subscale was compared with each of the two groups for history of student success: history of at-risk ($N = 59$) and always in good standing ($N = 216$). No statistically significant differences were found between the two groups for any of the emerging adulthood factors: identity versus exploration, $t = .72, p = .47$; experimentation versus possibilities, $t(61) = -.35, p = .73$; negativity and instability, $t = -.50, p = .62$; other-focused, $t = .154, p = .13$; self-focused, $t = -.02, p = .98$; feeling in-between, $t = .21, p = .83$. Thus, this hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 3: Does parental involvement moderate emerging adulthood and academic success? The researcher conducted linear regression with student cumulative GPA as the outcome and the subscales of the IDEA (emerging adulthood) and the parental involvement factors as the predictors. In the output, the ANOVA indicated there was not a significant effect of parental involvement factors or emerging adulthood subscales on student cumulative GPA at the $p < .05$ level for the three conditions [$F(2,176) = .488, p = .615$]. No further evaluation of the linear regression was evaluated due to the initial ANOVA resulting in a non-significant effect on the data. An exploratory analysis for fall GPA as the dependent variable was conducted similarly to the aforementioned linear regression analysis and based on the results of the ANOVA, there was not a significant effect on the dependent variable, as well [$F(2,165) = 2.07, p = .129$]. Therefore, no additional tests were performed, no additional data were observed from the linear regression test, and the hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 4: Demographic interactions with academic success, emerging adulthood, and parental involvement. A Chi-Square Test of Independence was performed to examine the relationship between an individual's parental involvement congruence group (future planning) and their ethnic background. The relationship between these variables was not significant, $\chi^2(8, 269) = 6.85, p = .55$. This test suggests that ethnic background is not related to an individual's perception of parental involvement for future planning factors. An additional Chi-Square Test of Independence was performed to examine the relationship between an individual's parental involvement congruence group (present interaction) and their ethnic background. The relationship between these variables was not significant, $\chi^2(8, 271) = 9.99, p = .27$. This test suggests that ethnic background is not related to an individual's perception of parental involvement for present interaction factor and is inconsistent with our predictions.

A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of ethnic background on emerging adulthood factors. There was a significant effect of ethnic background on the other focused construct for emerging adulthood at the $p < .01$ between the 5 ethnicities observed on the survey [$F(4,267) = 3.48, p = .009$]. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the White/Non-Hispanic group ($M = 2.62, SD = .59$) was significantly different than the African American/Non-Hispanic group ($M = 2.28, SD = .69$). There were no other statistically significant results for any ethnic group with any emerging adulthood construct. These data suggest hypothesis 4 in relation to ethnicity was not supported.

A Chi-Square Test of Independence was performed to examine the relationship between an individual's parental involvement congruence group (future planning) and

two groups for average hours worked in a week. Group 1 worked less than 30 hours per week, and group 2 worked 31 hours or more in a week. The relationship between these variables was not significant, $\chi^2(1, 269) = 2.3, p = .13$. Following a similar examination of the parental involvement present interaction, there was no statistically significant difference between those who worked less than 30 hours per week ($N = 264$) and greater than 31 ($N = 11$); $\chi^2(1, 271) = .26, p = .61$. This test suggests that hours worked does not interact with parental involvement factors and that hypothesis 4 is not supported.

Finally, a Chi-Square Test of Independence was performed to examine the relationship between an individual's average hours worked in a week and history of academic success. The relation between these variables was not significant $\chi^2(1, 272) = 1.55, p = .21$. This test suggests that hours work does not interact with a student's history of academic success and that the hypothesis is not supported.

Exploratory Statistics. Six independent samples t-tests were conducted comparing emerging adulthood subscales on gender. Our sample was comprised of 142 females and 133 males. There was a significant difference between the means of females ($M = 3.52, SD = .37$) and males ($M = 3.38, SD = .49$) for Identity versus Exploration; $t(272) = 2.68, p = .008$. There was also a significant difference in the means of females ($M = 2.95, SD = .51$) and males ($M = 2.80, SD = .54$) for Negativity and Instability; $t(272) = 2.39, p = .02$. There was a significant difference in the means of females ($M = 3.50, SD = .35$) and males ($M = 3.38, SD = .44$) for Self-Focused; $t(272) = 2.41, p = .02$. Finally, there was a significant difference in the means of females ($M = 3.46, SD = .47$) and males ($M = 3.29, SD = .56$) for Feeling In-Between; $t(272) = 2.76, p = .006$. For all four of these subscales, females scored higher than males.

Finally, a Chi-Square Test of Independence was performed to examine the relationship between an individual's gender and their academic success history. The sample included 21 women and 38 men who reported a history of academic risk, and 121 women and 94 men who reported no history of academic risk. These frequencies were statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, 274) = 7.94, p = .005$. This test suggests that gender does have an effect on an individual's history of academic success.

Discussion

This study examined the relationship between emerging adulthood, parental involvement, and student academic success. Specifically, we sought to evaluate whether the degree to which college students identified with being in the 'emerging adulthood' developmental stage was associated with (1) parental involvement and (2) student success. As previously mentioned, the relationship of parental involvement with student academic success combined with observed increases in parent-interaction with college-aged students were central to the development and implementation of this study. Furthermore, one of the strengths of the current study was the development and validation of the parental involvement discrepancy scale.

Emerging Adulthood

Emerging adulthood was proposed by Arnett (2000) in an attempt to classify young adults (ages 18 to 29 years) who exhibited behaviors and norms that not only differed from their younger and older counterparts but also seemed to resemble the upper class (Arnett, 2000; Arnett, 2003; Arnett, 2004b). These individuals do not "start their life" at a typical age nor could you describe them as being "launched" successfully, as some might refer to offspring who have left home and established their own independent

lives. The individuals themselves make statements like “I haven’t yet reached full adulthood” and often do not feel comfortable or are not prepared to be financially independent and take complete responsibility for themselves (Arnett, 2004b). This study aimed to examine potential disparity among a population of emerging adults, focusing on their relationships with their parents and academic success. What we found was a selection of individuals in emerging adulthood who are still arguably on the pathway to maturity but still tethered to their parents not quite ready to be launched out of the nest. There are two primary models of causality that may help explain the pattern of beliefs, norms, and behaviors of the individual in the emerging adult stage. Either parents fail to provide their offspring with the necessary opportunities to develop autonomy and independence, or else their offspring demand more assistance and fail to develop the skills to function on their own.

