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RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Influence of Socioeconomic Status on Parental Involvement Among Filipino Parents

Melvin Jabar,* Judith Garcia, and Marie Anne Valerio
De La Salle University, Philippines
*melvin.jabar@dlsu.edu.ph

Abstract: Parental involvement plays a crucial role in the achievement of positive educational outcomes of children. However, the level of involvement among parents varies based on the confluence of individual, familial, and societal factors. Anchored on such premise, this paper aims to investigate the influence of the different socioeconomic related variables to parental involvement, such as monthly income, subjective assessment of living condition, weekly expenditures related to children’s education, and membership in Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Program or the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps). It separately analyses parental involvement at home and in school, as these two distinctively involve nuanced practices. This paper is based on a survey conducted with 1,638 parents, mostly experiencing poverty, from 29 public elementary and high schools in six purposively selected municipalities/cities in the Philippines. The survey offers four major findings. First, the parents generally were more or less involved in parental involvement at home than in school. Second, parents in relatively higher income group showed parental involvement both at home and in school. However, a different picture appeared when taking into consideration the subject assessment of parents about their living conditions. Those who considered themselves to be very poor manifested parental involvement at home and in school more than those who viewed themselves to be economically better off. Third, parental involvement in school was relatively higher among CCT member parents than their non-CCT counterparts. Fourth, regression analysis identifies membership in CCT as a predictor of parental involvement. This paper concludes that financial resources from work or the CCT program could facilitate parental involvement in children’s education, especially among parents from relatively high income generating households and families living in poverty. Most studies look at variations in parental involvement across income groups. However, even within a specific income group, levels of parental involvement thus vary. Hence, it is interesting to know if intra-group income differentials can explain and predict variations in levels of parental involvement among families in the lowest income quantile of the population.
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Parental involvement plays a crucial role in the achievement of positive outcomes among children (Compton, 2016; Kimaro & Machumu, 2015). However, it is imperative to note that parents can make or break children’s academic success, depending on the degree by which they involve themselves in their children’s education. Parental involvement, such as the provision of safety and health, involvement in school activities, provision of material and non-material educational resources, to name a few, somehow boost the chances of children’s success. Education is often viewed as a strong and steady vehicle to achieve social progress and development. However, social progress can only be achieved if investment in human capital is increased.

Sociology of education has a special interest in parental involvement. This sub-discipline of Sociology focuses on how social relationships and structures can shape an individual’s educational experiences, including school outcomes. In fact, there are already several parental involvement studies using educational sociological lens (Fajoju et al., 2016; Harris & Robinson, 2016; Jafarov, 2015; Castro et al., 2015; Epstein et al., 2002). These studies point to the strong link between parental involvement and the success of children in school. Specifically, parental involvement was found to significantly influence children’s performance in core subjects (Fajoju et al., 2016; Alghazo & Alghazo, 2015; Jeynes, 2005) and in their emotional development and behavior (Sapungan & Sapungan, 2014). Parental involvement, especially when guided by teachers, contributes to fewer absences and retention of students and pupils (Lyman, 2014).

In the Philippines, there have been quite a number of researches on parental involvement and children’s academic success. These studies focused on the practices of parental involvement and its effects on learning outcomes (Orillosa & Magno, 2013) and behavior (Braza et al., 2014) among younger learners. In the case studies presented by San Antonio et al. (2008), parental involvement practices in schools, specifically providing avenues for parents to coordinate with school administrators, helped improved learning outcomes of children. Parental involvement in school is used as an intervention in creating positive academic outcomes in children. Studies on parental involvement have consistently underscored the roles of parents in creating positive strides towards the academic achievement of their children.

However, there is a gap in relation to the different factors of parental involvement in the Philippine context. One classic example is Blair’s (2014) quantitative research on parental involvement in the Philippines. Blair explored the cultural and economic factors as contexts of parental involvement. However, his examination was along the lines of social capital and the nature of parental involvement. Acknowledging that the level of support given by parents to their children’s education is pivotal in creating positive results, parental involvement remains to be a considerable subject among researchers of education and educators and policymakers.

