2013

Parental Involvement During College Preparation: Differences between First and Non-First Generation College Students

Deronta Renard Spencer
University of South Carolina - Columbia

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT DURING COLLEGE PREPARATION: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FIRST AND NON-FIRST GENERATION COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

Deronta Renard Spencer

Bachelor of Arts
University of South Carolina, 2009

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in

Sociology

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2013

Accepted by:

Shelley Smith, Director of Thesis

Patrick Nolan, Reader

Jimy Sanders, Reader

Nathan Martin, Reader

Lacy Ford, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee, my thesis director Shelley Smith, Jimy Sanders, Patrick Nolan, and Nathan Martin. I would especially like to thank Shelley Smith for putting up with me and my endless questions during this process. I would also like to thank all of the professors who let me come to their class and administer the survey and their students who took the time to take the survey. Without all of y'all help and cooperation I would not have been able to complete this thesis.

Abstract

In this thesis I explore differences in parental involvement during college preparation between first and non-first generation college students. I use the theories of social, cultural, and human capital to answer this question. I also look at how first and non-first generation differ among several other variables: parent's education, socioeconomic status, religion affiliation, religious attendance, gender, birth order, family structure, high school academic success, and parent involvement during sibling college preparation. I find that first generation students receive less parental involvement during college preparation than non-first generation college students. I also find differences between first and non-first generation students in regards to the variables, socioeconomic status, religion attendance, and birth order, and their impact on Involvement and Emotional Support. I find that first and non-first generation students are similar in regards to the impact of family structure, gender, parent's education, parental involvement during sibling's college preparation, and high school academic success on Involvement and Emotional Support.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Literature Review

1.1 Introduction

According to a report on first generation students called First in my Family (Saenz et al, 2007), the number of first generation college students at four year universities has decreased since the 1970s. The reason given for this is that more and more Americans have a college degree today than in the 1970s. However, another more likely explanation is that first generation students may pursue alternative roads to college such as two-year universities and for profit schools, reflecting their inability or unwillingness to pursue a four year degree. Several researchers ask the question: what is keeping so many first generation college students from pursuing education at a four year university? In my thesis I seek an answer to this question by looking at differences in parental involvement between first and non-first generation college students.

1.2 Background

An examination of the literature contains different definitions of first generation college students. Terry and Bilson (1982) defined first generation college students as students whose parents never attended college. Conversely, Engle (2007) defined first generation students as students who parents don't have a college degree. Both definitions are predominately found in the literature.

The research literature on FGS[1] tends to focus on three areas: demographic and enrollment characteristics and high school preparation of FGS, their transition to college life, and their postsecondary attainment and persistence.

Research on FGS at four year universities has found that they share demographic and enrollment characteristics that distinguish them from their N-FGS counterparts. FGS researchers established that these students are more likely to be older and married (Nunez & Cuccaro-Alamin, 1998), come from low income families (Terenzini et al1995), and to be black or Hispanic (Choy, 2001). A large scale survey of FGS at community colleges found that they share the same characteristics as FGS at four year universities (Inman and Mayes, 1999). They also found characteristics that may only be generalized to FGS at community colleges. They discovered that these students are generally females who are older and married with families and who delayed enrolling into college after high school. FGS tend to be underrepresented at selective universities (Clarke, 2000). This is because once they enroll in college FGS have a tendency to attend part time, to attend two-year, or for profit institutions instead of public and private four year institutions (Nunez, & Cuccaro-Alamin 1998), and to be placed in remedial programs (Tym et al, 2004). Those FGS who do attend college tend to have less high school preparation than their peers. In a report that analyzed secondary data by NCES, Warburton, Bugarin and Nunez (2001) found that FGS are unlikely to take a higher level math course or any courses that exceeded the minimum requirements (4 years of English, and 3 years of math, science, and social studies). The report also uncovered that FGS are less likely to take the college entrance exam and those who do usually score lower than N-FGS.

[1] Throughout the rest of my thesis "first generation students" are referred to as FGS and "non-first generation students" are referred to as N-FGS.

Due to their inadequate high school preparation, FGS have a hard time transitioning to college life. A study of Indiana University freshman discovered that FGS are more likely to have lower first semester GPA's, and to drop out of college during their first semester (Riehl, 1994). Another study surveyed 825 FGS and 1860 N-FGS at 23 different universities. It showed that FGS had lower gains in reading skills than N-FGS. The study also revealed that they take courses in technical and pre-professional fields rather than traditional fields, study less and work more (Terenzini et al 1995). Bozick (2007) analyzed data from the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study of 1996 and determined that low income students tend to work and live at home during their first year of college. Those who work more than 20 hours a week and live at home have a greater chance of leaving during the first year than those who work less than 20 hours a week and stay on campus. These factors cause FGS to be less successful than N-FGS at integrating into college life academically. They rarely meet with their advisors on a regular basis, attend events that are related to their career choice, or meet with classmates in study groups. These differences exist at two-year community colleges but not at four year universities (Tym et al, 2004). FGS also have trouble integrating socially into college life. They are less likely to spend time with people from school and less likely to join school clubs. This is true for FGS at both community colleges and four year universities (Tym et al, 2004). Collier and Morgan (2008) used data from focus groups of students and faculty members to look at the differences between FGS and N-FGS understandings of faculty expectations. It was discovered that FGS were at a disadvantage because they were unable to determine what was expected of them from their professors and thus were more likely to do poorly academically.

The transition to college is made even more difficult because FGS are transitioning from one culture to another, which can cause serious conflict and affect their campus life. Some students have described it as "a shock that takes years to overcome" (Hsiao, 1992). This arises because they don't know how to navigate the college environment which includes not understanding the financial obligations of college (Hsiao, 1992). Studies have shown that first generation students are reluctant to take out student loans because they do not want to acquire debt and they do not understand the process due to a lack of family history with loans (Somer and Woodhouse, 2000).They also find themselves at odds with their family because the family does not understand the benefits of a college degree. This escalates as the student begins to express their college life through their clothes and speech (Hsiao, 1992). A segment of research focuses on the phenomenon of survivor's guilt being applied to FGS. They feel guilty because they succeeded where other family members failed. This creates an internal conflict for students which can lead to depression and affect their academic success (Somer and Woodhouse, 2000).

Demographic and enrollment characteristics of FGS, high school preparation, and first year performance are all known to be associated with a FGS persistence and attainment. In a study to see whether FGS were at a higher risk of not matriculating, over 1000 full time college freshman were surveyed. The study found that FGS were not at a higher risk of dropping out of college, because they were aware of the opportunity for social mobility that comes with a college degree (Pratt and Skaggs, 1989). Other research, however, contradicts these findings. Nunez and Cuccaro-Alamin (1998) determined that FGS graduated at a lower rate, and that being a FGS negatively impacted

a person's persistence and attainment. According to Choy (2001), FGS are twice as likely to drop out of college before the second year, not expected to still be enrolled after three years, and not expected to have stayed enrolled and attained their degree after five years. This holds true even when controlling for poor high school preparation and factors like race and socioeconomic status, making first generation status more important than any other factors related to persistence and attainment. When looking at graduate school attendance, FGS are just as likely to get their master's degree in comparison to N-FGS but less likely to attend professional or doctoral programs. It has also been shown that those FGS who do attain their degree have the same early labor market opportunities and receive similar salaries (Choy, 2001).

Despite the breadth of first generation research in the areas of demographic and enrollment characteristics, college transition, and attainment and persistence, few researchers looked at differences in parental support and involvement between FGS and N-FGS (Hicks, 2006). In a survey of 701 enrolled students, FGS reported that although they believe they received adequate emotional support they felt that they did not get enough academic and financial support, while N-FGS reported that they received all three forms of support from their parents (Bilson and Terry, 1982). However, a later exploratory study of students at the University of Maryland-Eastern Shore revealed that parents of FGS were supportive of their children receiving a college education and were more involved in their academics as a result (Hicks, 2006).

I contribute to the existing literature by looking at differences in parental involvement between FGS and N-FGS during the college preparation process. More specifically I look at abstract (emotional) and concrete (financial," hands on") forms of

parental involvement and determine if they are more likely to be found among FGS or N-FGS. The goal of my study is to raise awareness about the need for policy that creates programs aimed at helping parents of first generation college students become more involve in their child's preparation for college.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

The theoretical concepts I used to frame the study are human, cultural, and social capital. I looked at parent's education as human capital, parent's knowledge about college as cultural capital, and parental involvement as social capital.

2.1 Parent's Education as Human Capital

Human capital refers to things that positively impact a person's health, increase their earnings, or contribute to their love of literature (Becker, 1975). Therefore, human capital is that "knowledge, skills, health, or values" (Becker, 1975, pg 16) that a person possesses. Examples of human capital are medical care, training, and most importantly education. Education is a good example of human capital because people with education tend to have high incomes. People with high incomes tend to have a better quality of life overall (Becker, 1975). In the context of college preparation, it has been found that children from middle class backgrounds were more likely to receive parental assistance during their college application process than low income children (Lareau and Weininger, 2008). I believe that the same is true for education. Children whose parents have higher amounts of education (high human capital) are more likely to receive help than children whose parents have lower amounts of education (low human capital).

2.2 Parent Knowledge about College as a Form of Cultural Capital

Bourdieu viewed cultural capital as a tool that reproduce the inequalities between the classes in society. According to Bourdieu this usually took place within the realm of education. Parents send their kids to school with certain among of cultural capital that they receive from their parents. This cultural capital comes in the form of social and cultural cues that can help them navigate the education process. Kids from upper income homes tend to have high cultural capital, whereas, kids from low income homes tend to have low cultural capital. Therefore, kids from upper income come to school with high cultural capital and an advantage for academic achievement in comparison to low income kids. Several studies have been conducted that focused on cultural and its effects of education. One study conducted by DiMaggio found that cultural capital impacted high school grades. Another study also conducted by DiMaggio and Mohr found that cultural capital also influences attendance rates for high school students, whether or not they drop out of high school, and even whom people married. Several definition for cultural capital have emerged since Bourdieu's definition (Lamont and Lareau, 1988). One of these definitions is" interest and experience with prestigious cultural resources (Lareau and Weininger 2003, pg 570)".A good example of this would be interest in and experience with higher education. Those who have experience with higher education have knowledge of the steps needed to be taken during the process. Patricia McDonough looks at knowledge of college admission processes as a form of cultural capital. Examples of this include, "knowledge about SAT scores, using tutoring to raise SAT scores, and awareness of the availability of college counselors to guide students through the admission process" (Lareau and Weininger 2003, pg 583). I want to expand on this by

including other aspects of the college preparation process. For instance, knowledge about sources of financial aid, what classes to take to prepare for admission, and how to study for admission exams like SAT and ACT. Parents knowledgeable about what it takes to prepare for college can navigate their children through the process. This serves as a source of cultural capital because it's something that is only possessed by those who have attended and graduated from college.

