

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2023, Vol. 4, No. 1, 174 – 187

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.01.16>

Research Article

Impact of Family Support System in the Academic Performance of Grade 3 Pupils at a Public Elementary School in Rizal, Philippines

Irene Dionio Juguilon

Tagumpay Elementary School, Philippines

Article history:

Submission January 2023

Revised January 2023

Accepted January 2023

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

juguilonirene80@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Family interaction establishes a foundation for learning at home. Parents are children's first teachers and the chief designers of children's daily curricula. Parents make decisions about what to communicate and how to communicate with their children on a daily basis. Parental involvement has been defined and measured in multiple ways, including activities that parents participate in at home and at school, as well as positive attitudes that parents have toward their child's education. This study determined the impact of family support system in the mathematical performance of Grade 3 pupils of a public elementary school in Rizal, Philippines. The descriptive research method was used in this study, and the instrument used to collect data from the participants was a survey questionnaire. Cross-sectional survey type was also applied. Various statistical methods such as frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and T-test were used in the interpretation of data. Results revealed that there are varied effects in the academic performance of family support system. Learners who received quality family support performed better academically than those who received less. It is recommended that parents support their children's early education at home as well as active involvement and participation in school. Finally, it is suggested that the school come up with support activities for parents in order to increase parental involvement at school.

Keywords: *Academic performance, Family support system, Parental involvement*

Introduction

Everything around us can be better understood with mathematics. Math can help children understand many aspects of their world by connecting to themselves and other curriculum areas. For many years, mathematics has held a privileged place in most school curricula: it is typically compulsory for students to study

the subject until an older age, and for longer each week, than most other school subjects. Historically, one of the primary reasons for this privileged status is the so-called 'theory of formal discipline': the idea that studying mathematics develops thinking skills more generally. Thus, the initial input by the parents were a part of the discipline.

How to cite:

Juguilon, I. D. (2023). Impact of Family Support System in the Academic Performance of Grade 3 Pupils at a Public Elementary School in Rizal, Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 4(1), 174 – 187. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.04.01.16

Another aspect is that education is necessary for societal development. The more educated a society's people are, the more civilized and disciplined the society is likely to be. It is the responsibility of the family to socialize children so that they can become productive members of society. The more involved parents are in the process of educating their children, the more likely it is that the children will excel academically and become productive and responsible members of society. Family interaction establishes a foundation for learning at home.

Parental involvement has been defined and measured in multiple ways, including activities that parents participate in at home and at school, as well as positive attitudes that parents have toward their child's education, school, and teacher (Epstein, 1996; Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994; Kohl, Lengua, & McMahon, 2000).

The socio-demographic characteristics of families shape parents' structuring of learning opportunities for children and in turn influence children's developing skills and school readiness. Parents are children's first teachers and thus the chief designers of children's daily curricula. During everyday interactions with their children, parents choose from moment to moment about what to communicate and how to do so. Even when mothers were provided (as primary caregivers) with a common set of materials to share with children (e.g., a book, beads) or provide standardized instructions (e.g. "Teach your child how to read and count"), mothers vary in the concepts they choose to teach, as well as how they teach. For example, mothers might differentially emphasize literacy, math, colors, object labels, or play when interacting with their preschoolers around toys, and these interactions will have implications for children's learning (Sénéchal & Lefevre, 2002).

Understanding the origins of variability in early numeracy skill appears to be critical in understanding children's school achievement: Duncan et al. (2007), in a meta-analysis of six longitudinal data sets, found that children's early numeracy performance was the best predictor of later school performance for both mathematics and reading. Although children may bring some innate skills to the task of learning about number and quantity

(Butterworth 2005; Ginsberg et al. 2006), presumably these skills are developed through children's interactions with their environments. Research on how children acquire literacy suggests that parents and other caregivers are influential in providing appropriate experiences to children to facilitate their acquisition of specific school-related skills (Evans & Shaw, 2008)