Consequently, educational reforms and policies, such as the “Education for All,” can be better realized if parental involvement is given huge emphasis. There is a growing body of literature that showed varying levels of parents’ participation based on socioeconomic status. However, it has been likewise noted that the existing literature is not always clear about what constitutes socioeconomic status that affects the involvement of parents in their children’s education (Lyman, 2014). Some studies define it to include education, income, and occupation or employment (e.g., Baker, 2014). The study of Seid et al. (2018) defined socioeconomic status (SES) as one’s standing or rank relative to others in a group or society determined through employment or occupation, income, and education. The study of Darin-Mattsson et al. (2017) included occupational complexity as an “alternative” SES indicator. Uncommonly, the National Center for Education Statistics (2012) in the United States of America suggested to include an individual’s assessment of one’s SES relative to others, which they identified as a psychological process variable. Given this backdrop, this paper used other socioeconomic related proxy indicators: expenditures related to children’s education, subjective assessment of family living situations, and membership in the CCT Program besides the more commonly used income.

**Domains of Parental Involvement**

There are no uniform ways of defining parental involvement. In its general sense, it is described as “any action taken by a parent that can theoretically be expected to improve student performance or behavior” (McNeal, 2014, p. 564). It is also viewed as the integration of the home and school (Smith, 2006). Anchored on the perspective that there is a connection
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between the school and the home in relation to a child’s education, parental involvement may be home or school-related. Creating connections between parents and their children, parents and teachers, and parents with other parents are viewed to “provide additional support for children’s learning” (Smith, 2006, p. 44).

Parental involvement at home involves activities varying from parents attending to their children’s learning needs at home, helping the child with homework, providing school supplies, to monitoring their children’s grades. The parents’ monitoring of grades conveys to the children that schooling is a serious matter. Among these three domains, parental involvement in school is deemed to be the most direct in affecting students’ academic achievement. It involves parents’ attendance of Parents-Teachers Association (PTA) meetings, school visits, participation in school programs or activities, discussion with other parents, and conferring with teachers regarding the grades of their children. Regular visits of parents in schools reinforce on the child the idea that the school and home are connected (Sapungan & Sapungan, 2014).

Socioeconomic Factors of Parental Involvement

Several sociologists argue that parental involvement can be conceived as a form of social capital. Based on Coleman’s conceptualization, parental involvement can be described as “social relations that are imbued with norms of trust, obligation or reciprocity” (McNeal, 2014, p. 565). This assumes that parents invest in their children, school personnel, and other parents. They trust that this investment will yield positive results, such as good behavior or academic performance or better connections with school personnel or other parents. McNeal (1999) characterized parental involvement as social capital in three ways. First, parental involvement conveys the presence of a web of social relations between and among actors that include parents, children, teachers, and other parents. Second, as parental involvement is based on kinship ties, the relationships between parent and child, parent and other parents, and parent and school provide encounters that require observance of norms, reciprocity, and obligations. The child, in this instance, becomes the center of whatever ties are mobilized within the dyadic and or triadic social relations. Third, through the web of relationships embedded in parental involvement, actors are able to share, mobilize, and access resources, including most notably economic ones, all of which are used to improve the children’s learning outcomes.

Several aspects of socioeconomic status are argued to greatly affect the involvement of parents in their children’s education more than others, such as income. However, the issue of equity in the promotion of parental involvement appears as several studies have found that rates of parental involvement are higher among the middle and upper classes than lower-class families (Veilymalay, 2012). Lyman (2014) found that family socioeconomic status was a significant predictor of academic achievement as it influences the quality of the relationship between school personnel and parents. Lyman (2014) further argued that families that provide basic physiological needs and social capital help promote the academic achievement of their children. Meanwhile, other studies have shown that low-income parents have fewer opportunities to get involved in their children’s schooling as they are more likely to have inflexible work schedules, multiple jobs, or positions without paid leave benefits (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007).

A number of empirical studies have been conducted to examine the influence of income on parental involvement in many countries. Such studies though, have varying results. Li and Qiu (2018) utilized the Chinese Family Panel Study in 2010 to examine how family background, including income, affects children’s educational achievement as well as parental support. The study surveyed 14,960 households all over China. It revealed that the socioeconomic status, including income, predicts 20% of the difference in parental support for children’s education. The study further noted that parents from higher socioeconomic status have higher parental involvement in the education of their children.