2.3 Differences between Human Capital and Cultural Capital

It should be noted that there is argument about what constitutes human capital and it's distinction from cultural capital. Becker (1975) argues that investments in human capital such as school and job training lead to an increase in income. His view is support by the fact that highly educated people in countries all over the world report higher earnings than lower educated people. Also, unemployment tends to be negatively correlated to education. However, some theorists disagree with the label "human capital". They feel that the economic effects of human capital are not as important as the cultural effects. One such theorist was Bourdieu (1986, pg. 98-99) who argued that human capital theorists do not realize that investments in human capital depends on the cultural capital that was inherited by the family. A family with a high amount of cultural capital will be able to invest more in their child's education that a family with little cultural capital. In the terms of my study, I will be adopting Bourdieu's view. The parent's ability to be involved in their child's college preparation (investment in human capital) is based on how much knowledge the parent has about the college preparation process (cultural capital).

2.4 Parental Involvement as Social Capital

An original definition of social capital is "the aggregate or potential resources which are linked to the possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition" (Bourdieu 1986, p.102). According to Bourdieu, the amount of social capital a person possess depends on the network connections they have at their disposal and the amount of capital available within this network (Dika and Singh, 2002). Another definition of social capital is from Coleman (Dika and Singh, 2002) who states that social capital is "inherent in the structure of relations between and among actors". Coleman (Dika and Singh, 2002) also proposes that social capital comes in three forms: level of trust, information channels, and norms and sanctions. A major difference exists between Bourdieu and Coleman's definitions of social capital. Bourdieu see's social capital as a resource for the elite to stay in power. Thus, social capital reinforces inequality in society base on race, class, and gender. Coleman view of social capital is as a tool used to promote trust, information channels, and norms within a community. Therefore, the family uses social capital to pass on norms to their children that would help them be more successful in life (Dika and Singh, 2002).

Several studies exist that explain how parental involvement can be conceptualized as social capital. Many of these studies used Coleman's definition of social capital. These studies focused on the parent and how they transmitted social capital to their child and looked at things such as family structure, discussion between parents and children, parental expectations, and parent's involvement in the school. The effects that these studies looked at pertained to educational achievement and attainment (Dika and Singh, 2002). One study looked at parental involvement as social capital and its effects on

behavioral and cognitive outcomes. Coleman (McNeal, 1999) argued that parental involvement could be conceptualized as social capital through three elements: form, norms of obligation and reciprocity, and resources.

Form refers to the many social ties and relations that exist in a social network. Parental Involvement clearly meets this definition through the relationship between parent and child, and the parent and their child's teacher. This also involves weak ties that exist within the network. For example, the relationship that the parent has with other teachers in the school through the strong tie they have with their child's teacher (McNeal, 1999). As we know from Granovetter (1973) weak ties provide more useful information than strong ties. Information a parent receives from other teachers in the school may help them be more involved than information they receive from their child's teacher. For instance, a parent may be looking for scholarship opportunities for their child. They would receive more useful information from other teachers than their child's teacher. In short, form involves the relationship between parent and child and the relationship they have with other people.

Norms of obligation and reciprocity exist in the parent- child relationship because these relationships tend to be based on blood and/or adoption. With parenthood comes the expectation that you take care of and invest in your children especially in regards to their education (McNeal,1999). For instance, parents feel obligated to help prepare their children for higher education in hopes they will get into a good university and increase their employment opportunities.

The use of resources is evident in the parent-child relationship. Parents have certain amounts of human and cultural capital that could benefit their children. These resources increase the amount of social capital in the relationship (McNeal, 1999). For example, parents with a college degree (human capital) have a certain amount of knowledge about college and what it takes to prepare for college (cultural capital) that they can pass on to their children. This increases the chances that they will be involved (social capital) in getting their child ready for college entry.

2.5 Human Capital and Cultural Capital in the Creation of Social Capital

Coleman (1988) looked at the role that social capital plays in the creation of human capital in the next generation. In his study human capital was measured as staying in high school until graduation verses dropping out. He showed that the more social capital there existed in the student's network the less likely they would drop out. I argue that when measuring human capital as education, human capital can contribute to the creation of cultural capital and human and cultural capital can create social capital. According to Bourdieu (1986), "The volume of social capital possessed by a given agent thus depends on the size of the network of connections he can effectively mobilize and the volume of capital possessed in his own right by each of those to whom he is connected" (pg 103). Therefore, the amount of social capital at a person's disposal depends on the amount of other forms of capital (human and cultural) that is possessed by members of his social network. My study adds to the literature because it looks at the role that human capital (college education) and cultural capital (knowledge about college) plays in the creation of social capital.

2.6 Hypotheses

In regards to my hypotheses I first hypothesize that FGS experience less parental involvement during college preparation than N-FGS (Hypothesis 1). I then hypothesize about a series of correlates that may be associated with parental involvement, regardless of FGS vs. N-FGS status of students (Hypotheses 2-10).

Parents of FGS tend to be less involved in the college preparation of their children. Cabrera and La Nassa (2001) used data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 to analyze the steps involved in preparing and applying for college for disadvantaged groups. They concluded that college-educated parents were more aware of the benefits of receiving a college degree and passed this knowledge on to their children. They are also more knowledgeable about what it takes to pay for college and the classes required for acceptance to college. Choy (2001) expanded this even further. She revealed that FGS receive less help from their parents' when applying to college. They are also less likely to discuss college plans with their parents', less likely to receive help from their parents' with gathering information about financial aid, and less likely to be accompanied by their parents' on visits to college campuses. Therefore the following hypotheses will be tested:

H1: Parents of non-first generation students were more involved during college preparation than parents of first generation college students.

H2: The higher the parent's education, the higher the level of parental involvement during college preparation.

Socioeconomic status can have a significant impact on how involved a student's parent is in their education, especially in regards to college preparation. In addition to looking at race Hartlep and Ellis (2010) also looked at how income relates to parental involvement in children's homework. They discovered that low income households had higher odds of being involved in their childs' homework than high income households. However, Cabrera and La Nassa (2001) found that parents from high socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely to discuss college with their children, to save for their children college, and to be more aware of financial aid opportunities. A later study by Lareau and Weininger (2008) examined parental involvement during the college application process among middle and lower class families. They found that parental involvement during the college application process was a middle class affair. While the lower class parents were no less willing to help their children, their lack of knowledge hindered how helpful they could be. I plan to test whether parental involvement during college preparation increases as socioeconomic class increases:

H3: Parents with high socioeconomic status are more involved during the college preparation process than parents with low socioeconomic status

There is a scarcity of information in regards to what role, if any, religion may play in parental involvement. One study addresses how religion impacts a father's involvement with his children. Wilcox (2002) used longitudinal data from the National Survey of Families and Households to measure how religion affects a father's one-on-one activities with his children, frequency of dinner with family, and participation in youth activities. Wilcox measured religion by looking at affiliation and church attendance. He focused his study on four types of religious groups: conservative Protestant, mainline

Protestant, Catholic, and unaffiliated. The responses for church attendance ranged from never to several times a week. He concluded that conservative Protestant and Catholic fathers showed more parental involvement than mainline Protestant and unaffiliated men. He also found that fathers who attended church a lot were more involved with their children. In my study I will also be looking for a relationship between parental involvement and religion affiliation and attendance. However, I will focus on more than just Protestant and Catholics. I will focus on parents from several denominations. To that end, I make the subsequent hypotheses:

H4: Parents with religious affiliation show higher levels of parental involvement than parents without religious affiliation.

H5: Parents with high church attendance are more involved during college preparation than parents with low church attendance.

Whether or not one is a single parent can impact how involved they are in their child's education. Single parents tend to have less time available to spend with their children. A study by Kendig and Bianchi (2008) examined how much time single, cohabiting, and married mothers spend with their children. They observed that single mothers spent less time with their children while cohabitating and married mothers spent about the same amount of time. One reason for this is that single mothers need to work longer hours than cohabitating and married mothers to support their children. Thus, they don't have as much time available to spend with their children. Another reason is that single parents are limited in educational attainment (Kendig and Bianchi, 2008). Highly educated mothers tend to spend more time with their children than less educated mothers.

Controlling for education and employment, single mothers spend as much, if not more, time with their children than married and cohabitating mothers. I am interested in seeing if parental involvement in college preparation varies with family structure. Hence, I make the following hypothesis

H6: Two parent families have higher levels of parental involvement than single or cohabitating parents.

Carter and Wojtkiewicz (2000) studied differences in parental involvement between sons and daughters. They discovered that when it pertains to discussions about school, parents were more involved with their daughters. However, when it came to being involved with their schooling directly, parents were more involved in the education of their sons. Another study by Raley and Bianchi (2006), reconfirmed these results, in addition to concluding that parents were more likely to save for college when they had sons compared to daughters. Conversely, Steelman and Powell (1991) concluded that sex made no difference in parent's willingness to go into debt for college or whether or not they saved for college. I am interested in seeing if this holds true when looking at parental involvement during college preparation. Are parents more involved in the college preparation of their sons' versus their daughters'? Thus, I make the following hypothesis:

H7: Parents show higher levels of parental involvement with sons than with daughters.

The birth order of the child can also determine how involved parents are with their children education. Brian Powell and Lala Steelman (1995) looked at the effects of child spacing on parent's ability to invest economically in their children. They concluded

that children who were closely spaced together received less parental investment then children who were spaced further apart. Additionally, Price (2008) studied the impact of birth order on the amount of time that parents spend with each of their children, and found that there are birth order differences in the amount of time spent by parents with their children. In the study, Price focused on time spent with each child at the same age. For example, when comparing the first born and second born he looked at time spent with the first born at age 4 and the time spent with the second born at age 4 also. He found that in a two or three child family, a parent was more likely to spend at least 20 minutes more time with the firstborn than the second born. The same was true for the second born in comparison to the third born. Thus I extend the logical implications of this tendency to test the argument that parents are more likely to be involved in the college preparation of their older children versus their younger children:

H8: The lower the birth order the higher the level of parental involvement during college preparation

If parents are highly involved in a child's college preparation than they will also be highly involved in their sibling's college preparation. Therefore I make the following hypothesis:

H9: The higher the level of parental involvement during the respondent's sibling college preparation the higher the level of parental involvement during their college preparation.

