

Parents' Experiences of HE Choice (0048)

Helen Haywood

Bournemouth University, UK

Introduction

As UK HE becomes marketised and more competitive (Molesworth *et al.* 2011), HEIs need to better understand student decision-making in order to recruit effectively. Some parents play an increasing part in this process (Fearn 2010), yet they are under-researched. There is also an assumption that HE choice is a rational, consumer choice and that more information will lead to 'better' choices (BIS 2016). This study seeks to challenge this assumption and to question the dominant discourses around HE choice, through its in-depth focus on parents' perspectives and on the often ignored choice context: here relationships.

Literature review

Despite moves away from seeing choice as purely rational (Meyer and Kahn 1991), to considering emotional (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982) and social aspects (Allen, 2002); models of choice and decision-making persist both in marketing (Kotler *et al.* 2012) and HE (Vrontis *et al.* 2007). These models reinforce underlying assumptions of rationality, as do the quantitative methodologies which dominate HE choice research (e.g. Maringe 2006).

Much literature on joint and family decision-making is dated (e.g. Sheth 1974; Spiro 1983). The approach is often quantitative (Ekstrom 2007), lacking focus on the process of decision-making (Hamilton 2009). Influence and conflict avoidance are key concepts and findings include that to avoid conflict, experience and expertise may be sacrificed (Davis 1976).

Method

This study's interpretivist approach purposefully responds to these gaps. 16 parents whose child was undergoing this process were interviewed. Participants were predominantly recruited through a co-educational comprehensive school in southern England. They were all female except one, and were broadly middle class. Phenomenological interviewing generated 27 hours of data. Data analysis followed Thompson *et al.s* (1989; 1990) two-stage process for phenomenological interpretation. Firstly, an idiographic analysis of each narrative was produced. The second stage consisted of looking for 'global themes' across interviews (*ibid.*).

Findings and discussion

This paper argues for moving beyond the rationality inherent in choice and decision-making models and for more consideration of the choice context. Here the context was the relationship between parent and child, focusing on relationship maintenance, as parents are keenly aware that this relationship is changing. Thus, the processes undertaken to reach decisions and the ways parents engaged with choices need to be seen as part of this liminal phase within this key relationship. Relationship maintenance was experienced in two overlapping ways: through conflict avoidance and teamwork.

Relationship maintenance through conflict avoidance. Parents described going to considerable lengths to avoid conflict in order to maintain this relationship. This was experienced in two primary ways; through persuasion and compromise.

Persuasion was about parents being careful with when and how they started and framed discussions, “*he’s got to be in the right frame of mind to want to chat to me*” (Sarah).

Tactics they employed to persuasively facilitate discussions, included taking advantage of car journeys:

...we’d be driving to school...and I’d be saying, well, obviously you’ve only got a couple of weeks,...have you made your choices...and I’m...trying to eke out of her what she’s deciding... (Mary),

or the presence of visitors, who could ask questions that parents couldn’t “*...[visitor] will say it and say what I want, but because it doesn’t come from me I’m happier...*” (Sarah).

Reasons for the heavy use of persuasion include that as the relationship is changing, parents are unsure about how best to engage with their child and also that this is a choice with which the child needs to be happy.

Compromise. There were several types of compromise. One was when parents decided which of the many choices to get involved in and which to leave to the child. This even included compromising when they felt the child was making mistakes, but in order to maintain the relationship, they kept quiet.

However, some parents had to compromise on aspects of the choice which did matter to them, leaving them feeling “*a bit redundant...*” (Wendy). Mary echoes this:

...so it would have been a safer back-up and I suppose because she isn’t very chatty and responsive we’ve sort of very much left it up to her, and...now, I do have a little regret...