Meanwhile, a study in Kenya (Wakiuru, 2016) among 120 parents similarly revealed that there is a positive association between income and parental involvement. Specifically, the study noted that parents’ frequency of participation in school’s decision making ($x^2 = 12.034, p= 0.017$) and collaboration ($x^2 = 9.081, p= 0.049$) can be associated with the income of the parents. The results of the study pointed to the idea that parents with higher income are likely to engage in school matters or concerns, particularly in terms of decision-making and collaboration.

Similarly, Berthelsen and Walker (2008) found that parents with higher incomes were more involved in children’s education. The authors made use of the Wave
Growing Up in Australia: The Longitudinal Study of Australian Children (LSAC). Their analysis focused on 3,380 children (parents as respondents) whose teachers were able to accomplish a teacher questionnaire. Results revealed that 60% of the teachers perceived parents to be highly involved. Teachers' practices, such as formal parent-teacher meetings, parent orientation activities, and parent participation in the classroom, provided more opportunities for parental involvement. Using ANOVA (analysis of variance), the authors found that a significant difference was seen in the level of parent involvement, particularly in terms of parent-school contact as consistently reported by the parents F(4, 3264)=7.61, p=.000) and by the teachers F(4, 3264) = 26.18, p =.000. According to the authors, the results suggested that parents with higher income engaged more in school activities compared to their lower-income parent counterparts.

Family income was found to be positively correlated with parental involvement in terms of providing support to children’s socio-cultural development (r=.540, p .05) and to fostering an education-friendly home environment. Such finding was revealed in the study of Şad and Gürbüztürk (2013) among 1,252 Turkish parents. The study further revealed that family income is negatively correlated with the frequency of curricular and extracurricular volunteering opportunities (r=-.331, p<.05). This means that as the family income decreases, the frequency of volunteering increases.

However, some studies found that regardless of socioeconomic status, parents are involved in their children’s education (Al-Matalka, 2014). This is not surprising given the range of strategies of parental involvement, which happen at home and in school, and the various indicators of socioeconomic status. It may be construed that specific socioeconomic factors have differing effects on the types of parental involvement. Hence, it is important to look into the influence of income-related variables in predicting the levels of parental involvement among Filipino parents.

Poverty situation, as Garcia (2018) noted, can deter parental participation in children’s education. In her qualitative study on parental involvement among Filipino families living in poverty, Garcia observed that despite their difficult economic conditions, parents put a value on their children’s education by actively engaging in parent-teacher connections. However, her study revealed that parents in the poverty context tend to focus more on parental involvement at home than in school. Garcia concluded that poverty serves as an inhibiting factor for parents to fully support children’s education. Despite economic challenges, parents, in their best capacity, explore all means possible to put their children to school and be engaged in their children’s schooling.

The above findings were also seen in the qualitative study of Yuliante et al. (2019) among rural and urban Javanese parents. According to the authors, parent participants acknowledged financial difficulty as an inhibiting factor in their involvement in children’s education, specifically parental involvement in school. Another qualitative study on parental involvement that showed a significant influence of income to parental involvement relates to a case in Rural Uganda (Drajea & O’Sullivan, 2014) where parents’ income played a role in parental involvement, particularly on the quality of support in relation to children’s’ education. The study maintained that because parents have to make ends meet, child-parent interaction is rather limited.

Few studies have likewise tackled the impact of conditional cash transfer programs on parental involvement in children’s education. In the U.S.A., for instance, the study of Aber et al. (2016) found out that parents under the New York City Family Rewards were observed to have increased parental spending for education. Another study on Family Rewards pointed on the minimal effect of the program on parental engagement (Miller et al., 2015). A qualitative study on Juntos (Peru’s CCT Program) demonstrated greater participation among parents as a result of the conditional cash transfer program (Jones et al., 2008). To date, research that looks into the impacts of the CCT Program on parental involvement in the Philippines is limited. Studies on CCT and its impact on children focused more on children’s school participation, school outcomes, and health outcomes. However, a few qualitative studies have marginally examined its impact this time on parental involvement.

Qualitative evaluation research of the 4Ps by De La Torre (2016) revealed that the implementation of the CCT Program in the Philippines resulted in the increase in parental engagement in terms of attendance and participation in classroom meetings. The program has likewise promoted parental participation in school activities like the school brigade. De La Torre added that when parents are not obligated to give to
a school’s income-generating activities, CCT parents are more than willing to volunteer in school tasks. The attendance in meetings, according to his study, allowed parents to monitor their children.