Numerous studies show that parental involvement impacts academic success. A meta-analysis conducted by Jeynes (2005) studied the impact of parental involvement on students' academic achievement. He found that students whose parents were regularly

involved in their education did better academically than those students whose parents were not involved in their education. This held true even when controlling for test scores and grades. It also was true for minority students. In an earlier study, Catsambis (2001) explored the impact of parental involvement on the success of high school seniors. She found that parental involvement during the senior year does impact student's success but not as much as it did in earlier years. She also found that educational expectations and parental encouragement were the most effective type of parental involvement in affecting academic success. In my study I hope to show that parental involvement during college preparation impacts adjustment to, and success in, college. Additionally, I want to show that children who show high levels of achievement in high school will be more likely to receive parental involvement. Based on this I make the following hypothesis:

H10: The higher the level of a student's academic achievement in high school, the higher the level of parental involvement during the college preparation process.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 *Data and Methods*

I collected data using survey research. When I constructed my survey instrument I based a part of my survey on existing questions from previous surveys of college students. The first survey I used was from the Duke University's *Campus Life and Learning* project which was used in the study of college students' perceptions and experiences. The project contains four surveys: precollege, first year, second year, and senior year. The questions I used were from the precollege survey because it pertains to the time period I am interested in. The questions I used from this survey are questions about religion, gender, and siblings. The second survey I drew from was the *American Community Survey*. The *American Community Survey* is an ongoing statistical survey that regularly gathers information similar to information conducted by the decennial census. The questions I gather from this survey pertain to race and ethnicity.

The setting for the study was a large public research university in the southeastern United States. The unit of analysis for my study is the individual, more specifically the undergraduate student.

The sampling method I used was non-probability convenience sampling. Although sampling error and precision are difficult to determine with this kind of sample, it is more practical for my situation (Singleton and Straits, 2005 pg. 133). Convenience sampling involves selecting a sample from "cases that are conveniently available" (Singleton and Straits, 2005 pg. 133). I requested permission from professors within several departments on campus to enter their classes and administer the survey to their students. I surveyed students from one upper level class and students from one lower level class within each major school. Due to the size of the College of Arts and Sciences I divided the school into four parts (the specific schools and classes surveyed are listed in Appendix A) and sampled an upper level and lower level class from each section. My final sample consisted of 1,095 students. 290 students were FGS. There was an absence of students from evening and online classes in my sample which may have contributed to the underrepresentation of FGS.

3.2 *Variables*

My study had twelve concepts: parent's education, socioeconomic status, religious affiliation, religion frequency, gender, birth order, family structure, high school academic success, college academic success, parental involvement during sibling's college preparation, college preparation, and parental involvement during college preparation.

Parent's Education

For parent's education I asked the question, what is the highest level of your education your mother/father completed? I used the respondent's answer to classified

them as first generation or non-first generation. I defined first generation college students as a student who did not have at least one parent with a college degree. If the respondent marked at least one parent as having a bachelor's degree then I classified them as N-FGS; if the respondent did not mark at least one parent as having a bachelor degree I classified them as a FGS. I later compiled the responses into four separate dummy variables for mother's and father's education each: "High school degree or less", "Some college or associate degree", "Bachelor degree", and "Master or Professional degree".

Socioeconomic Status

To measure socioeconomic status I asked the respondent what occupation their mother/father had. I used the 1990's census codes to code the occupations. If the occupation the respondent stated was not listed they were dropped from the analysis. For example, one respondent wrote that their parent worked in Mortgages. Afterwards, I converted the occupational codes into socioeconomic indices. I used the same socioeconomic indices that Hauser and Warren (1997) used for the 1990 census codes. Mother's occupation codes were changed to female socioeconomic indexes, and Father's occupation codes were changed to male socioeconomic indexes.

Religious Affiliation and Frequency

For religious affiliation I asked the respondent what their family religious affiliation was. The responses were coded into a dummy variable with 1 referencing people with religious affiliation and 0 referencing people without religious affiliation. For religious frequency I asked the respondent how often their family attended religious services while they were in high school. I divided the response into three separate dummy

variables: “Once a month or less” “More than once a month but not more than weekly” and “More than once a week”.

Gender

To measure Gender I asked the respondent what their sex was. I coded male as 1 and female as 2. Then, I created a dummy variable called “Sex of the student” with male as 1 and female as 0.

Birth Order

For birth order, I asked the respondents if they had any siblings and how many. I then proceeded to ask if any of their brothers or sisters were older. That allowed me to determine what the birth order of the respondent was. For example, if the respondent told me that they have 2 siblings and then responded that only 1 was older than they were, I knew that they were a middle child. Additionally, I created four separate dummy variables: “Only” “Firstborn” “Middle” and “Last”.

Family Structure

When looking at family structure I asked how many adults lived in the respondent’s home during their time in high school, and what their relationship to those adults was. I also asked if their mother and/or father were in the home during their high school years. I used the responses to determine if the respondents had two parents in the home during high school. If the respondent stated that at least two adults lived in the home and that both were their parents then I label the respondent as coming from a two

parent home. I constructed a dummy variable called “two parent” where student’s with two parents were label as 1 while students with one or no parents were label as 0.

High School Academic Achievement

When measuring high school academic success I asked the respondent what their high school GPA was, how many AP classes they took in high school, and how many extracurricular activities they participated in while in high school. I asked about extracurricular activities because there is a link between extracurricular activities and academic achievement (Gerber, 1996) (Harris et al, 1999).

Parental Involvement during Siblings College Preparation

I measured parental involvement during sibling’s college preparation by asking one question “How involved were your parents during your sibling(s) college preparation?” The responses range from “Very Involved” to “Not Involved”. I later used the responses to create four dummy variables “Very Involved” “Involved” “Somewhat Involved” and “Not Involved”.

College Preparation and Parental Involvement

To operationalize parental involvement and college preparation I asked a set of questions about the respondent’s parents’ level of involvement during their college preparation. I divided parental involvement into three areas: Financial, Hands On (direct parental involvement), and Emotional Support. For Financial, I constructed four additive scales. The questions I asked are listed in Table 3.1. The responses were *all, about 75 percent, half, about 25 percent, and none*. The scales were coded 5 to 1 respectively and

summed to get a range of 20 to 5, with 20 representing high financial involvement and 5 representing low financial involvement.

For Hands On, I also constructed five additive scales. Each scale ask a question that concerns how directly involved the respondent's parents were during the college preparation. These questions are displayed in Table 3.2. The answers ranged from 1 to 10 with 1 representing the low end and 10 representing the high end. The scales were coded according to the corresponding number and summed to get a range of 50 to 5, with 50 representing high hands on parental involvement and 5 representing low hands on parental involvement.

For Emotional Support, I constructed two Likert scales. I asked how emotionally supportive the respondent's parents were during the college preparation process. The answers ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree and were coded 5 to 1 respectively. The scales were combined to range from 10 to 2 with 10 representing high emotional parental involvement and 2 representing low emotional parental involvement. The questions are displayed in Table 3.3

Validity/Reliability

To measure the validity of my scales I conducted a factor analysis (the results for the factor analysis and Cronbach's alpha are listed in Appendix B). As I predicted there were three dimensions of parental involvement. However, the items for Financial Support and Hands On Support loaded together the strongest in the first factor. The items for Emotional Support loaded together the strongest in the third factor. Therefore, I combined the items for Financial Support and Hands On Support into one dimension of

parental involvement called “Involvement”. Consequently, the score for Involvement ranges for 5 to 70, with 5 representing low involvement and 70 representing high involvement. Cronbach’s alpha for the Involvement scale was.860 and for the Support scale was .600. This suggests high internal consistency for Involvement and moderate internal consistency for Support.

To test my hypotheses that used interval level variables I conducted a correlation between my predicting variables and involvement and support. To test the hypotheses that used nominal level variables I compared means for the involvement and support scales across categories of the nominal variables. The significance of difference was determined using independent sample t-tests.

Table 3.1 Financial

My parents paid for my college application fees
My parents paid for my transportation for campus visits
My parents paid for my SAT/ACT classes and/or materials
My parents paid for the fee's require for me to take the SAT/ACT

Table 3.2 Hands On

What was the level of help you received from your parents when deciding what classes to take in preparation for college?
What was the level of help you received from your parents when applying for financial aid for college?
What was the level of help you received from your parents in filling out the college application?
What was the level of help you received from your parents when studying for the SAT/ACT?
What was the level of help you received from your parents in planning and organizing campus visits?

Table 3.3 Emotional Support

My parents were supportive of my decision to attend college
My parents were supportive when I encountered an obstacle during my college application process

Chapter 4

Results

I first present the results for Hypothesis 1 which states that FGS have less parental involvement than N-FGS. Then, I present the results for Hypotheses 2 through 10 which test a series of correlates that may be associated with parental involvement, regardless of FGS OR N-FGS status of students. Lastly, I present the results for the final analysis which compares FGS and N-FGS on those correlates.

4.1 Results for Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1-parents of N-FGS were more involved during their childs' college preparation than parents of FGS-was supported. Table 4.1 contains the means, standard deviations, and differences in the mean level of Involvement and Emotional Support between FGS and N-FGS. The means for Involvement and Emotional Support for N-FGS are higher than for FGS. The difference in means for Involvement is 10.6 and significant. The difference in means for Emotional Support is lower by .4 and is also significant. Therefore, FGS receive lower levels of involvement and emotional support than N-FGS.

Hypothesis 2

I find significant support for the second hypothesis which states that parental involvement in college preparation increases with parent's education. Table 4.2 shows the mean level and the standard deviations of Involvement and Emotional Support for the different educational levels of mothers and fathers. For example, the mean score for less than high school with regard to mother's education is 23.5. This means that respondents whose mothers have less than a high school degree report an average of 23.5 out of 70 points on the Involvement scale. In contrast, the mean score for respondents whose mothers had a "Professional" or "Doctorate Degree" was 48.6 out of 70.