Relationship Maintenance through teamwork. Another way that experiences of HE choice are shown to be about relationship maintenance, is to consider teamwork. Teamwork was experienced in different ways, including times when parent and child worked well together and times when they did not. One or other could lead the process and this could vary; including each party focusing on different things e.g. a ‘parent type’ focus on employment. Teamwork also reflected differing levels of involvement, with some parents having to get heavily involved:

When we were looking through the prospectuses this was me going through the options and him just not being prepared to look...So in a sense I...had to do that for him I felt... (Sarah).

Whereas other parents had little involvement. How involved parents wanted or needed to be depended on the child and their relationship.

Conclusion and implications

This study’s findings underline the importance of deeply contextualising choice, here through focussing on relationships, an often neglected area in choice and HE literature, which mainly assumes that choices are rational and individual. Rather than being a consumer process, as governments and HEIs assume, it was experienced by parents as part of parenting and about trying to maintain this core relationship at a time of change.

Policy-makers and HEIs need to understand that this is not purely rational and that parents’ involvement is not necessarily leading to more informed processes, as parents will compromise in order to maintain the relationship. Providing more information as the White Paper advises (BIC, 2016), may simply overwhelm or confuse rather than either create a market or lead to the ‘right’ decision. HEIs need to recognise the importance of relationship maintenance and to consider how

they might attempt to facilitate this through their communications. They also need to be aware that just as there is no single 'prospective candidate', there are many sorts of parent, with different types and levels of involvement.

Reference list

Allen, D. E. 2002. Towards a theory of consumer choice as sociohistorically shaped practical experience: the Fits-Like-a-Glove (FLAG) Framework *The Journal of Consumer Research* (28) 4, pp.515-532

BIS HE White Paper May 2016. Success as a knowledge economy: teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/higher-education-success-as-a-knowledge-economy-white-paper> (accessed 23.5.16)

Davis H.L. 1976. Decision making within households, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2 (4) (March), pp.241-260.

Ekstrom, K.M. 2007. Parental consumer learning or 'keeping up with the children', *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 6, pp.203-217.

Fearn, H. 2010. "Helicopter parents should buzz off" says survey *Times Higher Education* [online] 11.1.10. Available from: <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=409934&encCode=545732899BC21811975JTBS737226611> (accessed 13.5.10)

Hamilton, K. 2009. Consumer decision making in low-income families: The case of conflict avoidance, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 8, pp.252-267.

Holbrook, M.B. & Hirschman, E.C. 1982. The experiential aspects of consumption: consumer fantasies, feelings and fun *Journal of consumer research* (9), pp. 132-140

Kotler, P., Keller, K.L., Brady, M., Goodman, M. & Hansen, T. 2012. *Marketing Management* 2nd ed. Harlow: Pearson

Maringe, F. 2006. University and Course Choice implications for positioning, recruitment and marketing *International Journal of Educational Management* 20, (6), pp.466-479

Meyer, R.J & Kahn, B. E. 1991. Probabilistic models of consumer choice behaviour, in: Robertson, T.S. & Kassarian, H.H. (eds.) *Handbook of Consumer Behaviour* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Molesworth, M., Scullion, R. & Nixon, L. (Eds), 2011. *The Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer* London: Routledge

Sheth, J.N. 1974. A theory of family buyer decisions, in: Sheth, J.N. (ed.) *Models of Buyer Behavior: Conceptual, Quantitative and Empirical*. New York: Harper & Row.

Spiro, R.L. 1983. Persuasion in family decision making, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, pp.393-402.

Thompson, C.J., Locander, W.B. & Pollio, H.R. 1989. Putting Consumer Experience Back into Consumer Research: The Philosophy and Method of Existential-Phenomenology *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (2), pp. 133-146

Thompson, C.J. Locander, W.B. & Pollio, H.R. 1990. The Lived Meaning of Free Choice: An Existential-Phenomenological Description of Everyday Consumer Experiences of Contemporary Married Women *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (3), pp. 346-361

Vrontis, D., Thassou, A. & Melanthiou, Y. 2007. A contemporary higher education student-choice model for developed countries *Journal of Business Research* 60 (9), pp. 979-989