Walkerdine (1990) proposed a distinction between types of numeracy activities that parents might provide, contrasting pedagogical activities (i.e., that are focused on teaching number skills) with instrumental activities (i.e., where numeracy content is incidental). Lefevre et al. (2009) proposed a similar distinction between direct and indirect numeracy activities, based on the view that parents might attempt to facilitate children's numeracy skills both through direct teaching (e.g., practicing arithmetic facts) and/or provide numeracy experiences indirectly through time spent on related activities (e.g., games with numbers or counting, measurement within cooking or carpentry activities). Note that direct instruction could also occur in numeracy-related (or literacy-related) activities, but the goals of these activities are likely to be much broader than the acquisition of academic skills. Lefevre et al. (2009) found that direct and indirect activities could be distinguished in a factor analysis that explored the frequency with which parents reported various activities. Similarly, Sénéchal and Lefevre (2002) found that parents' reports of direct and indirect literacy practices are independent, such that frequency of direct teaching about letters was unrelated to the frequency of shared storybook reading. Thus, some parents may engage in both direct and indirect activities, others may focus on one type of activity and exclude the other, and still other parents may feel that neither is necessary or appropriate. Researchers have also reported that the frequency with which parents reported directly teaching their young children early literacy and numeracy skills (i.e., counting, simple addition, word reading) predicted counting and number naming for preschoolers (Lefevre et al., 2002)

Sociocultural theories of human development highlight the ways in which parents'

views and practices and the economic resources of families come to be expressed in everyday parent-child interactions (Super & Harkness, 1986; Whiting, 1963). According to this perspective, children reside within a developmental niche that is comprised of the interacting microsystems of settings, customs, and actors. Within this niche, parents are key actors who scaffold their children's learning so that they can become competent members of their larger cultural communities.

Purpose of the Study

This study determined the impact of family support in the mathematical performance of Grade III learners at Tagumpay Elementary School, Rodriguez, Rizal. Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the Grade III pupils in terms of the following:
 - a. Gender;
 - b. Age;
 - c. Parental Involvement;
 - d. Academic Performance
2. What is the level of parental involvement of parent in terms of
 - a. Early Learning Practices at Home
 - b. Learning Practices at School
 - c. Parents' School Involvement
3. Is there a significant difference between the respondents' level of involvement across profile variables?
4. Does family support has an impact on the pupil's academic performance?

Research Methodology

The descriptive method of research used in the study to determine the impact of family support to the mathematical performance of the selected Grade III pupils at a public national high school in Rodriguez, Rizal for the school

year 2015-2016. The instrument used to gather data from the participants of the study was a survey questionnaire. Cross-sectional survey type was also applied. Cross-sectional research focuses on the relationships between variables at a specific point in time. The questionnaire consists of two parts: Part 1 was designed to collect information about the respondents' profiles. Part 2 was designed to determine the impact of family support on respondents' mathematical performance.

Different statistical methods were used in the interpretation of data. To determine the impact of family support of the respondents across profile variables, different test was used. The level of significance was set at 0.05. The study used the following scales to determine the impact of family support in mathematical performance:

SCALE	VERBAL EQUIVALENT
4.00 - 5.00	Always
3.00 - 4.00	Sometimes
2.00 - 3.00	Seldom
1.00 - 2.00	Rarely
1.00 - 1.00	Never

The profile of the respondents was determined using frequency counts and percentages. Weighted mean was used to determine the mathematical performance of the respondents based on the given family support.

Results and Discussion

The profile of the respondents includes the gender, media exposure, reading attitude, familiarity of Filipino authors, exposure to literary pieces and familiarity of historical events. Each personal factor was given respective tabular presentation.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of the Respondents in terms of Gender

RESPONDENTS	F	PERCENTAGE	RANK
Male	78	36.28%	2
Female	137	63.72%	1
Total	215	100.00%	

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' profile in terms of gender. Based on the data, 63.72% of respondents were female and 36.28% were male.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Age

RESPONDENTS	F	PERCENTAGE	RANK
below 22 yrs. Old	29	13.49 %	4
21-25 yrs. old	11	5.12 %	8
26-30 yrs. old	33	15.35 %	3
31-35 yrs. old	40	18.60 %	1
36-40 yrs. old	40	18.60 %	1
41-45 yrs. old	28	13.02 %	5
46-50 yrs. old	21	9.77 %	6
51 yrs. old & above	13	6.05 %	7
Total	215	100.00%	

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents in terms of age. 18.60% of the respondents were between the ages of 31-35, and 36-40. 15.35% under 26-30; 13.49% under below 22 years old; 13.02% under 41-45; and 9.77% are over the age of 51. This indicates that the majority of respondents are between the ages of 31 and 35, and between the ages of 36 and 40.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Child in Terms of Grade (First Grading- Mathematics)