For mother's education, the mean for Involvement increases with each degree level with the exception of "Professional Degree" which is slightly lower than "Master Degree". Table 4.3 displays the differences in mean level of Involvement and Emotional Support between mother's education levels. For example, there is a 1.8 mean difference in Involvement between "Some College" and "Associate Degree". However, this difference is not significant. The difference between "Associate" and "Bachelor" and "Associate" and "Master" is significant. A similar relationship can be found with Emotional Support. Support increases with each degree level until "Associate Degree" and higher. However, the only significant differences are between "GED/High School Diploma" and every other degree level.

In regards to father's education the mean for Involvement and Emotional Support increases with degree level with the exception of "Associate Degree" which is higher than "Bachelor Degree". Table 4.4 contains the differences in mean level of Involvement

and Emotional Support between father's education levels. For Involvement, there is a 4.3 difference in mean between "Professional"/ "Doctorate Degree" and "Master Degree". Moreover, this difference is the only significant difference between the college degree levels. For Emotional Support, there is either a zero or .1 difference between the college degree levels. All of these differences are not significant. The differences between the non-college and the college degree levels are significant except for "Some College" and "Associate Degree". For example, the .8 difference between "Associate Degree" and "Less than High School" is significant.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 states that parents with high socioeconomic status are more involved during college preparation than parents with low socioeconomic status. The results testing this hypothesis are displayed in table 4.5, which shows correlations between mother's and father's socioeconomic status and Involvement and Emotional Support. I find a weak positive association between father's and mother's SEI and Involvement and Emotional Support. Thus, an increase in mother's and father's SEI is positively associated with parental involvement.

Hypothesis 4

I find support for the hypothesis that parents with religious affiliation show higher levels of parental involvement during college preparation. Table 4.6 shows the means, standard deviations, and difference in mean level of Involvement and Emotional Support for religious affiliation. Respondents who state that their parents were religious have

higher means in Involvement and Emotional Support. The difference in Involvement level is 6.3. The difference in Emotional Support mean is .1. However, only the difference in Involvement is significant. Thus, religious parents show more Involvement than non-religious parents but no difference in Emotional Support.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 predicts that parents with high church attendance would also show high levels of parental involvement during college preparation. I find no support for this hypothesis. Table 4.7 contains the means and standard deviations for religious frequency. The means for Involvement and Emotional Support do not increase with the frequency of church attendance. For example, the mean for "Never" is 39.8 and the mean for "Daily" is 35. Also, not all of the mean differences are significant. Table 4.8 displays the differences in means for religious frequency. For instance, there is a .1 difference in mean for Emotional Support between "Never" and "Less Than Once A Month". For Involvement, the difference between "Never Attending Church" and every other religious frequency category-with the exception of "Daily"-is significant. In addition, "Less Than Once A Month"/ "Once A Week" is significant. The only significant differences in means for Emotional Support are "Once a week"/ "Daily" and "2-3 Times A Week"/ "Daily".

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 states that two-parent families have higher levels of parental involvement during college preparation than single parent and cohabitating families. Table 4.9 contains the results for this hypothesis. Respondents from homes with two parents report higher means in Involvement and Emotional Support than respondents who

do not come from two parent homes. The difference in mean level of Involvement is greater than the difference in Emotional Support. There is an 11 point difference in the mean level of Involvement but only a .5 difference in Emotional Support. Both differences are significant.

Hypothesis 7

The hypothesis that sons receive higher levels of Parental Involvement during college preparation than daughters is refuted. Instead, I find the reverse. Table 4.10 displays the male and female means, standard deviations, and differences in means for Involvement and Emotional Support between the two groups. Females report higher means in each category. For example, for Involvement the mean score for females is 46.9 compared to a score of 41.7 for males. The difference between the two means is 5.2. However, the difference between the means for Emotional Support is only .3. Both differences are significant.

Hypothesis 8

Hypothesis 8-the lower the birth-order the higher the level of parental involvement during college preparation-is modestly supported. Table 4.11 displays the different birth orders. "Only" and "Firstborn" are combined into category A. "Middle" children are in category B, and "Last Born"children are in category C. Table 4.12 shows the birth order means, standards deviations and differences in means for Involvement and Emotional Support. The mean for each birth order level are compared against the means of the other birth order levels combine. For instance, the first column contains the mean Involvement and Emotional Support score for "Middle" and "Last" combined. Column 2

contains the mean score for “Only” and “Firstborn” children. Column 3 contains the difference in means between the two groups. This pattern continues throughout the table. “Only” and “Firstborn” children report more Involvement and Emotional Support than “Middle” and “Last Born” children combined. “Middle” children report less Involvement and Emotional Support than “Only”, “Firstborn”, and “Last Born” children combined. Also, “Last Born” children report more Involvement and Emotional Support than “Only”, “Firstborn”, and “Middle” children combined. However, not all of the differences are significant. For Involvement, the only significant differences are the difference of 2.4 between Middle/Last and Only/Firstborn and the difference of 4.2 between Only/Firstborn/Last and Middle. For Emotional Support, the only significant difference is of .2 between “Only”/ “First”/ “Last” and “Middle”. Therefore, “Only” and “Firstborn” children show more involvement than “Middle” and “Last born” children, and “Middle” children show less involvement and emotional support than “Only” “Firstborn” and “Last Born” children.

Hypothesis 9

I find considerable support for the hypothesis that states that the higher the level of parental involvement during a sibling’s college preparation the higher the level of parental involvement during one’s college preparation. Table 4.13 displays the means and standard deviations for parental involvement during sibling’s college preparation. The means for Involvement and Emotional Support increase as the level of parental involvement increases. For example, the Involvement mean for “Very Involved” is 51.7 while the Involvement mean for “Not Involved” is 29.7. Table 5.14 lays out the differences in means for Involvement and Emotional Support. For instance, the difference

between “Very Involved” and “Involved” is 8.4, and the difference is significant. Furthermore, all of the differences in Involvement and Emotional Support are significant.

Hypothesis 10

Hypothesis 10- the higher the level of academic achievement in high school, the higher the level of parental involvement in college preparation- is supported. Table 4.15 presents the results for this hypothesis. There is a weak positive association between “High School GPA” and Involvement and Emotional Support. Hence, the more academically successful a high school student was the more likely his parents were to be involved in his college preparation. Additionally, there was a weak positive association between “Number of AP classes” and Emotional Support. Thus, the more AP classes a student took the more likely they were to receive emotional support during the college preparation process. Conversely, I find a weak negative association between the “number of extracurricular activities” and the amount of Involvement that a person received during college preparation. Therefore, the fewer extracurricular activities a student participated in the more involvement they received during college preparation.

4.2 Anova

In order to prevent Type 1 error that could result from my use of Independent t-tests I conducted an Anova on the variables Parent’s Education, Religious Frequency, and Sibling’s College Preparation. There were some differences. First, there were differences that were significant for the Indpendent t-tests but not for the Anova. For father’s education, the difference between Some College and Associate was not significant with the Anova. For mother’s education, the differences between Less than High School/GED

High School Diploma and Some College/Professional Degree were not significant for Involvement. Whereas, the difference between GED High School/Professional Degree was not significant for support. For religious frequency, the differences were Never/Once A Month, Less than Once A Month/Once A Week for Involvement and Once A Week/Daily and 2-3 Times A Week/Daily for Support. There was also one variable where mean differences were significant for the Anova but not for the Independent t-tests. The difference between Less than High School and every other degree category for Mother's education was significant for the Anova but not for the Independent t-tests. Also, for religious frequency there was a difference in mean for Less than Once A Month/Daily for Involvement and Never/Once A Month for Support. The difference between Less than Once A Month and Daily was 4.8 for the Independent t-tests and 9.7 for the Anova. The difference between Never and Once A Month was .1 for the Independent t-tests and .05 for the Anova. For Sibling's College Preparation, there were no differences. None of the differences alter my results. Parent's education is still found to have an effect. While, religious frequency is still found to not have an effect.

4.3 Regression

To further test my hypotheses I conducted a regression analyses on the dependent variables of Involvement and Emotional Support. I divided my sample into four groups based on first generation status and whether or not I had SEI information for both of their parents. My four samples were: FGS with valid SEI's, N-FGS with valid SEI's, FGS without valid SEI's, and N-FGS without valid SEI's. The samples determined which independent variables I tested. For example, for samples without valid SEI's I excluded the SEI variables. Additionally, I conducted two analyses for each group. One with

parent's education included and one with parent's education excluded. The results for this analysis are laid out in Tables 4.16 and 4.17.

Involvement

FGS with valid SEI's

Among FGS with valid SEI's- with parent's education included-the significant variables were "More Than Once A Month But Not More Than Weekly" "Two Parent" "Middle" "Last" "Very Involved in Sibling's College Preparation". 61 percent of the variance in the model can be explained by these variables. FGS who report that their family attended church more than once a month but not more than weekly score, on average, 16 points more on the Involvement scale than FGS who state that their family attended church more than once a week. FGS who came from two parent home, on average, earn 15 points more on the Involvement scale than FGS who came from single parent and/or cohabitating homes. Middle children who are FGS report, on average, 10 points less on the Involvement scale than only or firstborn children who are FGS. Similarly, last born children who are FGS report on average 8.9 fewer points on the Involvement scale than FGS who are only or firstborn children. Finally, FGS who state that their parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation on average receive 14 more points on the Involvement scale that FGS who report that their parents were not involved.

Excluding the parent education variables, the same variables remain significant with the addition of "Once A Month or Less". 60 percent of the variance can be explained by these variables. FGS whose parents attended church more than once a week

,on average, score 14 fewer points on the Involvement scale than FGS whose parents attended church once a month or less. Additionally, they earn ,on average, 18.8 points less on the Involvement scale than FGS whose parents attended church more than once a month but not more than once a week. FGS who lived in two-parent homes in high school score ,on average, 16 more points on the Involvement scale than FGS who lived in single parent and/or cohabitating homes. On average, FGS who are middle or last born children score 10 points less on the Involvement scale than FGS who are only or firstborn children. Lastly, FGS who report that their parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation receive,on average, nearly 15 more points on the Involvement scale that FGS who report that their parents were not involved.

N-FGS with valid SEI's

When including the parent's education variables among N-FGS with valid SEI's only one variable is significant: "The Number of Extracurricular Activities". When excluding the parent's education variables "The Number of Extracurricular Activities" "Female SEI" and "Two-Parent" are significant. In both models the respective variables account for 21 percent of the variance.

On average, for N-FGS for every one unit increase in the number of extracurricular activities there is a .1 decrease in the score for the Involvement scale. Conversely, for every increase in mother's SEI there is a .1 increase, on average, in the Involvement scale score. N-FGS from two parent families, on average, score 1 point more on the Involvement scale than N-FGS from single parent and/or cohabitating families.