In this study, emerging adulthood was assessed with the Inventory for the Dimensions of Emerging Adulthood (the IDEA; Reifmann, Arnett, & Carroll, 2007). It was hypothesized that there would be relationships between the parent-child interaction and academic success. This study’s sample scored higher on emerging adulthood subscales than their peers reported in the initial study establishing the IDEA by Reifmann, Arnett, and Carroll (2007) in four of the six constructs (identity versus exploration, experimentation versus possibilities, self-focused, and feeling in-between). Reifmann et al. (2007) compared emerging adults with adolescents (aged 13 to 17) and several categories of adults beyond the years of 24. These findings suggest that the current sample identified to a greater degree with subscales associated with being “neither tethered to their parents nor responsibilities of adult life,” avoidance of, ill-

equipped, or unprepared to “start a career, own a house, or [be] responsible for children”; each of which are characteristics commonly reported by the identity versus exploration construct (Arnett, 2004b). Furthermore, this sample identified to a greater degree with the IDEA subscales of experimentation versus possibilities, self-focused, and feeling in between than were previously reported by Reifmann et al. (2007), suggesting greater alignment with characteristics such as exploring changes in love, work, and living without the repercussions of adulthood, avoidance of long standing commitments, and continued parental tethering (Arnett, 2004b).

Scores on the IDEA for the current sample suggest full identification with the stage of ‘emerging adulthood;’ specifically, their scores on these dimensions when compared to adolescents younger than 18-23 and adults 24 and older are observably different (Reifman, Arnett, & Colwell, 2007). These findings suggest that these individuals are more likely to engage in behaviors consistent with emerging adulthood, such as frequently changing majors, living in multiple residences (i.e., unstable living arrangement), potentially moving back home, and being less likely to focus on others such as children and family (Arnett, 2004b). In sum, it appears that the current study’s sample corresponds with the tenets and data supporting emerging adulthood to a high degree.

Parental Involvement

This study explored relationships of parental involvement with various factors including emerging adulthood and student academic success. This study demonstrates that, with regard to future planning factors, on average, parents are perceived as actually “somewhat” involved which coincides with the participants reported desire for parents to

be “somewhat” involved. Consequently, that desire for parental involvement outweighed their reported level of actual involvement leading 46% (N=128) of respondents to indicate “too little” involvement by their parents compared to 16% (N=45) with “optimal” involvement and 36% (N=101) reported having “too much” involvement.

This study examined emerging adulthood factors in groups of participants who perceived their parents as having too little, optimal, and too much actual parental involvement. Experimentation and Possibilities was associated with parental involvement actual future planning, parental involvement actual parental involvement present interaction, and the feeling in-between subscale of parental involvement (actual) future planning. Based on these findings, it appears having parental support allows students to explore changes and opportunities in their lives which would be less possible should they be supporting themselves by taking more individual responsibility.

Interestingly, five of the six emerging adulthood factors were linked with the future planning construct for ideal parental involvement: identity versus exploration, experimentation versus possibilities, negativity and instability, self-focused, and feeling in between. Specifically, the greater the desire for parental involvement in planning for what school to attend or what classes to take (to name a few examples), the greater the individual identifies with most emerging adulthood factors. Therefore, these particular individuals are less likely to assume adult roles, are more likely to be tethered to their parents financially and emotionally, see this time of their life as a period for exploration, and differ from adolescents and adults in ways that prolong a period of in-betweenness. Conversely, it must be noted that, although statistically significant, the relationships between the aforementioned variables cannot be described as predictive.

Interestingly, even though the students indicated desiring less ideal involvement for parental involvement for present interaction than future planning, they still, on average, reported desiring more parental involvement in present interaction than they indicated their parents were actually involved. This comparison supports the literature that students desire more parental involvement during this emerging adulthood stage (Arnett, 2003).

Finally, we examined the putative link between parental involvement and ethnicity, and found no relationship. This outcome is contrary to the results suggested by Pryor, Hurtado, Sharkness, and Korn (2007) who indicated ethnic minority students were much more likely to report “too little” regarding parental involvement. There are many factors that may have contributed to the current study not finding a similar relationship amongst ethnic minorities including the disproportionate number of whites (74%) versus non-whites, higher cost of attendance compared to the national average (\$40,000 versus \$26,000) which may disproportionately affect the availability for ethnic minorities to attend, or higher academic standards which may also disproportionately affect the availability for ethnic minorities to enroll.

Student Success

The factors contributing to or limiting student success have been highly debated and solutions to retention and graduation rates or methods to improve those numbers are highly sought after. Although universities continue to spend more money on recruiting than retention (Barclay et al., 2018), there is an obvious need for both the institutions and the students (and therefore their families) to improve the aforementioned statistics (Millea et al., 2018). With the benefits of college retention and graduation advantageous

to both universities and students, it is surprising that more has not been done to improve these rates. Universities have implemented changes which may contribute to some improvement, though the national average graduation rate has remained under 60% (NCES 2016). Perhaps it is due to unsuccessful efforts which did not improve graduation rates (Barclay et al., 2018), increased competition for fewer students as total enrollment has dropped from its high in 2010 from 21 million to 19.8 million in 2016 (Digest of Educational Statistics, 2017), or the fact that the majority of university income can be attributed to the 60% of students who attend one institution and graduate within 6 years from that institution (NCES, 2018a).

Student success at all levels has been highly studied and evaluated, leading to attempts to improve and reform the system. Much of the current research on college success often references what was learned in studies evaluating elementary education or factors contributing to high school graduation. The literature in recent years has begun to search for commonalities for success amongst college students. Several factors contributing to success include study skills and habit classes (Barclay et al., 2018), smaller class sizes and greater availability for scholarships, grants, and loans (Millea et al., 2018), social support, test scores, self-confidence, high school GPA, socioeconomic status (Brown et al., 2014), however, this research does not seem to have changed the outcomes (Barclay et al., 2018). Furthermore, according to a study on student success, the leading causes for college attrition are having to work while attending school and not being able to afford tuition and fees (Johnson, Rockkind, Ott, & Dupont, 2009) which coincides with socioeconomic status or familial financial support to a greater degree than personal grit or ability.

In our sample, the 'working population' seemed to perform well in school, as no differences in academic success were found for this group of students who are working and obtaining their degree in this study. However, it should be noted that only 3% ($N = 8$) reported working for 30 or more hours per week. A greater sample size of students who are working during school may provide us with a better understanding of how student academic success interacts with the working population. Furthermore, the fact that so few students are working over 30 hours per week suggests that who were either no longer enrolled in school or were not part of this sample.

There are other factors associated with student success not to be ignored, including study skills classes (Barclay et al., 2018), student faculty ratio (Millea et al., 2018), and agreeableness (Brown et al., 2014). However, little is known as to what may have a direct effect to contribute to success, in fact, there are many data supporting the impact of parental involvement on high school grades (Fehrmann, Keith & Reimers, 1987; Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo, Assouline & Russel, 1994; Gonzalez, 2002; Kriegbaum, Villarreal, Wu, & Heckhausen, 2016). Nevertheless, it appears universities have yet to adopt practices that incorporate parents who have produced marked success, especially during a time in which all signs point to no slowing of parents being involved in their children's education.