The CCT program was likewise observed by Garcines (2017) as a facilitating factor to parental involvement among beneficiary parents. In his qualitative research on 4Ps, Garcines’ parent informants claimed that the program had allowed them to buy the educational needs of their children. This development, according to the parents, has motivated their children to perform well in school. Teacher informants likewise believed that through the program, parents actively attend school activities like “school brigade” as this is part of the conditions of the program. As Garcines (2017) elucidated, teacher informants recognized that parents begin to monitor not only their children’s academic performance but their class attendance as well.

Methods

This paper is based on quantitative-descriptive research, which involved 3,920 respondents in six selected provinces in the Philippines, namely, Bulacan, La Union, Iligan, Misamis Oriental, Negros Oriental, and Davao. The said research was commissioned by a private company to evaluate its Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives in the provinces where it operates. As part of the company’s CSR, scholarships to public elementary and high school students are provided. The company also extended infrastructural assistance, such as the establishment of classrooms and school buildings. The survey covered all schools under CSR interventions. Initially, the survey intended to cover all Grade 5 to Grade 9 students (complete enumeration). However, because it is voluntary, not all children and parents wanted to participate. Some students dropped out in the middle of the school year. To add, many students were not present during the survey. In total, 3,920 students were able to return the survey forms, which is 47% (total N of 8,340) of Grade 5 to Grade 9 students enrolled in the 29 elementary and junior high schools.

Of the total 3,920 respondents, only 1,638 (41%) were able to provide complete information relating to the economic-related indicators. Hence, for this paper, results will only be based on the 1,638 respondents. The three-month cross-sectional survey conducted in 2014 involved not only the parents but also their children and homeroom teachers. Hence, three different survey tools were given. This paper only focused on the parents’ survey results. As earlier indicated, the student respondents came from 29 different schools, 23 located in first-class municipalities and six in second class municipalities. In the Philippines, cities and municipalities are classified in terms of the average annual income. The income of first-class cities and municipalities should at least be PhP55,000,000.00. Second class municipalities should have an average annual income of between PhP45,000,000.00 to PhP54,999,999.00.

This paper puts forward the idea that parental involvement at home or in school can be affected by different socioeconomic status indicators. This survey operationalized SES using four independent variables, namely, family monthly income (categorical), education-related expenses (continuous), personal assessment of family living conditions (categorical), and membership in the government’s 4P’s Program (categorical). These variables were used to predict parental involvement in both home and school. In this paper, parental involvement is based on parents’ assessment (self-report) of their involvement in children’s education.

In terms of income data, the survey provided income range response options to the respondents instead of asking the actual family monthly salary to maintain confidentiality relating to personal information. The income range options included below PhP5,000, more than PhP5,000 but less than PhP10,000, more than PhP10,000 but less than PhP15,000, more than PhP15,000 but less than PhP20,000, and more than PhP20,000. Using the analysis of Albert et al. (2015), most of the parents in the survey would fall under the low-income cluster (earning below PhP19,040).

The survey also asked the weekly family expenditure in relation to children’s education. Expenditure includes the provision of material resources, school meals, school allowances, and other school-related fees but not including food served at home. It can be presumed that higher expenditure could denote higher income. For this item, the respondents were asked to provide estimates regarding their weekly expenditure related to their children’s education. Respondents were also asked regarding the personal or subjective assessment of their living conditions relative to their neighbors. They were asked if they deem their family
as either very poor, poor, not so poor, or better than other families in the neighborhood.

Another unique proxy income indicator is the family’s inclusion in the government’s CCT Program. The CCT Program targets to provide poor Filipino families with a health cash grant, education cash grant, and rice subsidy, among other social services. To be able to augment family expenses, beneficiaries are given cash subsidies depending on the number of children in the family below 18 years old.

The program comes with conditions, including the compulsory education of children. If children beneficiaries are unable to attend classes for a considerable number of days without valid reasons, the chance of receiving the cash grant for a certain period of time is forfeited. This requirement, therefore, necessitates parents to monitor their children’s attendance and ensure that their children attend school. Besides cash grant for health, education grant is also given to beneficiaries intended for the educational needs of the children. As part of the conditions, parents are encouraged to participate in their children’s school activities, including attendance in PTA meetings. The program is expected to increase parental involvement among parent beneficiaries.