FGS without valid SEI's

Looking at FGS without valid SEI's, with the parent education variables included, there are four significant variables. They are "Two-Parent" "Very Involved" "Involved" and "Mother Some College or Associate Degree". These variables explain 39 percent of the variance. On average, FGS from two-parent homes score 7 more points on the Involvement scale than FGS from single parent and cohabitating homes. FGS who report that their parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation earn 16 more points, on average, on the Involvement scale than FGS who parents were not involved. Similarly, those who report that their parents were involved in their sibling's college preparation report 11 more points, on average, on the Involvement scale than those who report that their parents were not involved at all. FGS whose mothers have some college or an associate degree, on average, report 6 more points on the Involvement scale than FGS whose mothers have a high school degree or less.

After excluding the parent's education variables "Two Parent" "Very Involved" and "Involved" remain significant. Without the parent education variables, these variables only explain 35 percent of the variance. FGS who report that they came from two parent homes, on average, earn 8 more points on the Involvement scale than those who report that they came from single parent and cohabiting homes. On average, FGS who state that their parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation score 18 more points on the Involvement scale than FGS who parents were not involved. Likewise, those who report that their parents were involved in their sibling's college preparation report 12 more points, on average, on the Involvement scale than those who report that their parents were not involved at all.

N-FGS without valid SEI's

For N-FGS without valid SEI's when including and excluding the parent education variables the same three variables are significant: "Two Parent" "Sex of the Student" and "Very Involved". The variables explain 25 and 23 percent of the variance in each model respectively. With the parent education variables included, N-FGS who had two-parents in high school score 5 more points on the Involvement scale than N-FGS who had single or cohabitating parents. Also, male N-FGS report 5 fewer points on the Involvement scale than female N-FGS students. N-FGS who report that their parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation receive on average nearly 9.5 more points on the Involvement scale that N-FGS who report that their parents were not involved.

When the parent education variables are excluded the numbers change slightly. N-FGS who state that they had two-parents in high school score 6 more points on the Involvement scale than those who state they had single or cohabitating parents. Male N-FGS earn 4 fewer points on the Involvement scale than female N-FGS students. N-FGS who parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation receive on average nearly 10 more points on the Involvement scale that N-FGS who parents were not involved.

Emotional Support

FGS with valid SEI's

Among FGS with valid SEI's "Two Parent" and "Somewhat Involved" are significant both with and without the parent education variables. The beta coefficients are nearly identical, and the variables explain 50 percent of the variance in Emotional Support for both models. On average, FGS from two-parent homes score 1 more point on the Emotional Support scale than FGS from single parent and cohabitating homes. FGS who report that their parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation earn 1 more points, on average, on the Emotional Support scale than FGS who parents were not involved. "Sex of the student" is significant when the parent education variables were included.

N-FGS with valid SEI's

In the model with the parent education variables included, the significant variables for N-FGS with valid SEI's are "Two Parent" "HGPA" "Number of AP classes" "Mother with Some College of Associate Degree" "Mother with Bachelor" and "Mother with Master or Professional Degree". However, these variables just explain 23 percent of the variance in Emotional Support. N-FGS who had two-parents in high school score .3 more points, on average, on the Emotional Support scale than N-FGS who had single or cohabitating parents. On average, for every increase in the high school GPA of N-FGS's there was a .1 increase in the score on the Emotional Support scale. Conversely, for every increase in the amount of AP classes an N-FGS took in high school there was, on average, a .06 decrease on the Emotional Support scale. N-FGS whose mothers have

at least some college or an associate degree score, on average, a full point more on the Emotional Support scale than N-FGS whose mothers have a high school degree or less. Likewise, N-FGS whose mothers have bachelor, master, or professional degree score, on average, .9 points more on the Emotional Support scale than N-FGS whose mothers have high school degree or less.

In the model without the parent education variables the significant variables are "Female SEI" "Two Parent" and "Number of AP classes". Without the parent education variables the R-square goes down to .17. Thus, the variables only explain 17 percent of the variance. For every increase in an N-FGS mother's SEI there is a .009 increase, on average, in the Emotional Support scale score. Also, for every increase in the amount of AP classes an N-FGS took in high school there is, on average, a .05 decrease on the Emotional Support scale. Lastly, N-FGS who come from two-parent homes score .4 more points, on average, on the Emotional Support scale than N-FGS who come from single or cohabitating homes

FGS without valid SEI's

Among FGS without valid SEI's "Very Involved" "Involved" and "HGPA" are significant for models with and without parent's education variables. Additionally, "Mother Some College or Associate Degree" is significant for the model with parent's education variables. The numbers for both models are similar. Also, the variables explain 24 and 22 percent of the variance respectively. On average, FGS who state that their parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation score between .8 (with parent education) and .9 (without parents education) more points on the Emotional

Support scale than FGS who parents were not involved. Similarly, those who report that their parents were involved in their sibling's college preparation report between .7 (with parents education) and .8 (without parents education) more points, on average, on the Emotional Support scale than those who report that their parents were not involved at all. For every increase in the high school GPA of FGS's there is a .3 increase in the score on the Emotional Support scale. Lastly, FGS whose mothers have at least some college or an associate degree score, on average, .5 points more on the Emotional Support scale than N-FGS whose mothers have a high school degree or less.

Non-first generation students without valid SEI's

For FGS without valid SEI's there are two significant variables "Very Involved" and Involved". The variables are significant in both models. The variables explain 10 and 9 percent of the variance respectively. N-FGS who state that their parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation score 1 point more on the Emotional Support scale than FGS who parents were not involved. Also, those who report that their parents were involved in their sibling's college preparation report .8 more points, on average, on the Emotional Support scale than those who report that their parents were not involved at all.

Table 4.1 Mean, Standard Deviations, and differences in mean for Involvement and Emotional Support between FGS and N-FGS.

	Non-first gen Mean and SD	**First gen Mean and SD**	**Non-first gen/First gen difference in mean**
Invol	48.3 (13.4)	37.7 (17.6)	10.6*[2]
Support	9.5 (.95)	9.1 (1.4)	.4*

[2] *P <.05

Table 4.2 Means and Standard Deviations for Involvement and Emotional Support for mother's and father's education.

Mother's Education	**Invol Mean and SD**	**Support Mean and SD**
Less Than High School	23.5 (15.9)	8.4 (2.3)
GED and High School Diploma	35.9 (18.2)	8.9 (1.5)
Some College but no degree	42.5 (15.4)	9.3 (1.0)
Associate Degree	44.3 (15.7)	9.5 (.98)
Bachelor Degree	48.8 (13.0)	9.5 (.98)
Master Degree	49.5 (12.6)	9.5 (.95)
Professional and Doctorate Degree	48.6 (13.4)	9.5 (1.0)
Father's Education	**Invol Mean and SD**	**Support Mean and SD**
Less Than High School	26.0 (16.5)	8.7 (1.6)
GED and High School Diploma	37.2 (17.8)	9.0 (1.4)
Some College but no degree	42.7 (16.0)	9.2 (1.5)
Associate Degree	47.9 (15.3)	9.5 (1.08)
Bachelor Degree	47.3 (13.6)	9.5 (.86)
Master Degree	49.4 (11.9)	9.5 (.74)
Professional and Doctorate Degree	51.6 (12.3)	9.6 (.95)

Table 4.3 Difference in mean for Involvement and Emotional Support between mother's education levels

Panel A: Involvement	Less Than High School	GED and High School Diploma	Some College but no degree	Associate Degree	Bachelor Degree	Master Degree	Professional and Doctorate Degree
Less Than High School							
GED and High School Diploma	12.4*[3]						
Some College but no degree	19*	6.6*					
Associate Degree	20.8*	8.4*	1.8				
Bachelor Degree	25.3*	12.9*	6.3*	4.5*			
Master Degree	26*	13.6*	7*	5.2*	.7		
Professional and Doctorate Degree	25.1*	12.7*	6.1*	4.3	.2	.9	
Panel B: Support	Less Than High School	GED and High School Diploma	Some College but no degree	Associate Degree	Bachelor Degree	Master Degree	Professional and Doctorate Degree
Less Than High School							
GED and High School Diploma	.5						
Some College but no degree	.9	.4*					
Associate Degree	1.1	.6*	.2				
Bachelor Degree	1.1	.6*	,2	0			
Master Degree	1.1	.6*	.2	0	0		
Professional and Doctorate Degree	1.1	.6*	.2	0	0	0	

[3] *P <.05

Table 4.4 Difference in mean for Involvement and Emotional Support between father's education levels

Panel A: Involvement	Less Than High School	GED and High School Diploma	Some College but no degree	Associate Degree	Bachelor Degree	Master Degree	Professional and Doctorate Degree
Less Than High School							
GED and High School Diploma	11.2*[4]						
Some College but no degree	16.7*	5.5*					
Associate Degree	21.9*	10.7*	5.2*				
Bachelor Degree	21.3*	10.1*	4.6*	.6			
Master Degree	23.4*	12.2*	6.7*	1.5	2.1		
Professional and Doctorate Degree	25.6*	14.4*	8.9*	3.7	4.3*	2.2	
Panel B: Support	Less Than High School	GED and High School Diploma	Some College but no degree	Associate Degree	Bachelor Degree	Master Degree	Professional and Doctorate Degree
Less Than High School							
GED and High School Diploma	.3						
Some College but no degree	.5	.2					
Associate Degree	.8*	.5*	.3				
Bachelor Degree	.8*	.5*	.3*	0			
Master Degree	.8*	.5*	.3*	0	0		
Professional and Doctorate Degree	.9*	.6*	.4*	.1	.1	.1	

[4] *P <.05

Table 4.5 SEI correlations for Involvement and Emotional Support

	Father SEI	**Mother SEI**
Invol	.170*[5]	.213*
Support	.101*	.122*

Table 4.6 Religious affiliation means, standard deviations, and difference in mean for Involvement and Emotional Support.