The present study evaluated a number of constructs and their ability to predict or their relationship with groups of students who either had no history of academic risk or a current or past history of academic risk including parental involvement and emerging adulthood subscales. When evaluating the two parental involvement subscales' discrepancy score groups "too little", "optimal", and "too much", no statistically

significant results were found. One might argue that the sample of students predominately indicated high levels of parental involvement and, though tenuous, a majority of students surveyed reported average to above average GPAs. Therefore, it is possible that this study evaluated a majority of students who, based on their reported interactions with their parents, are more likely to succeed. In addition, there were no relationships found between factors of emerging adulthood subscales and either fall or cumulative GPA. Moreover, parental involvement could not be a moderator for emerging adulthood because none of factors were related to student academic performance. Thus, none of the explored factors seem to contribute to student academic success/failure. The discrepancy between student achievement groups appeared too few, the discrepancy between students' reporting of emerging adulthood appeared too little, the majority of students reported high levels of involvement, and in each case, desired more involvement than received; which may have ultimately created too little variance among the sample.

Limitations

The present study evaluated a sample of individuals who are often referred to as "retained;" that is, no individual who was evaluated would be considered a college dropout or to have failed. That is, every sophomore participant cleared the hurdle of dropping out after their freshman year. Thus, individuals with the greatest academic problems to the point of withdrawal would not be included in this sample. Furthermore, the descriptive statistics demonstrated that the sample simply did not vary much on almost every primary measure evaluated, including academic achievement as demonstrated by self-reported GPAs well over 3.0. Likewise, they scored high on the

IDEA and, in most cases, higher than was presented by the developers of the constructs. They also reported relatively high levels of obtained and desired parental involvement.

Parental involvement and emerging adulthood may benefit from being evaluated by a single score, especially as more research suggests there is little evidence to support multiple factors of emerging adulthood. For instance, Davis, Dumas, Briley, and Sussman (2017) found that the IDEA was unable to predict risk taking behaviors, an important behavioral tenet of emerging adulthood. It can be suggested that a life stage is not meant to be predictive, that individuals have so much diversity amongst groups that whether or not someone is an adult or an adolescent is far too broad to establish causation. Age could just as easily be a predictor as it might be if someone were asked, “when is the last time you needed assistance with eating.”

Future Research

With regard to emerging adults and the proposed life stage, including individuals of the same age range who are not in college or who have dropped out of college would be invaluable. Specifically, evaluating what the perceived parental involvement of someone who did not attend or complete college. Further, their reported interaction might be should they not attend or withdrew due to financial reasons. How might that individual perceive the support of their family? Would the individual who dropped out of school report that they desired more parental involvement for the present interaction factor to help them be more successful or perhaps the future planning construct in order to have been more prepared. Another aspect to evaluate would be the interactions of varying methods of involvement with parental financial involvement.

Another subsample that should be considered is first generation students. This group of individuals may be more likely to score higher on the present interaction model of parental involvement, desiring greater daily involvement. Furthermore, though first-generation students may have a desire, as their peers do, for high levels of parental involvement, it is possible that their parents may not have the ability nor feel the necessity to do so; therefore, students would fall under the “too little” involvement group. Based on the present study, it could be hypothesized that any individual regardless of parental educational background who is attending college will distinguish themselves as an emerging adult.

We explored potential race/ethnicity differences. The hypothesis predicting variation in emerging adult scores with various ethnic groups was not supported. Consequently, our sample lacked the degree of diversity needed to adequately explore this issue. For example, although we did have some participants of varying races, all of our sample attended the same college in central Illinois. Future studies would benefit from exploring this issue across multiple colleges in different areas of the country.

Of interest, parental involvement was not associated with the emerging adulthood factor ‘other-focused.’ The typecast of the student in emerging adulthood is that they are highly self-focused and not likely to have empathy or concern for others. Perhaps a more detailed assessment of this construct might help to identify whether emerging adults do indeed have little regard for others. For instance, including questions regarding how often the student has interacted with others or their family’s lives could help clarify whether students in emerging adulthood do have little regard or empathy for others.

Although many of our predictions were not upheld in this study, the concepts discussed in this paper remain important for future study as they may help us better understand how society is affected by the continuing evolution of parent-child relationships and how we view “adulthood.” One of the most salient opportunities for research on this topic in the coming years will be the evaluation of higher education as a parental investment in their offspring. The rising costs of higher education require greater parental investment as many students cannot afford college on their own, regardless of whether they are in the ‘emerging adulthood’ stage or not. Basically, this issue may force students who are otherwise independent and autonomous by nature to be more dependent on their parents and further studies may evaluate the impact of these factors.

Finally, this study is not longitudinal and therefore graduation outcomes could not be predicted by the data. It is possible that this sample did not include individuals who did not return in the spring when data was collected, withdrew their classes mid semester, or students who did not attend class. In addition, it could be hypothesized that this study is a good evaluation of individuals who do achieve academic success based on high levels of parental involvement corresponding with high levels of emerging adulthood factors. Ultimately, more information is needed involving the students who drop out or do not complete college to truly evaluate how the current study’s factors interact with student academic success.

References

- Agliata, A., & Renk, K. (2008). College students' adjustment: The role of parent-college student expectation discrepancies and communication reciprocity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 37*(8), 967-982. doi:10.1007/s10964-007-9200-8
- American College Testing [ACT]. (2010a). National Collegiate Retention and Persistence to Degree Rates. Retrieved from http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/retain_2010.pdf
- American College Testing [ACT]. (2010b) National Retention Trends 1983 – 2010. Retrieved from http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/10retain_trends.pdf
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55*(5), 469-480. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469
- Arnett, J. J. (2003). Conceptions of the transition to adulthood among emerging adults in American ethnic groups. In: J. J. Arnett & N. L. Galambos (Eds.), *New directions in child and adolescent development: Exploring cultural conceptions of the transition to adulthood*, 100, 63-75.
- Arnett, J. J. (2004a). *Adolescence and Emerging Adulthood: A Cultural Approach*. New Jersey, Pearson Education, Inc.
- Arnett, J. J. (2004b). *Emerging Adulthood: The Winding Road From the Late Teens Through the Twenties*. New York, Oxford University Press
- Arnett, J. J. (2005). The developmental context of substance use in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Drug Issues, 35*, 235-253

Arnett, J. (2007). Emerging adulthood: What is it, and what is it good for?. *Child Development Perspectives*, 1(2), 68-73.

Arnett, J., Hendry, L., Kloep, M., Tanner, J. (2011). *Debating emerging adulthood: Stage or process*. New York: Oxford University Press

Atak, H., &Çok, F. (2008).The Turkish Version of Inventory of the Dimensions of Emerging Adulthood (The IDEA). *International Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 2(3), 148-154.