GRADE	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	F	PERCENTAGE	RANK
90-91	90.5	5	2.33 %	9
88-89	88.5	19	8.84 %	7
86-87	86.5	22	10.23 %	5
84-85	84.5	38	17.67 %	2
82-83	82.5	32	14.88 %	3
80-81	80.5	39	18.14 %	1
78-79	78.5	23	10.70 %	4
76-77	76.5	21	9.77 %	6
75 - below	75	16	7.44 %	8
TOTAL	82.55	215	100 %	

Table 3 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' child in terms of grade (First Grading – Math). 18.14% have a grade bracket of 80-81; 17.67% 84-85; 14.88% 82-83; 10.7% 78-79; 10.23% 86-87; 9.77% 76-77; 8.84% 88-89; 7.44% 75 and below; and 2.33% 90-91. This indicates that the majority of respondents' children received a Math grade in the first quarter under the grade bracket 80-81.

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Child in Terms of Grade. (Second Grading- Mathematics)

GRADE	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	F	PERCENTAGE	RANK
93-94	93.5	7	3.26 %	10
91-92	91.5	8	3.72 %	9
89-90	89.5	24	11.16 %	5
87-88	87.5	27	12.57 %	4
85-86	85.5	39	18.14 %	1
83-84	83.5	36	16.74 %	2
81-82	81.5	28	13.02 %	3
79-80	79.5	20	9.30 %	6
77-78	77.5	14	6.51 %	7
75-76	75.5	12	5.58 %	8
TOTAL	84.5	215	100 %	

Table 4 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' child in terms of grade (Second Grading – Math). 18.14% have a grade bracket of 85-86; 16.74% 83-84; 13.02% 81-82; 12.57% 87-88; 11.16%

89-90; 9.30% 79-80; 6.51% 77-78; 5.58% 76-77; 3.72% 91-92; and 3.26% 93-94. This indicates that the majority of respondents' children received a Math grade in the second quarter under the grade bracket 85-86.

Table 5 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Child in Terms of Grade (First Grading-English)

GRADE	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	F	PERCENTAGE	RANK
89-90	89.5	16	7.44 %	7
87-88	87.5	24	11.17 %	5
85-86	85.5	35	16.28 %	3
83-84	83.5	39	18.14 %	1
81-82	81.5	37	17.21 %	2
79-80	79.5	28	13.02 %	4
77-78	77.5	22	10.23 %	6
75-76	75.5	14	6.51 %	8
TOTAL	82.5	215	100 %	

Table 5 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' child in terms of grade (First Grading – English). 18.14% have a grade bracket of 83-84; 17.21% 81-82; 16.28% 85-86; 13.02% 79-80; 11.17%

87-88%; 10.23% 77-78; 7.44% 89-90; and 6.51% 75-76. This indicates that the majority of respondents' children received an English grade in the first quarter under the grade bracket 83-84.

Table 6. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Child in Terms of Grade (Second Grading-English)

GRADE	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	F	PERCENTAGE	RANK
91-92	91.5	11	5.12 %	8
89-90	89.5	17	7.91 %	6.5
87-88	87.5	27	12.56 %	4
85-86	87.5	35	16.28 %	3
83-84	83.5	39	18.14 %	2
81-82	81.5	41	19.06 %	1
79-80	79.5	20	9.30 %	5
77-78	77.5	17	7.91 %	6.5
75-76	75.5	8	3.72 %	9
TOTAL	83.5	215	100 %	

Table 6 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' child in terms of grade (Second Grading - English). 19.06% have a grade bracket of 81-82; 18.14% 83-84; 16.28% 85-86; 12.56% 87-88; 9.30% 79-80; 7.91% of 77-78 and 89-90; 5.12% 91-92; and 3.72% 75-76.

This shows that most of the child's respondents have a grade in English under 81-82. This indicates that the majority of respondents' children received an English grade in the second quarter under the grade bracket 81-82.