The parental involvement was assessed using the parental involvement scale designed by Jabar (2012) for his doctoral research on educational experiences and outcomes of children. The said scale involved two domains, namely, parental involvement at home and parental involvement in school. The scale consisted of 10 items, five items for parental involvement at home and the remaining five for parental involvement in school. The Likert scale for parental involvement is aimed to ascertain the level of parental involvement of parents in their children’s education. The scale requires parents to assess the frequency or regularity or the absence thereof with which they engage in a range of activities at home and in school relating to their child’s schooling on a 4-point frequency scale in which 4 means always, 3 for sometimes, 2 for seldom, and 1 for never. Two survey forms were used for the study, one in Filipino and the other one in Cebuano. The use of both languages is to ensure that respondents are able to understand the questions.

Parental involvement at home included participation in activities like helping children with their assignments, providing school supplies, talking to children regarding school concerns, monitoring grades, and checking on given assignments. Parental involvement in school pertained to attending in PTA meetings, visiting the school, participating in school programs or activities, and exchanging of ideas with other parents on matters relating to their children’s education. We performed normality tests for the different variables, but the results indicated that such data are not normally distributed. Given such findings, the analysis of the different variables made use of non-parametric statistics, namely, Spearman Rho, Kruskal-Wallis H Test, Mann Whitney U Test, and Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. To identify predictors of parental involvement, multiple regression analysis was performed. A separate analysis was done for parental involvement at home and parental involvement in school.

**Results**

**Socioeconomic Conditions of the Parent Respondents**

The Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA) in 2019 released a 2018 report that a family of five needs to have at least a monthly income of PhP10,481 to sustain its food and non-food essentials. Given such a standard, about 89% of the families involved in the study would fall under the poverty threshold. Therefore, this result suggests that the majority of school children are from economically challenged families. Only 10% reached above the poverty line. This data summarily indicates that the majority of the respondents of the study are from low-income households (see Table 1).

Parents allocate funds for their children’s education. A majority (77%) of the parents claimed that they spend about PhP500 or less on a weekly basis. Only a few (23%) of the parents would allocate more than the said amount. On average, the parents spend about PhP429 weekly for their children’s education. The lowest amount starts at PhP10, whereas the largest is PhP2,000.

Aside from quantifiable indicators, the survey asked the respondents to personally assess their family living conditions. They were asked if they consider themselves as either very poor, poor, not so poor, or better off relative to the other families in their neighborhood. Results indicate that despite their below poverty threshold income, 73% (n=1,187) of the respondents see themselves to be “not so poor” or to have “better” living conditions compared to their neighbors. Only 27% (n=451) reported that they are
Table 1

*Parents’ Monthly Income and Weekly Expenditures for Children’s Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Family Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 5,000</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 and Above</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekly Expenditures for Children’s Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 100 Pesos</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-500 Pesos</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:428.7410; SD:385.67343</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Living Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so poor</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than other families</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership in 4Ps (CCT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-member</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“very poor” or “poor.” Despite having low income, only 577 or 35% of the respondents are listed in the CCT Program of the government.

**Parental Involvement at Home and in School**

The survey made use of two parental involvement scales. One pertains to parental involvement at home (PIH). To establish the properties of the scale, a reliability test was performed, which yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .722. Through principal component analysis, one item had an eigenvalue of more than 1. The items that have the highest mean scores relate to the provision of school materials or supplies (M=3.6432, SD=.59627) and monitoring of grades (M=3.6160, SD=.64045; see Table 2). Items with the lowest mean score signifying a relatively low level of involvement are helping children in making assignments (M=2.8571, SD=.80567). The overall average domain score is 3.3483.

Meanwhile, the parental involvement in school (PIS) scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of .743. One item had an eigenvalue higher than 1 (see Table 3). The item that had the highest mean score is attendance in PTA meetings (M=3.4963, SD=.74864), whereas the item with the lowest mean score relates to the involvement of parents in children’s school activities (M=2.5635, SD=.99997). The mean score for this scale is 2.96374. When comparing the two parental involvement scales, the result suggests that parents have a higher overall mean score for PIH (M=3.3483) than PIS (M=2.96374).