Barclay, T. H., Barclay, R. D., Mims, A., Sargent, Z., & Robertson, K. (2018). Academic retention: Predictors of college success. *Education*, (2), 59.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.

Berkner, L., He, S., Forrest, E. (2002).U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. Descriptive Summary of 1995–96 Beginning Postsecondary Students: Six Years Later. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/2003151.pdf>

Birditt, K. S., Fingerman, K. L., Lefkowitz, E. S., &Dush, C. (2008). Parents perceived as peers: Filial maturity in adulthood. *Journal of Adult Development*, 15(1), 1-12. doi:10.1007/s10804-007-9019-2

Blinn-Pike, L., Worthy, S., Jonkman, J. N., & Smith, G. (2008). Emerging adult versus adult status among college students: Examination of explanatory variables. *Adolescence*, 43(171), 577-591.

Brown, C. S., Brown, I. U. J., Beale, R. L., & Gould, J. K. (2014). Factors influencing academic

success and self-esteem among diverse college students. *International Journal of Education Research*, 9(1), 1–14.

Brown, K. (2019). Emerging adulthood. *Salem Press Encyclopedia*.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019). Usual weekly earnings of wage and salary earners.

First

quarter 2019. Retrieved from: <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/wkyeng.pdf>

Bynner, J. (2005). Rethinking the youth phase of the life-course: The case for emerging adulthood?. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 8(4), 367-

384. doi:10.1080/13676260500431628

Carney-Hall, K. C. (2008). Understanding current trends in family involvement. *New Directions For Student Services*, (122), 3-14. doi:10.1002/ss.271

Chang, J., & Le, T. N. (2005). The influence of parents, peer delinquency, and school attitudes on academic achievement in Chinese, Cambodian, Laotian or Mien, and Vietnamese Youth. *Crime & Delinquency*, 51(2), 238-264.

Cheah, C., & Nelson, L. (2004). The role of acculturation in the emerging adulthood of aboriginal college students. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28(6), 495-507. doi:10.1080/01650250444000135

Cohen, P., Kasen, S., Chen, H., Hartmark, C., & Gordon, K. (2003). Variations in patterns of developmental transmissions in the emerging adulthood period.

Developmental Psychology, 39(4), 657-669. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.39.4.657

- Cutright, M. (2008). From helicopter parent to valued partner: Shaping the parental relationship for student success. *New Directions For Higher Education*, (144), 39-48.
- Cutrona, C. E., Cole, V., Colangelo, N., Assouline, S. G., & Russell, D. W. (1994). Perceived parental social support and academic achievement: An attachment theory perspective. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 66(2), 369-378.
- Darlow, V., Norvilitis, J., & Schuetze, P. (2017). The relationship between helicopter parenting and adjustment to college. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, 26(8), 2291–2298.
- Davis, J. P., Dumas, T. M., Briley, D. A., & Sussman, S. (2018). A meta-analysis of the association between substance use and emerging adult development using the IDEA scale. *American Journal on Addictions*, 27(3), 166-176.
- Donoghue, C., & Stein, P. J. (2007). Diversity in adult experiences and criteria for adulthood among college students. *College Student Journal*, 41(4, Pt A), 831-842.
- Dougherty, K., & Natow, R., *The politics of performance funding for higher education: Origins, discontinuations, and transformations* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015): National Conference of State Legislatures, "Performance-Based Funding for Higher Education," Retrieved from: <http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/performance-funding.aspx>
- Dumas, T. M., Lawford, H., Tieu, T., & Pratt, M. W. (2009). Positive parenting in adolescence and its relation to low point narration and identity status in

emerging adulthood: A longitudinal analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(6), 1531-1544. doi:10.1037/a0017360

Eryilmaz, A., & Atak, H. (2011). Investigation of starting romantic intimacy in emerging adulthood in terms of self-esteem, gender and gender roles. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 11(2), 595-600. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Falbo, T., Lein, L., & Amador, N. A. (2001). Parental involvement during the transition to high school. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 16(5), 511.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York (2017). Quarterly report on household debt and credit. New York, NY: Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Retrieved from: <https://www.newyorkfed.org/microeconomics/databank.html>

Fehrman, P. G., Keith, T. Z., & Reimers, T. M. (1987). Home influence on school learning: Direct and indirect effects of parental involvement on high school grades. *Journal of Educational Research*, 80(6)

Gonzalez, A., Greenwood, G., & WenHsu, J. (2001). Undergraduate students' goal orientations and their relationship to perceived parenting styles. *College Student Journal*, 35(2), 182.

Gonzalez, A. R. (2002). Parental involvement: Its contribution to high school students' motivation. *Clearing House*, 75(3), 132.

Habley, W., Valiga, M., McClanahan, R., Burkum, K., (2010) What works in student retention? Retrieved from <http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/droptables/AllInstitutions.pdf>

Hamilton, L. (2011). Strategies for success: Parental funding, college achievement, and the transition to adulthood. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, 71.

- Herlickson, A. B., Wettersten, K. B., Herrick, C. G., Kim, G. Y., Hunter, P. J., Guilmino, A., Faul, K., Jagow-France, D., Mach, B., Napton, S., Beecher, T., Holzer, K., Rudolph, S. E. (2009). Initial development and psychometric properties of the Adolescent Perceptions of Parental Pro-Educational Attitudes and Behaviors Scale (APPEABS). *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 41*.
- Heyneman, S. P. (2005). Student Background and Student Achievement: What Is the Right Question?. *American Journal of Education, 112*(1), 1-9.
doi:10.1086/444512
- Hoover, E., & Supiano, B. (2008). Surveys of Students Challenge 'Helicopter Parent' Stereotypes. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(21), A22.
- Howe, N. (2010). A New PARENT GENERATION: Meet Mr. and Mrs. Gen X. *Education Digest, 75*(9), 4-12.
- Jensen, K. L., & Minke, K. M. (2017). Engaging families at the secondary level: An underused resource for student success. *School Community Journal, 27*(2), 167-191.
- Johnson, J., Rochkind, J., Ott, A., & DuPont, S., (2009). With Their Whole Lives Ahead of Them. Myths and Realities Why So Many Students Fail to Finish College. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED507432.pdf>
- Jordyn, M., & Byrd, M. (2003). The relationship between the living arrangements of university students and their identity development. *Adolescence, 38*(150), 267-278.