	Non-religion Mean and SD	**Religion Mean and SD**	**Non-religion and religion difference in mean**
Invol	39.1 (13.8)	45.4 (15.5)	6.3*[6]
Support	9.3 (1.1)	9.4 (1.1)	.1

Table 4.7 Religious frequency means, and standard deviations

Frequency of Religious Attendance in High School	**Invol Mean and SD**	**Support Mean and SD**
Never	39.8 (17.0)	9.3 (1.3)
Less Than Once A Month	44.7 (15.5)	9.4 (.91)
Once A Month	45.5 (14.7)	9.2 (1.3)
2-3 Times a Month	45.3 (15.1)	9.4 (1.1)
Once A Week	47.5 (14.0)	9.4 (1.1)
2-3 Times A Week	47.0 (16.6)	9.5 (.96)
Daily	35.0 (20.3)	8.2 (1.7)

[5] * P <.05
[6] *P <.05

Table 4.8 Religious frequency difference in means for Involvement and Emotional Support

Panel A: Involvement	Never	Less Than Once A Month	Once A Month	2-3 Times A Month	Once A Week	2-3 Times A Week	Daily
Never							
Less Than Once A Month	4.9*[7]						
Once A Month	5.7*	.8					
2-3 Times A Month	5.5*	.6	.2				
Once A Week	7.7*	2.8*	2	2.2			
2-3 Times A Week	7.2*	2.3	1.5	1.7	.5		
Daily	4.8	4.8	10.5	10.3	12.5	12	
	Never	Less Than Once A Month	Once A Month	2-3 Times A Month	Once A Week	2-3 Times A Week	Daily
Never							
Less Than Once A Month	.1						
Once A Month	.1	.2					
2-3 Times A Month	.1	.0	.2				
Once A Week	.1	.0	.2	0			
2-3 Times A Week	.2	.1	.3	.1	.1		
Daily	1.1	1.2	1	1.2	1.2*	1.3*	

[7] *P<.05

Table 4.9 Two parent means, standard deviations, and differences in mean for Involvement and Emotional Support.

	Non Two Parent Mean and SD	**Two Parent Mean and SD**	**Two Parent mean difference**
Invol	36.8 (17.5)	47.8 (13.8)	11*[8]
Support	9.0 (1.4)	9.5 (.99)	.5*

Table 4.10 Sex of the student means, standard deviations, and differences in mean for Involvement and Emotional Support.

	Male Mean and SD	**Female Mean and SD**	**Sex of the Student difference in mean**
Invol	41.7 (15.1)	46.9 (15.4)	5.2*[9]
Support	9.2 (1.2)	9.5 (1.0)	.3*

‘

Table 4.11 Birth Order

A	Only/Firstborn
B	Middle
C	Last

[8] *P <.05
[9] * P <.05

Table 4.12 Birth order means, standard deviations, and differences in mean for Involvement and Emotional Support.

	B/C Mean and SD	**A Mean and SD**	**A vs. B/C difference in mean**	**A/C Mean and SD**	**B Mean and SD**	**B vs. A/C difference in mean**	**A/B Mean and SD**	**C Mean and SD**	**C vs. A/B difference in mean**
Invol	44.1 (15.7)	46.5 (15.1)	2.4*[10]	46.1 (15.0)	41.9 (16.9)	4.2*	45.0 (15.8)	45.6 (14.9)	.6
Support	9.40 (1.1)	9.47 (1.1)	.07	9.4 (1.1)	9.2 (1.2)	.2*	9.41 (1.1)	9.48 (1.0)	.07

Table 4.13 Parental Involvement during sibling's college preparation means and standard deviations for Involvement and Emotional Support

Sibling's Parental Involvement	**Invol Mean and SD**	**Support Mean and SD**
Very Involved	51.7 (12.7)	9.7 (.81)
Involved	43.3 (12.3	9.4 (1.1)
Somewhat Involved	35.6 (14.7)	9.0 (1.2)
Not Involved	29.7 (19.2)	8.4 (1.8)

[10] *P <.05

Table 4.14 Parental Involvement during sibling's college preparation differences in means for Involvement and Emotional Support.

Panel A: Involvement	Very Involved	Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
Very Involved				
Involved	8.4*[11]			
Somewhat Involved	16.1*	7.7*		
Not Involved	22*	13.6*	5.9*	
Panel B: Support	Very Involved	Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
Very Involved				
Involved	.3*			
Somewhat Involved	.7*	.4*		
Not Involved	1.3*	1*	.6*	

Table 4.15 High School GPA, AP classes, and extracurricular activities correlations with Involvement and Emotional Support.

	Invol	**Support**
HGPA	.121*[12]	.144*
High School AP classes	.050	.066*
Number of Extracurricular Activities	-.118*	-.058

[11] *P <.05
[12] * P <.05

Table 4.16 Regression for dependent variable Involvement (Standard errors are in parentheses)

	Valid SEI				No SEI			
	Firstgen	**Firstgen**	**Non-Firstgen**	**Non-Firstgen**	**Firstgen**	**Firstgen**	**Non-Firstgen**	**Non-Firstgen**
Male SEI	-.044 (.149)	-.067 (.142)	.008 (.072)	.007 (.062)				
Female SEI	.227 (.133)	.239 (.123)	.141 (.073)	.137* (.063)				
Relig	1.3 (12.697)	-1.0 (12.326)	6.4 (4.724)	6.9 (4.478)	4.2 (8.071)	2.1 (8.197)	6.5 (3.832)	5.5 (3.710)
Once A Month or Less[13]	11.9 (5.979)	14.1* (5.544)	-.259 (2.924)	-.009 (2.838)	-1.5 (3.973)	-2.7 (4.019)	-2.4 (2.470)	-2.2 (2.458)
More Than Once A Month But Not More Than Weekly	16.6*[14] (6.117)	18.8* (5.682)	-.807 (2.778)	-.689 (2.692)	-.144 (3.906)	.013 (3.984)	-2.2 (2.342)	-1.6 (2.320)
Two Parent	15.5* (3.922)	16.5* (3.659)	1.5 (2.235)	1.2* (2.121)	6.8* (2.944)	7.8* (2.839)	5.2* (1.840)	6.1* (1.763)
Sex of the Student[15]	-4.3 (3.663)	-4.5 (3.601)	-2.2 (1.882)	-2.0 (1.792)	.010 (2.885)	.022 (2.933)	-4.6* (1.411)	-4.3* (1.393)
Middle [16]	-10.5* (4.723)	-10.2* (4.615)	-3.4 (2.273)	-3.4 (2.196)	-3.9 (3.254)	-5.5 (3.250)	-1.5 (1.683)	-1.5 (1.668)
Last	-8.9* (3.790)	-9.7* (3.641)	-2.0 (1.842)	-1.9 (1.784)	.679 (3.072)	-.647 (3.090)	-.297 (1.571)	-.153 (1.547)
Very Involved[17]	14.3* (5.309)	14.7* (5.032)	1.0 (4.710)	1.0 (4.526)	16.4* (3.557)	18.5* (3.547)	9.5* (3.255)	9.9* (3.139)
Involved	5.3 (5.362)	5.4 (5.302)	-6.1 (4.846)	-5.8 (4.652)	10.7* (3.883)	11.9* (3.936)	1.8 (3.286)	2.0 (3.161)
Somewhat Involved	7.5 (5.640)	8.2 (5.540)	-7.8 (5.076)	-7.9 (4.851)	1.7 (3.852)	2.9 (3.907)	-4.5 (3.645)	-3.8 (3.506)
HGPA	-3.3 (1.997)	-3.3 (1.958)	-.512 (1.132)	-.420 (1.086)	1.9 (1.372)	2.0 (1.388)	-.052 (.830)	.012 (.811)
Number of Extracurricular Activities	.084 (.118)	.107 (.114)	-.143* (.058)	-.148* (.054)	-.142 (.075)	-.144 (.076)	.000 (.069)	.001 (.068)
Number of AP classes	.627 (.783)	.832 (.752)	-.593 (.330)	-.610 (.316)	-.449 (.684)	-.451 (.696)	-.204 (.297)	-.151 (.293)
Mother with Some College	.3.5 (4.042)		1.9 (4.851)		6.1* (2.677)		2.1 (2.978)	

[13] Reference category: More than once a week
[14] * P <.05
[15] Reference category: Females
[16] Reference category: Only and Firstborn
[17] Reference category: Not Involved

or Associate Degree[18]								
Father with Some College or Associate Degree[19]	-2.8 (3.777)		1.1 (4.854)		3.2 (2.823)		2.8 (3.403)	
Mother with Bachelor			1.8 (4.866)				2.3 (2.700)	
Father with Bachelor			.953 (4.382)				2.1 (2.863)	
Mother with Master or Professional Degree			1.7 (5.014)				4.0 (3.048)	
Father with Master or Professional Degree			.644 (4.524)				5.1 (2.915)	
R-square	.614	.604	.214	.211	.393	.359	.253	.238
Constant	24.293	24.295	42.924*	44.646*	7.203	13.194	31.477*	35.779*

[18] Reference category: Mother high school degree or less
[19] Reference category: Father high school degree or less

Table 4.17 Regression for dependent variable Emotional Support (Standard errors are in parentheses)

	Valid SEI				**No SEI**			
	Firstgen	**Firstgen**	**Non-firstgen**	**Non-firstgen**	**Firstgen**	**Firstgen**	**Non-firstgen**	**Non-firstgen**
Male SEI	-.020 (.014)	-.019 (.013)	-.008 (.005)	-.008 (.004)				
Female SEI	-.005 (.013)	-.004 (.012)	.007 (.005)	.009* (.004)				
Relig	-.554 (1.218)	-.569 (1.167)	-.414 (.301)	-.176 (.297)	-.198 (.728)	-.337 (.731)	.286 (.325)	.290 (.314)
Once A Month or Less[20]	.835 (.573)	.876 (.525)	-.035 (.194)	-.059 (.195)	-.438 (.358)	-.534 (.358)	-.027 (.209)	-.015 (.207)
More Than Once A Month But Not More Than Weekly	1.0 (.590)	1.0 (.540)	.139 (.184)	.113 (.185)	-.367 (.352)	-.364 (.355)	-.077 (.199)	-.094 (.196)
Two Parent	1.4*[21] (.380)	1.5* (.350)	.354* (.148)	.390* (.147)	.475 (.266)	.448 (.253)	.175 (.152)	.197 (.145)
Sex of the Student[22]	-.963* (.352)	-.959 (.342)	-.163 (.126)	-.140 (.125)	.293 (.260)	.316 (.261)	-.083 (.118)	-.062 (.116)
Middle [23]	.098 (.453)	.090 (.437)	.053 (.151)	.096 (.151)	-.365 (.294)	-.425 (.290)	-.041 (.142)	-.017 (.140)
Last	-.242 (.368)	-.263 (.349)	.071 (.124)	.095 (.125)	-.006 (.277)	-.064 (.275)	-.088 (.130)	-.069 (.128)
Very Involved[24]	.851 (.518)	.883 (.487)	.493 (.318)	.616 (.317)	.767* (.321)	.883* (.316)	1.0* (.276)	.977* (.265)
Involved	.357 (.522)	.364 (.510)	.481 (.326)	.594 (.325)	.716* (.350)	.793* (.351)	.856* (.280)	.769* (.268)
Somewhat Involved	1.3* (.549)	1.3* (.532)	.130 (.343)	.302 (.340)	.564 (.347)	.634 (.348)	.321 (.310)	.228 (.298)
HGPA	-.294 (.193)	-.298 (.187)	.151* (.074)	.144 (.074)	.353* (.124)	.343* (.124)	.005 (.070)	.006 (.068)
Number of Extracurricular Activities	-.001 (.011)	-.001 (.011)	.001 (.004)	-.002 (.004)	-.007 (.007)	-.006 (.007)	.006 (.006)	.005 (.006)
Number of AP classes	.131 (.076)	.135 (.072)	-.062* (.022)	-.059* (.022)	.006 (.062)	.010 (.062)	.018 (.025)	.019 (.024)