Table 7. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Child in Terms of Grade (First Grading-Science)

GRADE	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	F	PERCENTAGE	RANK
89-90	89.5	13	6.05 %	8
87-88	87.5	28	13.02 %	4
85-86	85.5	34	15.82 %	3
83-84	83.5	36	16.74 %	2
81-82	81.5	45	20.93 %	1
79-80	79.5	25	11.63 %	5
77-78	77.5	18	8.37 %	6
75-76	75.5	16	7.44 %	7
TOTAL	82.5	215	100 %	

Table 7 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' child in terms of grade (First Grading - Science). 20.93% have a grade bracket of 81-82; 16.74% 83-84; 15.82% 85-86; 13.02% 87-88; 11.63%

79-80; 8.37% 77-78; 7.44% 75-76; and 6.05% 89-90. This indicates that the majority of respondents' children received a Science grade in the first quarter under the grade bracket 81-82.

Table 8. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Child in Terms of Grade (Second Grading- Science)

GRADE	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	F	PERCENTAGE	RANK
91-92	91.5	9	4.19 %	9
89-90	89.5	16	7.44 %	6
87-88	87.5	35	16.28 %	4
85-86	85.5	37	17.22 %	2
83-84	83.5	42	19.53 %	1
81-82	81.5	36	16.74 %	3
79-80	79.5	18	8.37%	5
77-78	77.5	12	5.58%	7
75-76	75.5	10	4.65%	8
TOTAL	83.5	215	100 %	

Table 8 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' child in terms of grade (Second Grading - Science). 19.53% have a grade bracket of 83-84; 17.22% 85-86; 16.74% 81-82; 16.28% 87-88; 8.37%

79-80; 7.44% 89-90; 5.58% 77-78%; 4.65% 75-76; and 4.19% 91-92.

This indicates that the majority of respondents' children received a Science grade in the second quarter under the grade bracket 83-84.

Table 9. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Child in Terms of Grade (First Grading-Filipino)

GRADE	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	F	PERCENTAGE	RANK
89-90	89.5	19	8.84 %	6
87-88	87.5	22	10.23 %	5
85-86	85.5	38	17.67 %	3
83-84	83.5	43	20.00 %	2
81-82	81.5	47	21.86 %	1
79-80	79.5	27	12.56 %	4
77-78	77.5	13	6.05 %	7
75-76	75.5	6	2.79 %	8
TOTAL	82.5	215	100 %	

Table 9 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' child in terms of grade (First Grading - Filipino). 21.86% have a grade bracket of 81-82; 20% 83-84; 17.67% 85-86; 12.56% 79-80; 10.23% 87-

88; 8.84% 89-90; 6.05% 77-78; and 2.79% 75-76. This indicates that the majority of respondents' children received a Filipino grade in the first quarter under the grade bracket 81-82.

Table 10. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Child in Terms of Grade (Second Grading-Filipino)

GRADE	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	F	PERCENTAGE	RANK
95-96	95.5	3	1.40 %	11
93-94	93.5	8	3.72 %	9
91-92	91.5	11	5.12 %	7
89-90	89.5	24	11.16 %	5
87-88	87.5	29	13.49 %	4
85-86	85.5	40	18.60 %	1
83-84	83.5	38	17.67 %	2
81-82	81.5	30	13.95 %	3
79-80	79.5	16	7.45 %	6
77-78	77.5	10	4.65 %	8
75-76	75.5	6	2.79 %	10
TOTAL	94.05	215	100 %	

Table 10 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' child in terms of grade (Second Grading - Filipino). 18.60% have a grade bracket of 85-86; 17.67% 83-84; 13.95% 81-82; 13.49% 87-88; 11.16%

89-90; 7.45% 79-80; 5.12% 91-92; 4.65% 77-78; 3.72% 93-94; 2.79% 75-76; and 1.40% 95-96. This indicates that the majority of respondents' children received a Filipino grade in the second quarter under the grade bracket 85-86.

Table 11 Summary of the Weighted Average Grade Per Subject for First Grading

SUBJECT	WEIGHTED AVERAGE GRADE	RANK
Mathematics	82.55%	1
English	82.50%	2
Science	82.50%	2
Filipino	82.50%	2
TOTAL	82.51%	

Table 11 summarizes the weighted average grade for each subject in First Grading. Mathematics was ranked first, with a weighted

average grade of 82.55%; English, Science, and Filipino all received 82.50%.