- Kenyon, D., & Koerner, S. (2009). Examining emerging-adults' and parents' expectations about autonomy during the transition to college. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 24*(3), 293-320. doi:10.1177/0743558409333021
- King, J. (2002). *Crucial choices: How students' financial decisions affect their academic success*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education
- Kins, E., Beyers, W., Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2009). Patterns of home leaving and subjective well-being in emerging adulthood: The role of motivational processes and parental autonomy support. *Developmental Psychology, 45*(5), 1416-1429. doi:10.1037/a0015580
- Kloep, M., & Hendry, L. B. (2010). Letting go or holding on? Parents' perceptions of their relationships with their children during emerging adulthood. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 28*(4), 817-834. doi:10.1348/026151009X480581
- Kouros, C., Pruitt, M., Ekas, N., Kiriaki, R., & Sunderland, M. (2017). Helicopter parenting, autonomy support, and college students' mental health and well-being: The moderating role of sex and ethnicity. *Journal of Child & Family Studies, 26*(3), 939-949.
- Kriegbaum, K., Villarreal, B., Wu, V. C., & Heckhausen, J. (2016). Parents still matter: Patterns of shared agency with parents predict college students' academic motivation and achievement. *Motivation Science, 2*(2), 97-115.

- Lee, J. M., Kim, K. T., & Hong, E. J. (2018). Exploring financial burdens of student loan holders in the United States. *Family & Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 46(4), 347–362.
- Liem, J. H., Cavell, E., & Lustig, K. (2010). The influence of authoritative parenting during adolescence on depressive symptoms in young adulthood: Examining the mediating roles of self-development and peer support. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 171(1), 73-92.
- Lindell, A. K., Campione-Barr, N., & Killoren, S. E. (2017). Implications of parent-child relationships for emerging adults' subjective feelings about adulthood. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 31(7), 810–820.
- Majer, J. M. (2009). Self-efficacy and academic success among ethnically diverse first-generation community college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2(4), 243-250. doi:10.1037/a0017852
- Manos, M. (2009). Helicopter parents: Empathetic or pathetic? *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, 89(3), 21.
- Merriman, L. S. (2007). It's your child's education, Not yours. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(13), B20.
- Millea, M., Wills, R., Elder, A., & Molina, D. (2018). What matters in college student success?
Determinants of college retention and graduation rates. *Education*, (4), 309.

Molgat, M. (2007). Do transitions and social structures matter? How 'emerging adults' define themselves as adults. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10(5), 495-516. doi:10.1080/13676260701580769

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2010). Fall Enrollment for Degree Granting Institutions. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_205.asp

National Center for Higher Educational Management Systems (NCHEMS) (2009). Retention Rates – First-Time College Freshman Returning Their Second Year. *Four-Year Public 2009*.

Nelson, L. J., Badger, S., & Bo, W. (2004). The influence of culture in emerging adulthood: Perspectives of Chinese college students. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28(1), 26.

Nelson, L. J., Padilla-Walker, L. M., Carroll, J. S., Madsen, S. D., Barry, C., & Badger, S. (2007). "If you want me to treat you like an adult, start acting like one!" Comparing the criteria that emerging adults and their parents have for adulthood. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21(4), 665-674. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.21.4.665

Nelson, L. J., Padilla-Walker, L. M., Christensen, K. J., Evans, C. A., & Carroll, J. S. (2011).

Parenting in emerging adulthood: An examination of parenting clusters and correlates.

Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 40(6), 730-743.

Newport, F., & Busteed, B. (2013). Americans still see college education as very important. Retrieved from: <http://news.gallup.com/poll/166490/americans-college-education-important.aspx>

Osyerman, D., Brickman, D., & Rhodes, M. (2007). School success, possible selves, and parent school involvement. *Family Relations*, 56(5), 479-489. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Padilla-Walker, L., Nelson, L., & Carroll, J. (2012). Affording emerging adulthood: Parental

financial assistance of their college-aged children. *Journal of Adult Development*, 19(1), 50-58.

Pryor, J. H., Hurtado, S., Sharkness, J., Korn, W. S. (2007). The American freshman: National norms for fall 2007. Retrieved from heri.ucla.edu/pr-display.php?prQry=11

Rainey, A. (2006). Parents of college students today, often referred to as "helicopter parents" for their hovering habits, are in frequent contact with their children, according to a survey report released in March by the College Parents of America. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(32), A39.

Ratelle, C. F., Larose, S., Guay, F., & Senécal, C. (2005). Perceptions of parental involvement and support as predictors of college students' persistence in a science curriculum. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19(2), 286-293. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.19.2.286

Reifman, A., Arnett, J.J., & Colwell, M.J. (2007, Summer). Emerging adulthood: Theory, assessment, and application. *Journal of Youth Development*, 2 (1).

Schiffrin, H., & Liss, M. (2017). The Effects of helicopter parenting on academic motivation.

Journal of Child & Family Studies, 26(5), 1472–1480.

Schwartz, S. J., Côté, J. E., & Arnett, J. (2005). Identity and agency in emerging adulthood: Two developmental routes in the individualization process. *Youth & Society*, 37(2), 201-229. doi:10.1177/0044118X05275965

Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B.L., Ravert, R. D., Kim, S. Y, Weisskirch, R., S., Williams, M. K.,

Bersamin, M., Finley, G. E., (2009). Perceived parental relationships and health-risk

behaviors in college-attending emerging adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(3), 727.

Serido, J., Shim, S., Mishra, A., & Tang, C. (2010). Financial parenting, financial coping behaviors, and well-being of emerging adults. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 59(4), 453-464. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00615.x

Settersten, R., Ray, B. (2010). Not quite adults: Why 20-somethings are choosing a slower path to adulthood, and why it's good for everyone. New York: Random House, Inc.

Shifting the Paradigm of Parent and Family Involvement: A Practitioner Perspective of Families

as Partners in Student Success. (2015). *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 41(6), 45-65.

Syed, M., & Azmitia, M. (2008). A narrative approach to ethnic identity in emerging adulthood: Bringing life to the identity status model. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(4), 1012-1027. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.44.4.1012

Syed, M., & Azmitia, M. (2010). Narrative and ethnic identity exploration: A longitudinal account of emerging adults' ethnicity-related experiences. *Developmental Psychology*, 46(1), 208-219. doi:10.1037/a0017825

Torres, V., Gross, J. K., & Dadashova, A. (2011). Traditional-age students becoming at-risk: Does working threaten college students' academic success? *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 12(1), 51-68.

United States Census Bureau. (1997) Statistical Abstract of the United States-*Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/3/97pubs/97statab/educ.pdf>

United States Census Bureau. (2009a). Median Age at First Marriage for Men. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GRTTable?_bm=y&-geo id=01000US&- box head nbr=R1204&-ds name=ACS 2009 1YR G00 &-redoLog=false&-mt name=ACS 2005 EST G00 R1204 US30&-format=US-30

United States Census Bureau. (2009b). Median Age at First Marriage for Women. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GRTTable?_bm=y&-geo id=D&- box head nbr=R1205&-ds name=ACS 2009 1YR G00 &-lang=en&-redoLog=false&-format=D&-mt name=ACS 2009 1YR G00 R1204 US30

United States Census Bureau. (2010). Marital Status and Living Arrangements:

Document 57. Marital Status of the Population by Sex and Age: 2010. Retrieved

from

<https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2011/compendia/statab/13led/population.html>

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). Table 302.60: Enrollment rates of 18 to 24 Year olds in degree granting institutions, by level of institution and sex and race/ethnicity of student: 1967 through 2012.

Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_302.60.asp

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). Table

330.10: Average undergraduate tuition and fees and room and board rates charged for full-time students in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by level and control of institution: 1963-64 through 2015-16. Retrieved from:

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_330.10.asp

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2017a). Table

104.10: Rates of high school completion and bachelor's degree attainment among persons age 25 and over, by race/ethnicity and sex: Selected years, 1910 through 2017. Retrieved from

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17_104.10.asp?referrer=report

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2017b) Digest

of Education Statistics, 2017. Retrieved from

<https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/>

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2017c). Table

105.30: Enrollment in elementary, secondary, and degree-granting postsecondary

institutions, by level and control of institution: Selected years, 1869-70 through fall 2027. Retrieved from

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17_105.30.asp?referrer=report

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2018a). Table

326.10: Graduation rate from first institution attended for first-time, full-time bachelor's degree- seeking students at 4-year postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity, time to completion, sex, control of institution, and acceptance rate: Selected cohort entry years, 1996 through 2011. Retrieved from

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_326.10.asp

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2018b). Table

326.30: Retention of first-time degree-seeking undergraduates at degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by attendance status, level and control of institution, and percentage of applications accepted: Selected years, 2006 to 2017. Retrieved

from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_326.30.asp

White, H. R., Fleming, C. B., Kim, M., Catalano, R. F., &McMorris, B. J. (2008).

Identifying two potential mechanisms for changes in alcohol use among college-attending and non-college-attending emerging adults. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(6), 1625-1639. doi:10.1037/a0013855

Wimshurst, K., & Allard, T. (2008). Personal and institutional characteristics of student failure. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(6), 687-698.

doi:10.1080/02602930701772911

Wintre, M., &Yaffe, M. (2000). First-year students' adjustment to university life as a

function of relationships with parents. *Journal Of Adolescent Research*, 15(1), 9.

Wong, E., Wiest, D., & Cusick, L. (2002). Perceptions of autonomy support, parent attachment, competence and self-worth as predictors of motivational orientation and academic achievement: an examination of sixth- and ninth-grade regular education students. *Adolescence*, 37(146), 255-266.

Table I

Table I Means (M), Standard Deviations (SD), and Intercorrelations Among All Variables																	
Variable	Descriptive Statistics		Intercorrelations														
	M	SD	EP	NI	OF	SF	FIB	PIAFT	PIAFI	PIHFP	PIHPI	PIHFP	PIHPI	G			
Identify versus Exploration	3.45	.44	.59***	.27***	.09	.61***	.44***	.07	.07	.19***	-.01	-.13*	.11	-.04	.10	-.16**	
Experientialism and Pragmatism (EP)	3.46	.46		.29***	.06	.59***	.46***	.23***	.16**	.30***	.10	-.06	.07	.02	.05	0.08	
Negativity/ambiguity (NI)	2.88	.53			.22***	.10	.31***	.04	.002	.165**	-.001	-.14*	.005	.03	.04	-.14*	
Other Focused (OF)	2.54	.63				.15*	.07	.06	.05	-.03	-.02	.101	.09	-.09	-.17**	-.06	
Self Focused (SF)	3.14	.40					.41***	.08	.03	.17**	.009	-.10	.05*	.001	.04	-.15*	
Fostering Interactions (FIB)	3.38	.52						.16**	.11	.24***	.07	-.08	.05	-.01	.10	-.17*	
Parental Involvement Actual Future Planning (PIAFT)	3.46	.58							.72***	.69***	.41***	.43***	.34***	-.06	-.05	-.13*	
Parental Involvement Actual Present Interaction (PIAFI)	2.19	.94								.57***	.71***	.17***	.39***	-.18**	.05	-.08	
Parental Involvement Ideal Future Planning (PIHFP)	3.64	.95									.56***	-.32***	-.04	-.08	.08	-.13*	
Parental Involvement Ideal Present Interaction (PIHPI)	2.16	1.02											.52***	.05	-.15*	.004	
Parental Involvement Discrepancy Future Planning (PIDFP)	-.30	1.66												.10	.03	-.14*	
Parental Involvement Discrepancy Present Interaction (PIDPI)	-1.87	6.69														-.17**	
Student Academic History (SAH)	1.78	.42															
Ethnic Background (EB)	1.47	.96															
Gender (G)	1.48	.50															

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 2

Table 2 <i>Means for Different Age Groups on Inventory of the Dimensions of Emerging Adulthood (IDEA) Subscales. Current Study Compared With Reiffman, Arnett, and Carroll (2007) Study 1 and Study 3 data</i>				
Variable	Descriptive statistics			
	Reiffman, Arnett, Carroll (2007)			
	6-12th grade <i>M</i>	Current Study <i>M</i>	Emerging Adults <i>M</i>	30-39 (non-married) <i>M</i>
Identity versus Exploration	2.90	3.45	3.35	2.85
Experimentation and Possibilities	3.05	3.46	3.37	2.79
Negativity/Instability	2.76	2.88	2.93	2.68
Other Focused	1.96	2.54	2.47	3.43
Self Focused	2.73	3.44	3.23	2.89
Feeling In-between	2.77	3.38	3.26*	N/A

*Statistic obtained from Study #3 following implementation of new construct
Items within each subscale were averaged together for each respondent. Scores ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree)

Table 3

Table 3						
<i>Inter Item Correlations for Parental Involvement Actual and Ideal Scales for Future Planning</i>						
Question Coorelations						
	Question #	2	3	4	11	14
Parental Involvement (Actual) Future Planning	1	.70	.67	.54	.39	.40
	2		.63	.63	.39	.45
	3			.62	.38	.41
	4				.38	.37
	11					.52
Cronbach's Alpha=.853	14					
Question Coorelations						
	Question #	2	3	4	11	14
Parental Involvement (Ideal) Future Planning	1	.71	.60	.44	.36	.42
	2		.55	.53	.39	.44
	3			.46	.26	.45
	4				.34	.30
	11					.53
Cronbach's Alpha=.830	14					

Table 5

Table 5			
<i>Parental Involvement Factors Grouped by Discrepancy Score (calculated by subtracting actual involvement from ideal involvement) Comparing Means (M) for Emerging Adulthood Subscales</i>			
Planning (Factor 1)	Load	Interaction (Factor 2)	Load
Question 1	0.849	Question 10	0.828
Question 2	0.842	Question 7	0.826
Question 3	0.774	Question 13	0.807
Question 4	0.658	Question 8	0.796
Question 14	0.645	Question 9	0.753
Question 11	0.574	Question 5	0.737
		Question 12	0.671
		Question 15	0.642
		Question 6	0.278