[20] Reference category: More than once a week
[21] *P <.05
[22] Reference category: Females
[23] Reference category: Only and Firstborn

[24] Reference category: Not Involved

Mother with Some College or Associate Degree[25]	.092 (.388)		1.1* (.326)		.503* (.242)		-.076 (.250)	
Father with Some College or Associate Degree[26]	.006 (.364)		-.473 (.327)		-.057 (.255)		.167 (.288)	
Mother with Bachelor			.972* (.326)				-.132 (.225)	
Father with Bachelor			-.351 (.294)				.355 (.243)	
Mother with Master or Professional Degree			.929* (.336)				-.073 (.254)	
Father with Master or Professional Degree			-.340 (.305)				.398 (.247)	
R-square	.508	.507	.231	.170	.246	.223	.109	.093
Constant	10.012*	9.998*	7.940*	8.105*	6.461*	6.931*	8.004*	8.280*

[25] Reference category: Mother high school degree or less

[26] Reference category: Father high school degree or less

Chapter 5

Summary

5.1 Discussion

The aim of my study was to see what factors-particularly parent's education-effect parental involvement during college preparation. First, I tested the basic premise that FGS have less parental involvement than N-FGS. Then, I hypothesized about a series of correlates that may be associated with parental involvement, regardless of FGS or N-FGS status of students. Lastly, I compared FGS and N-FGS on those correlates.

Consistent with Hypothesis 1, first generation students are more likely to report that their parents were less involved during their college preparation. Hypothesis 2 states that parental involvement will increase with parent's education. I find that parental involvement increases with parent's education level. I predicted that parental involvement would level off after bachelor degree. However, I find that parental involvement level off after associate degree. This suggests that there is no difference between associate degree and bachelor degree. Thus, having a two-year degree is just as useful as having a four year degree when helping your child prepare for college. Additionally, I also find differences in the effect of parent's education between FGS and N-FGS. FGS whose mothers have some college or an associate degree have higher levels of Involvement and Emotional Support during college preparation than FGS whose

parents have a high school education or less. Similarly, N-FGS whose mothers have some college or associate degree or more have higher levels of Emotional Support in college preparation than N-FGS whose mothers have a high school degree or less.

Hypothesis 3 states that parental involvement will increase with parent's socioeconomic status. There is a positive correlation between socioeconomic status and Involvement and Emotional Support. Also, mother's socioeconomic status is more positive correlated than father's socioeconomic status. Mother's socioeconomic status also has an effect with non-first generation college students. N-FGS whose mothers have high socioeconomic status receive more Involvement and Emotional Support during college preparation than N-FGS whose mothers have low socioeconomic status. However, this effect is found only after removing the parent education variables.

Hypothesis 4 and 5 deal with the effect of religion on parental involvement. Hypothesis 4 predicts that parents with religious affiliation provided more involvement and support to their children during the college preparation process. I believe that this is due to the fact that many religions promote family and parental involvement. Therefore, it's logical that religious parents will be more involved with their children's college preparation. Hypothesis 5 states that the amount of parental involvement during college preparation increases as family's church attendance increases. This was not supported. The number of times a person's family attended church did not determine how involved their parents were during their college preparation. However, those respondents who state that their parents never attended church report less involvement than those who state that their parents attended church less than once a month or more. Though, respondents who state that their family attended church daily report less involvement than people who

never attended church. Additionally, the difference was not significant. Thus, respondents who parents attended church-regardless of how infrequently-report more involvement that those whose parents never attended church but there was no difference between respondents whose parents attended church. There was no significant difference in support. Also, FGS students whose family attended church once a month or less or more than once a month but not more than weekly report more Involvement than FGS whose parents attended church more than once a week. These results suggest two things: attending church is better for Involvement then not attending church and that attending church daily has the same effects as not attending church at all. Although the latter effect could be due to the small number of respondents who report that their family attended church daily.

Hypothesis 6 is supported. Respondents from two parent homes report more parental involvement and support than those who were not from two parent homes. These effects are the same for both first and non-first generation college students. This is consistent with research that shows that single mothers spend less time with their children and have less educational attainment (Kendig and Bianchi, 2008). Thus, they do not have the time or the knowledge to help prepare their child for college.

Hypothesis 7 is not supported. I find that gender has an effect but not in the way that I assumed. I predicted that males would report more parental involvement than females. However, females report more involvement and support than males. This contradicts research that parents were more involved in the education of their sons (Carter and Wojtkiewitcz, 2000). I also find N-FGS males receive less involvement during college preparation N-FGS females. FGS males receive less emotional support

than FGS females during college preparation. I believe the reason for this is because more women are attending college and attaining college degrees at a higher rate than men. Thus, parents may be more involved in their daughter's college preparation because they have more expectations for them to go to college and attain a degree.

Hypothesis 8 stated that the lower the birth-order the higher the level of parental involvement. This was modestly supported. Only and firstborn children receive more involvement than middle and last born children. While, Middle born children report less involvement and support than only, firstborn, and last born children combined. FGS who are middle and last born children report receiving less involvement and support than FGS who are only and firstborn children. There are a few likely explanations for these findings. The finding regarding "Only" and "Firstborn" children confirms Price (2008) work that says parents spend more time with older children vs. younger children. Middle children likely receive help from older siblings. This is particularly likely for FGS who are middle children because their parents are less able to help them. Therefore, they will rely on their older siblings if they attended college before them.

Hypothesis 9 predicts that students who report that their parents were involved in their siblings college preparation would likely report that their parents were involved in their college preparation .There was strong support for this hypothesis. Respondents who report that their parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation had a higher level of involvement than respondents whose parents were not involved. Both FGS and N-FGS whose parents were very involved in their sibling's college preparation receive more Involvement and Emotional Support than FGS and N-FGS who report that their parents were not involved in their sibling's college preparation. FGS whose parents

were involved in their college preparation report more Involvement and Emotional Support than FGS whose parents were not involved. Whereas, N-FGS who report that their parents were involved report just more Emotional Support than N-FGS who parents were not involved. Lastly, FGS who state that their parents were somewhat involved received more Emotional Support that FGS who state that their parents were not involved. This infers that parents were involved in the respondent's college preparation because they were involved in their sibling's college preparation as well. However, it is likely that when reporting how involved their parents were in their sibling's college preparation, respondents were actually reporting their perception of this base on how involved their parents were in their college preparation. Meaning that this is not measuring the level of parental involvement their sibling receive but the level of parental involvement they received.

Hypothesis 10 was partially supported. It states that parental involvement during college preparation would increase with academic achievement. Both high school GPA and number of AP classes is positively correlated with involvement and support. However, extracurricular activities is negatively correlated. I think that this is because extracurricular activities were not a good measure of academic achievement in my study. FGS and N-FGS who had high GPA's in high school report more emotional support than FGS and N-FGS who had low GPA's. Additionally, N-FGS who took a lot of AP classes report less emotional support than N-FGS who took fewer AP classes. Students with high GPA's probably receive more parental involvement because of their high academic achievement. Parents would be more likely to help a child they believed would be successful in college. Students who took a lot of AP classes in high school would have

been in a position to receive a lot of help from the school in regards to college preparation. Therefore, their parents would not need to be as involved in their college preparation.

With each hypothesis the differences in involvement are greater than the differences in Emotional Support. By this I mean that the differences in support are minor compared to the differences in Involvement. For example, the differences in Involvement range from .6 to 25.6 for father's education but the differences in Involvement and Emotional Support ranged for 0 to .9. This trend was evident with each and every hypothesis. I take this to mean that the variables in my study have a bigger impact on involvement than support.

5.2 Conclusion

In general, FGS receive lower levels of parental involvement and support during college preparation. FGS and N-FGS differ in regards to the variables, socioeconomic status, religion attendance, and birth order, and their impact on Involvement and Emotional Support. FGS and N-FGS are similar in regards to the impact of family structure, gender, parent's education, parental involvement during sibling's college preparation, and high school academic success on Involvement and Emotional Support. In regards to the different forms of capital my results show that parents with high amounts of human capital have high amounts of cultural capital and display more social capital with their children during the college preparation by being actively involved in the process. It can also be argue that it's the parent's cultural capital that lead them to be more involvement in their child's college preparation which can be seen as an investment

in their child's future human capital. The policy implications for my study are that it shows the need for programs that are aimed at providing college preparatory assistance to first generation college students. Also, programs that help guide parents of first generation college students through college preparation process and show them how to assist their children.

My study contains several limitations. First, there are weaknesses due to my choice of survey as a research method. One way surveys are weak is because of reactivity. This is caused by the respondents giving answers that they think are more appropriate rather than answering truthfully. Reactivity is also caused by the respondents not remembering an event needed in order to answer to questions or in some cases just refusing to answer the question (Singleton and Strait, 2005 pg. 227). Both of these causes "measurement error" (Singleton and Strait, 2005 pg. 227), which can affect the validity of my results. Another way surveys are weak is because it does not allow you to change your study design in case a new variable appears in the study. I would have to continue my research without including this variable in my study. This would also affect the validity of my results because including that variable could have changed the outcome. My study is also limited because of my use of convenience sampling. Convenience sampling does not allow me to generalize my findings to a larger population. It also makes it difficult for me to make statistical inference with regards to my results even though I do.