Table 12 Summary of the Weighted Average Grade Per Subject for Second Grading

SUBJECT	WEIGHTED AVERAGE GRADE	RANK
Mathematics	84.50	2
English	83.50	3
Science	83.50	3
Filipino	94.05	1
TOTAL	86.38	

Table 12 summarizes the weighted average grade for each subject in Second Grading. Filipino was ranked first, with a weighted average grade of 94.05%; Mathematics was ranked

second, with a weighted average grade of 84.50%; and English and Science were ranked third, with weighted average grades of 83.50%.

Table 13 Summary of Average Grade for First Grading and Second Grading per Subject

SUBJECT	WEIGHTED AVERAGE	RANK
Mathematics	83.52%	2
English	83.00%	3
Science	83.00%	3
Filipino	82.27%	1
TOTAL WEIGHTED AVERAGE	82.95%	

Table 13 summarizes the weighted average grade for first and second quarter. Filipino was ranked first with a weighted average grade of 88.27%; Mathematics was ranked second with 83.52%; and English and Science were both ranked third with weighted average grade of

83.00%. This shows that Filipino has the highest weighted average in both first and second quarters.

Table 14 shows that the average weighted grade in Second Grading (86.38%) is higher than in First Grading (82.51%).

Table 14. Summary of Average Grade Per Grading Period

GRADING PERIOD	TOTAL WEIGHTED AVERAGE	RANK
1 st Grading	82.51%	2
2 nd Grading	86.38%	1
TOTAL	84.44%	

Table 15. Mean Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Early Learning Practices at Home

	MEAN	VERBAL DESCRIPTION	RANK
1.Told stories to (Binabasahan ng kuwento ang anak)	2.18	Seldom	6
2.Sang songs or lullabies with (Inaawitan siya ng mga awiting pambata)	3.27	Sometimes	5
3.Counted or drew things with (Nagbibilang o gumuguhit ng mga bagay bagay)	3.46	Sometimes	4
4.Took outside the home compound (Ipinapasyal siya sa labas ng bahay)	3.59	Sometimes	2
5.Read books or looked at picture books with (Bumabasa o tumutingin ng mga larawan sa aklat)	3.51	Sometimes	3
6.Played with family (Nakikipaglaro sa bawat miyembro ng pamilya)	3.75	Sometimes	1
TOTAL AVERAGE WEIGHTED MEAN	3.29	Sometimes	

LEGEND:

SCALE	VERBAL EQUIVALENT
4.00 - 5.00	Always
3.00 - 4.00	Sometimes
2.00 - 3.00	Seldom
1.00 - 2.00	Rarely
1.00 - 1.00	Never

Table 15 shows the Mean Distribution of the respondents in terms of Early Learning Practices at Home with a weighted average of 3.29. This shows that playing with family earned the highest mean and done sometimes by the respondents in terms of Early Learning Practices at Home.

Table 16. Mean Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Learning Practices at School

	MEAN	VERBAL DESCRIPTION	RANK
1 Can identify or name at least 10 letters of the alphabet. (<i>Nakakikilala ng sampung letra ng alpabeto</i>)	4.03	Sometimes	1
2 Can read at least four simple, popular words. (<i>Nakababasa ng mga simpleng salita</i>)	3.74	Sometimes	5.5
3 Does recognize the symbol of all numbers from 1 to 10. (<i>Nakakikilala ng mga simbolo ng bilang 1 hanggang 10</i>)	3.75	Sometimes	4
4 Can pick up a small object with two fingers, like a stick or a rock from the ground. (<i>Nakapupulot ng mga maliliit na bagay sa sahig tulad ng stick o bato gamit ang dalawang daliri</i>)	3.74	Sometimes	5.5
5 Is sometimes too sick to play. (<i>Nawawalan ng gana minsan sa paglalaro</i>)	3.25	Sometimes	8
6 Does follow simple directions. (<i>Nakasusunod sa mga simpleng panuto</i>)	3.76	Sometimes	3
7 When given something to do, is able to do it independently? (<i>Nagagawa niyang mag-isa ang mga bagay na ipinagagawa sa kanya</i>)	3.59	Sometimes	7
8 Does get along well with other children. (<i>Nakikihalubilo siya sa ibang bata</i>)	3.83	Sometimes	2
9 Does kick, bite, or hit other children or adults. (<i>Naninipa, nangangagat at namamalo sa kapwa niya bata at pati sa matatanda.</i>)	2.33	Seldom	10
10 Does get distracted easily. (<i>Madaling mapukaw ang kanyang atensyon</i>)	3.01	Seldom	9
TOTAL AVERAGE WEIGHTED MEAN	3.29	Sometimes	

LEGEND:

SCALE	VERBAL EQUIVALENT
4.00 - 5.00	Always
3.00 - 4.00	Sometimes
2.00 - 3.00	Seldom
1.00 - 2.00	Rarely
1.00 - 1.00	Never

Table 16 shows the mean distribution of the respondents in terms of learning practices at school with a total weighted average mean of 3.29 as done sometimes.