Given the limitation of normality in the distribution, a Wilcoxon Signed Rank test was performed to confirm the significant difference in the mean ranks of parental involvement at home and parental involvement in school. The test indicates that parental involvement at home mean rank (759.57) was statistically significantly higher than parental involvement in school (450.08), Z=-24.839, p=.000. These significant statistical results provide a general picture that the parents in the survey are more involved at home than in school.
Table 2
Descriptive Statistics and Principal Component Analysis of Parental Involvement at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Principal Component Analysis Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I buy my child school materials.</td>
<td>3.6432</td>
<td>.59627</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I monitor my child’s grades.</td>
<td>3.6160</td>
<td>.64045</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discuss with my child his/her school concerns.</td>
<td>3.4634</td>
<td>.70572</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I check my child’s homework.</td>
<td>3.1618</td>
<td>.83747</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help my child accomplish his/her school homework.</td>
<td>2.8571</td>
<td>.80567</td>
<td>2.401</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain Average** 3.3483 .49781

Response Options of the Scale: 4-Always, 3-Sometimes, 2-Rarely, 1-Never

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics and Principal Component Analysis of Parental Involvement in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Principal Component Analysis Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I attend PTA meetings.</td>
<td>3.4963</td>
<td>.74864</td>
<td>.2491</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I visit my child’s school.</td>
<td>2.9402</td>
<td>.76585</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consult my child’s teacher about my child’s grades.</td>
<td>2.9139</td>
<td>.95432</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to other parents about school concerns.</td>
<td>2.9048</td>
<td>.87144</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in my child’s school’s activities.</td>
<td>2.5635</td>
<td>.99997</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain Average** 2.96374 .61349

Response Options of the Scale: 4-Always, 3-Sometimes, 2-Rarely, 1-Never

**Level of Parental Involvement and Income**

Results of the Kruskal-Wallis test showed a statistically significant difference in mean ranks in parental involvement at home among parents by four different income groups (H(4) = 10.618, p = .031; see Table 4). The mean rank for parents earning a monthly income of PhP20,000 and above is the highest (956.98), whereas the lowest is among parents earning between PhP15,000 to PhP19,999 (773.05) monthly. The results suggest that parents earning a relatively higher income are more involved in their children’s education at home, whereas the lowest is among parents earning a monthly income ranging from PhP15,000 to PhP19,000.

Similarly, Kruskal-Wallis test results indicate a statistically significant difference in parental involvement in school mean ranks among parents by four different income groups (H(4) = 14, 065, p = .007). Parents having a monthly earning of PhP20,000 or higher have the highest mean rank (941.76). Consistently, parents earning between PhP15,000.00- PhP19,999.00 have the lowest mean ranks in both parental involvement at home and
parental involvement in school. In summary, parents from the highest income group are more involved in parental involvement in school. However, the same can also be observed among parents with income below PhP10,000.

**Parental Involvement and Perception of Living Condition**

Statistical difference was also noted in the mean ranks of parental involvement when parents are categorized according to their perception of their living conditions relative to others ($H(3)=14.489$, $p=.002$; see Table 4). Parents who assessed themselves to be “very poor” had the highest mean rank (991.66) in parental involvement at home than compared to parents from the other groups. The group which had the lowest mean rank had parents who viewed themselves to be “not so poor” (872.15). Meanwhile, parental involvement in school mean ranks were also found to be significantly different among parents in the different perceived living condition grouping ($H(3)=9.604$, $p=.022$). Parents who viewed themselves to be “very poor” had the highest mean rank, whereas parents who viewed themselves to be “better than other families” had the lowest. Parents who viewed themselves as “not so poor,” consistent with the earlier findings, had the lowest parental involvement in school.

**Membership in CCT and Parental Involvement at Home and in School**

A Mann-Whitney U test indicated a significant difference in mean ranks between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of the CCT Program. Parental involvement in school was higher for parents who are beneficiaries of CCT (891.22) than those who are not (780.50), ($U=-4.552$, $p=.000$). No significant difference in mean ranks was noted among parents who are beneficiaries (807.25) and non-beneficiaries of CCT (826.16) when it comes to parental involvement at home ($U=-780$, $p=.435$). This result suggests that parents who are beneficiaries of the CCT are the ones who participate more in school activities than their non-CCT parent counterparts.