The findings of my study suggest topics for further exploration. First, I believe that future studies should examine if there are differences between children with parents who have no more than an associate degree and children whose parents have a bachelor

degree. Are parents with a bachelor degree more involved in their children's education? Are children with parents who have associate degrees just as academically successful as children of bachelor degree parents? Should first generation students be defined as students who have at least one parent with an associate degree?

Another topic for future study is the relationship between parental involvement and religion. My study revealed that religious parents were more involved in their children's education and people who attended church were more involved than those who did not. Future studies should examine whether religious parents are more likely to be involved in their children's education. Do you monitor their children study habits more? Do they discuss education more with their children? Are they more involved with their child's school?

Lastly, future studies should use random sampling instead of convenience sampling. Additionally, future studies should use qualitative analysis to find out why first generation students receive less involved during college preparation. Do their parents care less about education? Or do they just lack the knowledge and/or skills to be of adequate help to their children?

References

Bean, John. P, and Barbara Metzner. 1985. "A conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition". *Review of Education Research,* 55: 485-540.

Babbie, Earl 2007. *The Practice of Social Research.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, College Learning.

Becker, Gary S. 1975. "Human Capital" Pg 32-33 in The Structure of Schooling: Readings in the Sociology of Education, edited by Richard rum, Irenee R. Beatie, and Karly Ford. Thousand Oaks, California. Sage and Pine Forge, pg 32-33.

Becker, Gary S. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education.* 2d ed. New York: Columbia University Press for NBER, 1975.

Bilson, Janet Mancini., and Margaret Brooks Terry 1982. "In Search of the Silken Purse: Factors in Attrition among First Generation Students". *College and University, 58*(1): 57-75

Bourdieu, Pierre (1986). "The Forms of Capital". *J.Richardson (Ed) Handbook of Theory and Research for Sociology of Education, p 241-258.*

Bozick, Robert. 2007. "Making it Through the First Year of College: The Role of Students' Economic Resources, Employment, and Living Arrangements." *Sociology of Education* 80(3): pp 261-284.

Cabrera, Alberto F., and Steven M. La Nasa. 2001. "On the path to college: Three critical tasks facing America's disadvantaged". *Research in Higher Education,* 42(2): 119-150.

Carter, Rebecca S. and Roger A. Wojtkiewicz. 2000. "Parental Involvement and Adolescents' Education: Do Daughters or Sons Get More Help?" *Adolescence* 35:29-44.

Catsambis, Sophia. 2001. "Expanding knowledge of parental involvement in children's secondary education: connections with high schools seniors'academic success". *Social Psychology of Education*, 5: 149-177.

Choy, Susan. 2001. "Students whose parents did not go to college: Postsecondary access, persistence, and attainment" (NCES Statistical Report 2001–126). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Clarke, Deborah Yarber "First in the family: First-generation college students in the Ivy League" January 1, 2000. *Dissertations available from ProQuest.* Paper AAI9991693. http://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AAI9991693

Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital". *The American Journal of Sociology,* 94: S95-S120.

Collier, Peter J and David L. Morgan 2008. "Is that Paper Really Due Today?: Differences in first generation and traditional College students understandings of faculty expectations. *Higher Education,* 55(4): 425-446.

Delong, Allen Wayne 2004. "Parents of first generation college students: their perceptions on the importance of college".

Engle, Jennifer. 2007." Postsecondary Access and Success for First-Generation College Students". *American Academic, 3*(1): 25-48.

Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties". *The American Journal of Sociology,* 78(6): 1360-1380.

Hartlep, Nicholas D, and Antonio L. Ellis. 2010. "Are Household Income, Gender, and Important in Shaping Parental Involvement in Children's Education?" *NERA Conference Proceedings 2010.* Paper 26.

Hsiao, Karen Petersen 1992. "First Generation College Students: Confronting the Cultural Issues". *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 80.

Hicks, Terrence 2006. "Assessing the Effects of Parental Involvement on First Generation and Second Generation College Students". *Faculty Working Papers from the School of Education.* Paper 5

Inman, W. Elliot and Larry Mayes. 1999. "The Importance of Being First: Unique Characteristics of First Generation Community College Students". *Community College Review Spring*, 26: 3-22

Jeynes, William. H. 2005." Parental involvement and student achievement: A meta-analysis" (Family Involvement Research Digest). Cambridge, MA: *Harvard Family Research Project*.

Kendig, Sarah. M. and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 2008. "Single, Cohabitating, and Married Mothers' Time With Children". *Journal of Marriage and Family,* 70: 1228–1240.

Lamont, Michele and Annette Lareau 1988. "Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps, and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Bevelopments" Pg 34-49 in The Structure of Schooling: Readings in the Sociology of Education, edited by Richard rum, Irenee R. Beatie, and Karly Ford. Thousand Oaks, California. Sage and Pine Forge, pg 34-49.

Lareau, Annette and Elliot B. Weininger. 2003. “Cultural Capital in Educational Research: A Critical Assessment”. *Theory and Society*, 32(5/6): 567-606.

Lareau, Annette and Elliot B. Weininger. 2008. “Class and the Transition to Adulthood.” Pp118-151 in *Social Class*, edited by A. Lareau and D. Conley. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

McNeal, Ralph. (1999). “Parental Involvement as Social Capital: Differential effectiveness on science achievement, truancy, and dropping out”. *Social Forces*, 78(1), 117-144.

Moschetti R, and Hudley, C (2008). “Measuring social capital among first generation and non first generation, working class white males”. *Journal of College Admission,* 198 25-30.

Neuman, W. Lawrence 2006. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Boston, Ma. Pearson Education, Inc.

Nuñez, Anne-Marie., and Stephanie Cuccaro-Alamin. 1998. “First-generation students: Undergraduates whose parents never enrolled in postsecondary education” (Report No. NCES 98–082). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Powell, Brian and Lala Carr Steelman, 1995. “Feeling the Pinch: Age Spacing and Economic Investments in Children.” *Social Forces* 73: 1465-1486.

Powell, Brian and Lala Carr Steelman, 1991. “Sponsoring the Next Generation: Parental Support for Higher Education.” *American Journal of Sociology* 96: 1505-1521.

Pratt, Phillip.A., and C. Thomas Skaggs. 1989. “First Generation College Students: Are they at a greater risk for attrition than their peers?” Research in Rural Education, 6(2): 31-34.

Price, Joseph. 2008. “Parent-Child Quality Time: Does Birth Order Matter?” *Journal of Human Resources* 43(1): 240–265.

Raley, Sara., and Suzanne M. Bianchi 2006. “Sons, Daughters, and Family Processes: Does Gender of Children Matter?”. Annual Review of Sociology, 32.

Riehl, Richard J 1994. “The Academic Preparation, Aspirations, and First Year Performance of First Generation Students”. *College and University,* 70 (1): 14-19.

Saenz, Victor B., Sylvia Hurtado, Doug Barrera, De’Sha Wolf, and Fanny Yeung. 2007. “First in my Family: A Profile of First-Generation College Students at Four-Year Institutions since 1971”. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Singleton, Royce., and Bruce Straits. 2005. *Approaches to Social Research.* New York, New York. Oxford University Press

Somers, Patricia., Shawn Woodhouse, James E. Cofer Sr. 2000. "The persistence of first generation college students". *NASPA Journal,* 41(3), 418-435

Terenzini, Patrick., Leonard Springer, Patrick M. Yaeger, Ernest T. Pascarella, and Amaury Nora. 1995."First-Generation College Students: Characteristics, Experiences, and Cognitive Development". *Research in Higher Education,* 37: 1-22

Tym, Carmen., Robin McMillion, Sandra Barone, Jeff Webster. 2004. "First Generation College Students: A Literature Review". Round Rock, TX: Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation.

Warburton, Edward C., Rosio Bugarin, and Anne-Marie Nunez. 2001. "Bridging the Gap: Academic Preparation and Postsecondary Success of First-Generation students." *Education Statistics Quarterly*, 3: 73-77.

Wilcox, W. B. 2002. "Religion, Convention, and Paternal Involvement". *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64: 780–792.

Appendix A

School and Classes Surveyed

Table A. 1 List of schools and classes surveyed

School	Class
College of Arts and Sciences	AFAM 201
College of Arts and Sciences	CHEM 541
College of Arts and Sciences	ENG 101
College of Arts and Sciences	GEOL 101
College of Arts and Sciences	HIST 303
College of Arts and Sciences	MATH 111
College of Arts and Sciences	PSYC 440
College of Arts and Sciences	SOCY 101
College of Arts and Sciences	STAT 516
College of Arts and Sciences	WGST 309
Business	ECON 221
Business	MKTG 352
Education	EDEC 250
Education	EDEC 510
Engineering and Computing	BMEN 211
Engineering and Computing	CSCE 520
Hospitality, Retail, and Sports Management	HTRM 110
Hospitality, Retail, and Sports Management	SPTE 450
Mass Communications and Information Studies	JOUR 201
Mass Communications and Information Studies	JOUR 504
Music	MUSC 100 A
Music	MUSC 353
Nursing	NURS 210
Nursing	NURS 411
Public Health	EXSC 191
Public Health	EPED 410
Social Work	SOWK 222
Social Work	SOWK 422
South Carolina Honor's College	SCHC 158
South Carolina Honor's College	SCHC 472 C

Appendix B

Factor Analysis and Cronbach's Alpha

Table B. 1 Factor Analysis

Item	1	2	3
Percentage of College Application Fees Paid For By Parents	.702	.472	-.081
Percentage of Transportation Cost to College for Campus Visits Paid For By Parents	.716	-.371	.020
Percentage of SAT/ACT Study Classes and/or Materials Paid For By Parents	.670	-.516	-.150
Percentage of SAT/ACT Fees Paid For By Parents	.690	-.534	-.109
Level of Help Received From Parents When Deciding What Classes To Take in Preparation For College	.719	.388	-.161
Level of Help Received From Parents When Applying For Financial Aid	.683	.234	.040
Level of Help Received From Parents When Applying For College	.732	.442	-.159
Level of Help Received From Parents When Studying For SAT/ACT	.627	.459	-.285
Level of Help Received From Parents When Planning and Organizing Campus Visits	.779	.204	-.050
Parental Support of Decision To Attend College	.385	.019	.807
Parental Support During Obstacles When Applying For College	.618	.154	.535

Table B. 2 Cronbach's Alpha

	Cronbach's Alpha
Involvement	.860
Support	.600