Table 17. Mean Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Parents' School Involvement

	MEAN	VERBAL INTERPRETATION	RANK
1 Do you participate in different activities in school? (Sumasali sa iba't ibang aktibidad / gawain sa paaralan)	3.70	Sometimes	3
2 Did you allow your child to join activities in school? (Pumapayag na ang anak ay sumali sa iba't ibang aktibidad/ gawain sa paaralan)	3.78	Sometimes	2
3 Have you met with the teacher to discuss your child's learning? (Nakikipag-ugnayan sa guro upang alamin ang kalagayan ng anak sa paaralan)	3.55	Sometimes	4
4 Do you think your child learned at school? (Sa iyong palagay, natututo ba ang iyong anak sa paaralan?)	3.90	Sometimes	1
Total Average Weighted Mean	3.73	Sometimes	

LEGEND:		
SCALE	VERBAL EQUIVALENT	
4.00 - 5.00	Always	Table 17 shows the mean distribution of the respondents in terms of Parents' School Involvement which has a total average weighted mean of 3.73 as done sometimes.
3.00 - 4.00	Sometimes	
2.00 - 3.00	Seldom	
1.00 - 2.00	Rarely	
1.00 - 1.00	Never	

Table 18. T-Test on the Relationship on the Respondents' Demographic Profile of parents of the Grade III pupils in terms of Gender

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
Gender	107.5	41.72	0.049953	1.6525	Reject the Ho	Significant

Table 18 shows that it does not affect the respondents' demographic profile in terms of gender. The T- value is 1.6525 and the P-value is 0.049953 which is lower than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 19. T-Test on the Relationship on the Respondents' Demographic Profile of parents of the Grade III pupils in terms of Age

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
Age	26.875	11.13	0.049974	1.6525	Reject the Ho	Significant

Table 19 shows that it does not affect the respondents' demographic profile in terms of age. The T- value is 1.6525 and the P-value is 0.049974 which is lower than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 20. T-Test on the Relationship on the Respondents' Demographic Profile of parents of the Grade III pupils in terms of Grade per subject; Mathematics

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
Mathematics	83.52	1.37886	0.049953	1.6525	Reject the Ho	Significant

Table 20 shows that it does not affect the respondents' demographic profile in terms of grades in Mathematics. The T- value is 1.6525 and the P-value is 0.049953 which is lower than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 21. T-Test on the Relationship on the Respondents' Demographic Profile of parents of the Grade III pupils in terms of Grade per subject; English

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
English	83.00	0.70711	0.049953	1.6525	Reject the Ho	Significant

Table 21 shows that it does not affect the respondents' demographic profile in terms of grades in English. The T- value is 1.6525 and the P-value is 0.049953 which is lower than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 22. T-Test on the Relationship on the Respondents' Demographic Profile of parents of the Grade III pupils in terms of Grade per subject; Science

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
Science	83.00	0.70711	0.049953	1.6525	Reject the Ho	Significant

Table 22 shows that it does not affect the respondents' demographic profile in terms of grades in Science. The T- value is 1.6525 and the P-value is 0.049953 which is lower than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 23. T-Test on the Relationship on the Respondents' Demographic Profile of parents of the Grade III pupils in terms of Grade per subject; Filipino

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
Filipino	88.27	8.16708	0.049953	1.6525	Reject the Ho	Significant

Table 23 shows that it does not affect the respondents' demographic profile in terms of grades in Filipino. The T- value is 1.6525 and the P-value is 0.049953 which is lower than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 24. Summary of the T-Test on Relationship of;

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
Gender	107.5	41.72	0.049953	1.6525	Reject the Ho	Significant

Age	26.875	11.13	0.049974	1.6525	Reject the Ho	Significant
Grades in all subject	23.31	39.93	0.04996	1.6527	Reject the Ho	Significant