**Weekly Educational Expenditures and Parental Involvement**

Spearman Rho was performed to see if there is a significant correlation between weekly expenditures for children’s education (in PhP) and parental involvement. The results indicate that there are no significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Living Situation</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Involvement at Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>991.66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.489</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>817.37</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so poor</td>
<td>783.86</td>
<td>766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than Other Families</td>
<td>872.15</td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Living Situation</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Involvement in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>931.33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.604</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>854.70</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so poor</td>
<td>783.68</td>
<td>766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than Other Families</td>
<td>840.60</td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
correlations between parental involvement at home and weekly education-related expenditure \((r=-.005, p=.853)\) and between parental involvement in school and weekly education-related expenditure \((r=-.043, p=.084)\). This means that the increase or the decrease in weekly expenditure on the children’s education does not tend to increase nor decrease parental involvement.

### Predictors of Parental Involvement

Multiple regression was performed to predict parental involvement at home based on family income, educational expenses, perceived living conditions, and membership or non-membership in the CCT Program of the government. However, no significant regression equation was found \((F(4, 1633)= 1.169, p=.323)\), with an \(R^2\) of .003. However, a significant regression equation was found in parental involvement in school \((F(4, 1633)= 6.307, p=.000)\), with an \(R^2\) of .015. Parent’s predicted mean score in parental involvement in school is equal to 3.211 – .157 \((\text{membership}/\text{non-membership in CCT})\), where membership in CCT is coded as \(1=\text{member of CCT}, 2=\text{not member of CCT}\), and parental involvement in school is measured in terms of parental involvement mean scores where 4 is the highest and 1 is the lowest. Parents who are beneficiaries of the CCT obtained a .157 score higher than non-beneficiaries of the CCT. Membership in CCT was a predictor of parental involvement.

In summary, parents involved in the survey are generally more involved at home than in school insofar as children’s schooling is concerned. However, the different statistical tests offered variations in participation when the different variables are considered. First, a significant difference was noted in parental involvement among parents from the different income groups. Parents with relatively higher income (with a monthly income of more than PhP20,000) are more involved in children’s education at home and in school than parents from other income groups. Meanwhile, parents in “poorer” households are more involved in school that at home. Second, PIH and PIS were also found to be significantly different when parents are grouped into four mutually exclusive categories based on the perception of their living conditions. Parents who viewed themselves to be very poor are more involved in children’s education at home and in school compared to parents from other income groups. Third, parents who are beneficiaries of the CCT Program are more involved in school than the non-beneficiaries.

### Discussion

This study notes that parents with reported relatively higher income are more involved both at home and in school insofar as children’s studies are a concern. This result resonates the findings of earlier studies by Li and Qiu (2018), Wakiuru (2016), Berthelsen and Walker (2008), and Şad and Gürbüztürk (2013) that suggested the significant impact of socioeconomic status on parental involvement. According to them, parents from higher socioeconomic status have a higher degree of parental participation in the education of their children. This primarily is due to the fact the economic resources give them the opportunity to provide the educational necessities of children as well as the luxury to skip doing gainful activities and, instead, engage in school activities with their children. Parents in poorer families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(SE)</th>
<th>(SC Beta)</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>(Sig.)</th>
<th>(95.0% \text{ Confidence Interval for } B)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>(Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>42.982</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.069</td>
<td>3.355</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>6.307</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Expenses</td>
<td>-.118E-005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.332E-005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Situation</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.385</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT Membership</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>4.818</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have to address competing demands of ensuring that there is food on the table for the family as well as providing the other non-food essentials for the entire family. However, if one needs to prioritize, it is always the concern for survival that needs attention while children’s needs get the short end of the stick. Although parents in the study are from low-income families, variations of income yielded variations in parental involvement. This means that in relative terms, families with higher incomes are more engaging.

Meanwhile, parents who reported having lower income was found to be more involved in children’s education in school rather than at home. This is the same observation as noted by Garcia (2018) on her study with Filipino parents from low-income families. In addition, based on a personal assessment of living conditions relative to their neighbors, parents who see themselves as “very poor” are more involved in children’s education both at home and in school compared to parents who see themselves as “non-poor.” As Garcia (2018) argued, parents mind their children’s education by engaging actively in parent-teacher connections. Despite economic challenges, parents will find ways to put their children to school and be actively involved.