Table 6

Table 6 <i>Total number of participants per parental involvement group</i>			
Variable	Group Frequencies		
	<i>Too Little</i>	<i>Optimal</i>	<i>Too Much</i>
Parental Involvement Future Planning	125 (45%)	45 (16%)	101 (36%)
Parental Involvement Present Interaction	128 (46%)	39 (14%)	106 (38%)
Totals	253 (46%)	84 (15%)	207 (38%)

Appendix A

Demographic Questionnaire

1. Age: _____

2. Gender: _____ (1) Female _____ (2) Male

3. Ethnic Background:

____Caucasian (1)____Hispanic (4)

____African American (2)____Native American (5)

____Asian or Pacific Islander (3) ____Other (6) Specify: _____

4. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly

Agree

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)

(7)

5. My culture is an important part of my identity.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly

Agree

- (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)
(7)

6. Marital Status:

___ Single/Never Married(1) ___ Divorced (4)

___ Married (2) ___ Widowed (5)

___ Separated (3) ___ Other (6) Specify: _____

7. Are you a parent? ___ Yes ___ No

8. Please indicate how many hours per week you worked while a student in the past year (do not include months not in school).

___ I did not work (1)

___ 01 to 10 hours per week (2)

___ 11 to 20 hours per week (3)

___ 21 to 30 hours per week (4)

___ 31 to 40 hours per week (5)

___ Greater than 41 hours per week (6)

9. Please indicate your year in school

___ Freshman (1) ___ Senior (4) ___ Graduate student (5)

___ Sophomore (2) ___ Other (6) Specify: _____

___ Junior (3)

10. Have you ever been on academic warning or academic probation?

___ Yes ___ No

11. Student status during fall 2013. How many credits did you take during the fall of 2013?

Full-time 12 hours or more (1)

Part-time 11 hours or less (2)

12. Are you taking credits this summer? If so, how many? _____ credits

13. If you are taking a summer class, is at least one class meeting on campus?

Yes **No** **Not Applicable**

14. Are you residing locally for this summer? Yes No

15. Have you ever been enrolled in LRC 102: Study Skills Development?

Yes **No**

16. During the semester you were enrolled in LRC 102: Study Skills Development, do you feel that your parents were:

Less involved (1)

The same amount of involvement (2)

More involved (3)

17. GPA:

_____ **Fall 2013 GPA** _____ **Overall GPA**

18. Family Structure:

Parents Married (1) **Parents Divorced/Neither Remarried (4)**

Never Married (2) **Parent/s Remarried (5)**

Parents Separated (3) **Widowed (6)**

Other Please Specify: _____(7)

19. If applicable, how old were you when your parents separated or divorced?

___ Years Old (1)

20. Please indicate your primary parental figure/s (Check all that apply):

___ Father (1) ___ Step-Mother (4)

___ Mother (2) ___ Other Please Specify: _____(5)

___ Step-Father (3)

21. Has your GPA ever fallen below 2.0?

___ Yes ___ No

22. Do you consider yourself a first-generation student (i.e., no other family member of an older generation, such as your parents and grandparents, attended college)?

___ Yes ___ No

23. How much financial assistance have you received from your parent/guardian in the following areas?

a. Tuition and fees

___ None ___ Partial ___ Full

b. Housing

___ None ___ Partial ___ Full

c. Food/gas

___ None ___ Partial ___ Full

d. Spending money

___ None ___ Partial ___ Full

e. Other (please specify)

24. Number of months living at home with parent/guardian in past year:

___ **Months (1-12)**

25. For either of your parents/guardians, what is the highest achieved education level?

___ **Less than high school (1)** ___ **4-year degree (4)**

___ **High school (2)** ___ **Master's degree (5)**

___ **Some college/associates degree (3)** ___ **Ph.D. or professional degree (6)**

26. Family income (estimated):

___ **Under 20k (1)** ___ **60k – 80k (4)**

___ **20k – 40k (2)** ___ **80k – 100k (5)**

___ **40k – 60k (3)** ___ **100k or more (6)**

Appendix B

The Inventory for the Dimensions of Emerging Adulthood Questionnaire (IDEA)

(Views of Life Survey)

First, please think about this time in your life. By “time in your life,” we are referring to the present time, plus the last few years that have gone by, and the next few years to come, as you see them. In short, you should think about a roughly five-year period, with the present time right in the middle.

For each phrase shown below, please place a check mark in one of the columns to indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree that the phrase describes this time in your life. For example, if you “Somewhat Agree” that this is a “time of exploration,” then on the same line as the phrase, you would put a check mark in the column headed by “Somewhat Agree” (3).

Be sure to put only one check mark per line.

s this period of your life a...	Strongly Disagree (1)	Somewhat Disagree (2)	Somewhat Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
1. time of many possibilities?				

2. time of exploration?				
3. time of confusion?				
4. time of experimentation?				
5. time of personal freedom?				
6. time of feeling restricted?				
7. time of responsibility for yourself?				
8. time of feeling stressed out?				
9. time of instability?				
10. time of optimism?				
1. time of high pressure?				
2. time of finding out who you are?				
3. time of settling down?				
4. time of responsibility for others?				
5. time of independence?				
6. time of open choices?				
7. time of unpredictability?				
8. time of commitments to others?				

9. time of self-sufficiency?				
10. time of many worries?				
11. time of trying out new things?				
12. time of focusing on yourself?				
13. time of separating from parents?				
14. time of defining yourself?				
15. time of planning for the future?				
16. time of seeking a sense of meaning?				
17. time of deciding on your own beliefs and values?				
18. time of learning to think for yourself?				
19. time of feeling adult in some ways but not others?				
20. time of gradually becoming an adult?				
21. time of being not sure whether you have reached full adulthood?				

Subscale	Items to Average
Identity Exploration	12, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28
Experimentation/Possibilities	1, 2, 4, 16, 21
Negativity/Instability	3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 17, 20
Other-Focused	13, 14, 18
Self-Focused	5, 7, 10, 15, 19, 22
Feeling "In-Between"	29, 30, 31

Appendix C

Parental Involvement Part 1

For each phrase shown below, please indicate how involved your parents were. Please be aware of the time frame for questions 7 through 15 (i.e., “In the past year”).

1. How involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Decision to Go to College

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

2. How involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Application Process for College

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

3. How involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Decision to Go to This college (McKendree)

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

4. How involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Dealings With Officials at McKendree

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

5. How involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Choosing College Courses at McKendree

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

6. How involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Choosing Extracurricular College Activities at McKendree (e.g., Greek organizations, intramurals, clubs, honor societies)

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

7. In the past year, how involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Study Habits

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

8. In the past year, how involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Use of Campus Resources (e.g., such as writing center, counseling center, financial aid)

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

9. In the past year, how involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Discussion of College Courses During the Semester

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

10. In the past year, how involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Planning for Future Courses

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

11. In the past year, how involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Economic Planning

1 2 3 4 5

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

12. In the past year, how involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Choice of Academic Major

1 2 3 4 5

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

13. In the past year, how involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Completion of Academic Work (e.g., revision of papers, homework, etc.)