Table 24 shows that gender, age and grades in all subjects did not affect the respondents' demographic profile. The T- value is 1.6525 for both gender and age and 23.31 for grades in all subjects and the P-value is 0.049953, 0.049974 and 0.049996 respectively, which are lower than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 25. T-Test on the Relationship on the Respondents' level of parental involvement in terms of Early Learning Practices at Home

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
Early Learning Practices at Home	3.293	0.57	0.050003	2.0150	Accept the Ho	Not Significant

Table 25 shows that it does affect the respondents' level of parental involvement in terms of early learning practices at home. The T-value is 2.0150 and the P-value is 0.050003 which is higher than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 26. T-Test on the Relationship on the Respondents' level of parental involvement in terms of Learning Practices at School

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
Learning Practices at School	3.503	0.51	0.050001	1.8331	Accept the Ho	Not Significant

Table 26 shows that it does affect the respondents' level of parental involvement in terms of learning practices at school. The T-value is 1.8331 and the P-value is 0.050001 which is higher than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 27. T-Test on the Relationship on the Respondents' level of parental involvement in terms of Parents' School Involvement

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
Parents' School Involvement	3.733	1.15	0.050153	2.3534	Accept the Ho	Not Significant

Table 27 shows that it does affect the respondents' level of parental involvement in terms of parents' school involvement. The T-value is 2.3534 and the P-value is 0.050153 which is higher than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 28 shows that Early Learning Practices at Home, Learning Practices at School, and Parents' School Involvement affect the respondents' level of parental involvement of parents. The T-value is 1.8331 for both Early Learning Practices at Home and Learning

Practices at School and 2.3534 for Parents School Involvement and the P-value is 0.050003, 0.050001 and 0.050153 respectively which are higher than 0.05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 28. T-Test on the Relationship on the Respondents' level of parental involvement in terms of Learning Practices at School

Respondents	AWM	SD	P-computed value	T- critical value	Decision	Interpretation
Early Learning Practices at Home	3.293	0.57	0.050003	1.8331	Accept the Ho	Not Significant
Learning Practices at School	3.503	0.51	0.050001	1.8331	Accept the Ho	Not Significant
Parents' School Involvement	3.733	1.15	0.050153	2.3534	Accept the Ho	Not Significant

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study revealed that females dominated the respondents. Most of the respondents are under thirty-one to thirty-five and thirty-six to forty years of age and the grades in Second grading is significantly higher than the First Grading. Furthermore, it was found that early learning practices at home involved playing with family while identifying or naming at least ten letters of alphabet is the prominent practice at school. Parents' school involvement focused on thinking about their children's education and learning.

In addition, the study also revealed that there is a significant relationship between the respondents' level of involvement across profile variables such as gender, age and grades in all subjects. Early learning practices at home, learning practices at school and parents' school involvement affect the respondents' level of parental involvement. There are varied effects in the academic performance of family support system. To those learners who received quality family support have higher academic performance than those who receive less.

For further researches, it is recommended: (1) parents should give support to the children in terms of early education at home and practices and involvement at school for a better academic performance of the pupils; (2) parents must understand the importance of education of their children by means of active

involvement and participation in the school; (3) the school should create support activities for the parents so that there will be more parental involvement at school, these will contribute to the awareness of the parents in their duties and responsibilities in assisting their children at school; (4) the Parent-Teachers Association must support all the academic activities of the school by participating actively and creating programs for parent's involvement; and (5) the local government and community must conduct or create more programs that could enhanced the training and skills of the parents to better create a good family structure.

References

- Evans, M.A., & Shaw, D. (2008). Home Grown for Reading: Parental Contributions to Young Children's Emergent Literacy and Word Recognition. *Canadian Psychology*, 49, 89-95.
- Kohl, G. O., Lengua, L. J., McMahon, R. J., & Prevention Research Group, C. P. (2000). Parent Involvement in School Conceptualizing Multiple Dimensions and Their Relations with Family and Demographic Risk Factors. *Journal of school psychology*, 38(6), 501. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4405\(00\)00050-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4405(00)00050-9)
- Sheldon, S. B., & Epstein, J. L. (2005). Involvement Counts: Family and Community Partnerships and Mathematics Achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 98(4), 196-206.
- Walkerdine, V. (1990). Difference, Cognition, and Mathematics Education. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 10(3), 51-56. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40247996>