

The Influence of Parental Involvement On Student Achievement

Jemimah V. Cancino

cancinojemimah@gmail.com

Diliman Preparatory School Commonwealth Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City 1121, Philippines

Abstract

The study examined the relationship between the parental involvement and student achievement and how parent involvement in terms of encouragement, modeling, reinforcement and instruction influences student achievement in Diliman Preparatory School SY 2021-2022. The data were gathered utilizing a the adapted and modified questionnaire and administered to 128 parents of the students enrolled in the intermediate grade level of Diliman Preparatory School. Results showed that parents are strongly agree that they encourage their children to believe that they are capable of learning new things, that they can succeed in school. In terms of modeling, the parents show to their child that they must not give up when things get tough in school and they show that they gain as much knowledge as possible, and they can learn new things. In terms of reinforcement, parents are strongly agree that they show their child that they like it when their child is eager to learn new things and skills to develop and maintain their child's attributes which can result with positive learning outcomes. In terms of Instruction, they teach their child to ask questions when they are unsure about something, and adhere to the teacher's instructions. Finally, the relationship between parental involvement and child's performance was found to be negative. However, the strength of that relationship varied based on the type of assessment used to measure student achievement. The current study found that majority of parents are involved in their children's education, however, more awareness of the parental involvement is needed and more strategies on parental involvement needs to be employed for the success of the new curriculum.

Keywords: parental involvement; student achievement; encouragement; modeling; reinforcement; instruction

INTRODUCTION

The COVID19 pandemic has created challenges and crisis around the world. Due to changing characteristic of the virus, it is continuously impacting every aspect of our lives, economically, politically and cultural landscapes of societies around the world. To stop the virus from spreading, the government implemented quarantine rules and temporarily closed both public and private educational institutions.

The UNESCO (2020) initially reported that more than 28 million Filipino learners have been affected by the COVID19 crisis and by the Philippine government's quarantine measures. With Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan presented by the DepEd, it seeks to get the education back on track, students learning at home, and with support from the learner's partner or parents.

Aside from child-oriented books at home, Brossard et al. (2020) revealed that parental involvement is very important for remote learning to happen and succeed. As a result, all policy decisions that form remote learning should be considered in order for parents to be able to implement and assist their child in learning. Higher student achievement, better interest in academics and homework, and reduced dropout rates have all

been linked to the parental involvement especially in the education of their children. According to Strickland (2015), parental involvement was proven to have positive correlation with the scholastic accomplishment of the students in the past few years, which is why it has gotten more attention in educational system. Correlations have also been found with attendance, behavior, retention of the student's grades, as well as the satisfaction both of the students and of the parents.

The cognitive development of every children is heavily influenced by their parents, thus, for the child to succeed, the connection between the parents and school must be retained most especially during the child's primary school years (Bartolome et al., 2017). In addition, as discussed by Boonk et. al (2018), for years, the relationship between involvement of the parents and achievement academically of the student has caught experts' interest especially in educational system. In general, the findings of this meta-analyses show that there was a significant link between parental involvement and student achievement academically.

In some countries, researchers revealed that the involvement of parents in the education of their children have a significant effect on student's achievement academically in school. This notion was further cemented by Ndirangu and Kibaara (2014) who stated that those parents who are more interested on the education of their children and actively attending school's programs, activities and conferences with their children performed better academically and are more disciplined.

In the Philippines, some researchers looked into the parental involvement and the student achievement and its correlation. Cuartero-Enteria and Tagyam (2020) studied the indigenous people's parents and their parental involvement in chosen elementary schools in Mindanao's northern region which the parents' profile was specifically identified. In this study they include the parental support financially and involvement in terms of learning at home and communication. The result of this study showed that the parental involvement of Indigenous people plays a critical part in students' academic. But, they also stated that there is still room for progress that needs to be aimed in terms of improving the awareness like continuous enhancement training for indigenous people regarding the relationship of the school, parents, and effective guidance.

Based on the above-mentioned studies, over time, it can be seen that, there have been studies conducted on the positive impacts and importance of parental involvement in influencing students' academic performance. The majority of studies have also looked at the socioeconomic status of the participants and parent's profile but little has been done on investigating how and to what extent parental involvement influence students' achievement which is the thrust of this study.

This study would like to determine the relationship between the parental involvement on student achievement in Diliman Preparatory School. Specifically, to describe the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, employment, work modality, monthly income, and grade level of the child they supervised. Regardless of the fact that the importance of parental involvement in education of every child being recognized worldwide, a significant number of DPS parents are rarely interested in the achievement of their children academically. Consequently, the result of this study will contribute to the betterment, development and enhancement of the programs and activities that encourages parental involvement. For the side of the parents, this is a great help to identify the effective parenting practices and strategies that fosters academic achievements. As to the Master of Arts in Educational Leadership and Management program, this study could serve as the reference for future research on the development and enhancement of the school programmes, activities and curriculum.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Parental Involvement

For a long time, researchers have been studying parental involvement in the educational system which have a great contribution in developmental and educational outcomes for preschool, elementary school children, and even in secondary school. In this study, the term "parental involvement" may be described as to any adult

who is the child's primary family caregiver and the provider of basic needs. Non-biological guardians such as stepparents, or foster parents and adoptive parents are included in this category, as well as the biological parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, or siblings. At least two adults should be responsible of the upbringing of the child, this includes working together with the child that may provide a help in the social and emotional development of the child. Bartolome (2017) made mentioned that Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, as children grow through elementary, middle, and high school, Parental involvement was described like a "rich vein" of influence of their parents in their lives. This suggests that the benefits of a healthy home-school relationship extend beyond a child's academic success in their early years of education and into adulthood.