The use of perception of living conditions as a proxy indicator of SES is a psychological process variable (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). Such assessment involves affect and emotions as one reflects on one’s family living condition with reference to others. Perhaps, parents in impoverished families have developed aspirations for themselves to invest (time, effort, and other resources) in their children so that the latter will have better chances in life. In other words, parents’ current impoverished living conditions could have motivated them to engage in their children’s education to compensate for their inability to provide more economic resources. Because of their current impoverished condition, it may be said that the parents hope their children will not experience the same life in the future. Hence, for these parents, education is deemed to be an important vehicle to escape from poverty. As Drummond and Stipek (2004) observed, low-income parents put a premium on education to achieve economic upward and social progression.

Additionally, beneficiaries of the CCT Program are more active in parental involvement in school than parents who are non-beneficiaries. Such finding is similar to what Aber et al. (2016) noted among parents in their study who were under the New York City Family rewards. Through the program, the mothers had a significant increase in cash involvement spending for education. A qualitative study on Juntos (Peru’s conditional cash transfer program) demonstrated the same result, noting greater participation among parents as a result of the conditional cash transfer (Jones et al., 2008). The conditional cash transfer helped parents living in poverty to address what Lybbert and Wydick (2018) called an “aspiration gap.” This referred to the dissonance between current living conditions and aspired standard living conditions. The resources they acquired through the program (not only financial but also educational and moral---values clarification) have narrowed down the gap no matter how slim it may be. In addition, the cognitive, moral, and financial assets they gained through the CCT Program opened doors, hoping that someday, life will offer better chances for them through the education of their children. In fact, the study of Drummond and Stipek (2004) observed that parents from low-income families value more the importance of parental involvement in their children’s education. However, such belief should be translated into some form of behavioral repertoires (like parental involvement) and can be enhanced when institutional help is extended to them. One can think that the CCT Program is a means that provides an avenue for parents to have an impact on their children’s learning outcomes.

Interestingly, those parents who described themselves to be not so poor and those who reported receiving a monthly income between PhP15,000 to PhP19,999 had the lowest parental involvement both at home and in school. Among the parents in the survey, this is the group that is about to reach a low, middle-income category (Albert et al., 2015). In other words, these are families that are to move out of poverty. The low level of parental involvement among parents in this group could be due to possible permanent gainful employment, so that absence from work is difficult. Due to employment or income generating activity, they have less time with children to discuss school matters at home and to attend in school affairs. Weiss (2003), for example, articulated that full-time employment of mothers may decrease their ability to be involved in children’s schooling.

In conclusion, this study demonstrated that parental involvement varies according to socioeconomic conditions of the families, noting that those with higher
incomes are more involved in their children’s education. Through subject assessment of one’s living condition, parental involvement appeared to be higher among parents who viewed themselves as very poor compared to those who think they are economically better off. This study also concludes that CCT membership has predicted parental involvement. Members of the program had higher parental involvement than non-members. Lastly, weekly expenditures on children’s education did not explain differences in parental involvement.

This study contributes to the understanding of the impact of related socioeconomic status on parental involvement. First, even among families from low-income households, parental involvement varies, and such variations are due to differences in monthly income, perceptions of living conditions, and membership in the CCT Program. Most studies on parental involvement often compare parents from different income quantiles (intergroup); thus, it showed glaring differences in the engagement in children’s education owing to disparities in the levels of access to resources, including financial ones. However, this study has focused on low-income families (intragroup) who are simplistically assumed to have the same poverty situations. Even within low-income families, the extent of parental involvement must be understood as a spectrum. Second, this study has shown the positive effects of CCT on children’s education as it has indeed increase parent involvement, and ultimately, will have spillover effects on children’s outcomes.

Although this study demonstrated the influence of socioeconomic status on parental involvement, certain caveats have to be noted as methodological lapses. The data used in the survey are based on self-reports, and thus, have to be crudely taken at face value. The analysis did not include propensity score matching to address the issue of self-selection bias, particularly on the CCT membership. The inclusion of the CCT Program as a variable was rather decided on an impulse as it was not really the focus of the study. Hence, parents who are CCT beneficiaries are rather a minority in this survey. Hence, it is highly recommended that future quantitative study needs to be cognizant about selection criteria, ensuring more or less equal representation for both the control and treatment group for robust analysis. In addition, when examining the effects of the CCT Program, income (if at all possible, a continuous type of data) must also be taken into consideration rather than simply categorizing individuals as members or non-members of the program. As earlier noted, even among poor families, disparities in income could result in a spectrum of parental involvement.
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