1 2 3 4 5

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

14. In the past year, how involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Career Planning

1 2 3 4 5

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

15. In the past year, how involved were your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) in your:

Daily Decisions (e.g., what to eat, what to do, which activities to participate in, etc.)

1 2 3 4 5

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

16. Other/ Comments:

Appendix D

Parental Involvement Part 2

For each phrase shown below, please indicate IDEALLY, how involved you would have liked your parents (or legal guardians) to be. Please be aware of the time frame for questions 7 through 15 (i.e., “In the past year”).

1. IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Decision to Go to College

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

2. IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Application Process for College

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

3. IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Decision to Go to This College (McKendree)

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

4. IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Dealings With Officials at McKendree

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

5. IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Choosing College Courses at McKendree

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

6. IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Choosing Extracurricular College Activities at McKendree (e.g., Greek organizations, intramurals, clubs, honor societies)

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

7. In the past year, IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Study Habits

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

8. In the past year, IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Use of Campus Resources (e.g., such as writing center, counseling center, financial aid)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

9. In the past year, IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Discussion of College Courses During the Semester

1 2 3 4 5

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

10. In the past year, how involved were your parents (or legal guardians) in your:

Planning for Future Courses

1 2 3 4 5

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

11. In the past year, IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Economic Planning

1 2 3 4 5

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

12. In the past year, IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Choice of Academic Major

1 2 3 4 5

Uninvolved Not Very Involved Somewhat Involved Very involved

13. In the past year, IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Completion of Academic Work (e.g., revision of papers, homework, etc.)

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

14. In the past year, IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Career Planning

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

15. In the past year, IDEALLY, how involved would you have liked your parent/s (or legal guardian/s) to be in your:

Daily Decisions (e.g., what to eat, what to do, which activities to participate in, etc.)

1	2	3	4	5
Uninvolved	Not Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Very involved	

16. Other/ Comments:

Appendix E

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Michael Mendez, a Master's degree candidate in the Clinical Psychology M.A. program at Eastern Illinois University, under the supervision of Dr. Tami Eggleston of the McKendree Psychology Department. The purpose of this study is to analyze variables that may be related to college academic success. These findings can potentially help college personnel better understand and support the needs of college students.

With your agreement to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire which will take approximately 10 - 15 minutes to complete. Please note that you must be at least 18 years of age to participate. Participation is entirely voluntary and therefore, you may withdraw from the study at any time. Your provided responses will remain anonymous throughout the study and the collected information will be used for research purposes only. There are no risks associated with this study. If you would like to be included in the drawing for one of the \$20 Wal-Mart Gift Certificates, please indicate on the below detachable portion by providing your phone number to the lead researcher following the completion of your survey. If you are one of the winners, you will be contacted via phone.

If you have any questions concerning the study, you are invited to contact the lead researcher via email at michaelvmendez@gmail.com or the researcher advisor, Tami Eggleston at tegglest@mckendree.edu. Also, should you have any questions or concerns regarding the treatment of human participants in this study you may contact: Institutional Review Board, McKendree University, 701 College Rd., Lebanon, IL 62254. You will be given the opportunity to discuss any questions about your rights as a research subject with a member of the IRB. The IRB is an independent committee composed of members of the University community, as well as lay members of the community not connected with McKendree. The IRB has reviewed and approved this study.

Please return this portion of the sheet below the dotted line. By signing below, you are indicating that you are at least 18 years of age, and have read, understand, and accept the terms indicated above.

SIGNATURE:

Providing your phone number is OPTIONAL and only if you would like to be placed in a drawing for a \$20 Walmart gift card.

PHONE NUMBER: _____

Appendix F

FEEDBACK STATEMENT

[Please print out and/or keep a copy of this form]

Thank you for your participation in this study. The goal of this study is to determine how parental involvement and emerging adulthood relate to academic success in college students. Arnett (2000) introduced a stage of development termed *emerging adulthood*. He states that the prolonged “in-betweenness” that emerging adults experience is rooted in the changes of the parent-child relationship that take place throughout the ages of 18 to 25 (Arnett, 2004b). Recent trends have observed parents becoming more and more involved in their children’s lives and education, which may or may not be impacting students’ academic success. For instance, a study in 2006, encompassing 127 institutions around the United States, reported 93% of student affairs professionals believed there had been an increase in parental interaction over the previous five years (Merriman, 2007). Also, Pryor, J. H., Hurtado, S., Sharkness, J., Korn, W. S. (2007) found that about one quarter of college freshman reported that their parents had “too little” involvement in choosing both college courses as well as their activities.

Few studies have assessed the impact of parental involvement on academic success, however, Cutrona, Cole, Colangelo, Assouline, and Russell (1994), found that parental social support was related to higher grade point average in a university setting. With increased attention regarding academic success and student retention (i.e., keeping students in a single institution through commencement) over the last decade, it is important to gain a better understanding of what factors contribute to academic success. This study hopes to provide insight by identifying a few of the contributing factors, which might add to our awareness of what works for successful students.

I want to sincerely thank you for participating in this study. Should you have any questions about this research, please feel free to contact me, Michael Mendez, via email at michaelymendez@gmail.com or Dr. Tami Eggleston via telephone at 618-537-6859, or via email at tegglest@mckendree.edu.

If you would like to be included in the drawing for one of the \$20 Wal-Mart Gift Certificates, please email the lead researcher, Michael Mendez, at michaelymendez@gmail.com and put the code PCRASD1 in the subject line. If you are one of the winners, you will be contacted via email to obtain your mailing address.

References

- Arnett, J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469-480. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469
- Arnett, J. (2004b). *Emerging Adulthood: The Winding Road From the Late Teens Through the Twenties*. New York, Oxford University Press
- Cutrona, C. E., Cole, V., Colangelo, N., Assouline, S. G., & Russell, D. W. (1994). Perceived Parental Social Support and Academic Achievement: An Attachment Theory Perspective. *Journal Of Personality & Social Psychology*, 66(2), 369-378.
- Merriman, L. S. (2007). It's Your Child's Education, Not Yours. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(13), B20. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Pryor, J. H., Hurtado, S., Sharkness, J., Korn, W. S. (2007). The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 2007. Retrieved from heri.ucla.edu/pr-display.php?prQry=11

For information regarding student success and academic assistance, please consult the following resource:

Academic Support Center
509 Stanton Street
Lebanon, IL 62254