According to Liu (2010), Over the years, involvement of parents has already been identified as an unattainable goal and usually is associated in different activities which are centered on the interaction between the home and the school. The Hoover-Dempsey-Sandler (1995, 1997) model was developed and considered as the original model of parental involvement. It looks into parental involvement and the methods of influence that parents employ if they're involved. This mechanism was created in the context of traditional education. These mechanisms are the psychological underpinnings of involved parents' behavior and activities, were utilized by the parents during their involvement in the schoolwork of their child that most likely explains how involvement affects education outcomes of the student and his/her performance academically (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005, p. 8); the following mechanism of the parental involvement are the following: encouragement, modeling, reinforcement, and instruction. According to this model, the focus of parental encouragement is on how parents support their child affectively especially in the child's education such as guiding them doing homework or any learning and school related activities. It also means that, when a child who is encouraged to persevere is more likely to succeed in doing so than compared to a child who isn't. However, the learning that students might gain from the modeling of pro-social behavior by their parents which is related to parental modeling. Students can learn from their parents as their role model or examples, and if they see their parents taking an active role in school events, they will be more driven to learn. The parental reinforcement, puts emphasis on the parents that rewarding positive attitudes and behavior that are associated with positive learning results which will develop and maintain these positive characteristics. It implies that certain actions will be repeated (or acquired) by children. when they are consistently connected with positive reinforcement patterns. Finally, the last scale is the parental instruction, this manifests itself in the and connection bond of the parents and their child during the involvement in schoolwork and activities such as doing the homework, as the parents and child discuss learning strategies in a collaborative manner, the processes, and result, as well as implementation of the instructional strategies.

The involvement of the parents can be defined in a variety of ways. According to Nadenge (2015), the parental involvement is characterized as the parent's participation on the student's school work as well as understanding of the relationship between parenting qualities and academic accomplishment of students, as well as a commitment to students. Similarly, according to Bartolome, et al. (2017), parental involvement is defined as a parent's level of involvement in their child' education.

Parental involvement incorporates both home-based and school-based. Altschul (2012) offer the following characteristics of these two forms of Parental involvement: assisting pupils with their assignments, interacting and having a conversation with them regarding school, setting and communicating high expectations, fostering student achievement in school, and providing structures for learning are all examples of parental involvement from the comfort of their own homes. Volunteering, participating in school programs and groups, and establishing relationships with teaching personnel and non-teaching personnel are all examples of parental involvement which is school- based. Boonk, et al. (2017), for example, distinguishes between two types of involvement of the parents. School-based techniques include connecting with the teacher of their child and attending and actively joining school programs while home-based methods techniques include providing structure and support for the child's learning and education at the comfort of their home. Although in many

researches, the term "parental involvement" is described in many variety of ways. According to LaRocque, et al. (2011), parental involvement is defined as "the dedication of resources by the parent to the child".

"The role of parental involvement in online schooling could be more important than it is in traditional schooling where the teacher teach in the classroom," according to Russell (2004). Bulkley, K., and Fisler, J. (2003) stated that the parental involvement is also important in the different modes of learning and education specially in traditional and non-traditional in every public and private schools, and homeschooling which was agreed also by Green, C.L., and Hoover-Dempsey, K. (2007). Teachers and students being present physically has a great effect on the development and formation of success academically was defined by Roblyer and Marhsall (2003), an example is the ability to control oneself especially in difficult situations, ability to use technology, self-respect, motivation to learn, and effective skills in managing the time.

An authoritarian parenting style are prevalent among Filipino parents in the Philippines, according to Alampay (n.d.). According to her research, the aforementioned culture and values of shyness (*mahiya*), helping others (*pakikipagkapwa*), and repaying (*utang na loob*) are some of the interconnected concepts that influence the dynamics of many Filipino parents' parenting styles and the relationship between parent and child which are the respect of the children for authority of the parents and obedience, togetherness in the family, and meeting familial commitments are all characteristics of these families. Filipino parenting style and behaviors may change in the nearing future, according to the findings of her study about parenting here in the Philippines. Therefore, before proceeding to the development of Parental Involvement policies and frameworks, the repercussions of the mentioned new behaviors and beliefs affecting Filipino families and the development of the children must be completely evaluated. Although many Filipino parents with different socioeconomic backgrounds believe that education is very important to the development of their children and they're prepared to go beyond their capacity to ensure the academic success their child.

In Philippine schools, one of the very serious problem that they face is about the school retention of the students, with many children failing to proceed above the elementary years (Blair, 2014). Parents in the Philippines are concerned about the education of the children want their children to succeed, but because of their culture's established filial responsibilities, the family's basic needs take precedence over the individual needs of the child, according to his comparative study of Filipino and American cultures. So he applies theories that foresee the flow of family capital in his studies. It suggests that, future research should look into the additional foreign populations to be aware of differences in terms of culture and develop more theories that take cultural and structural factors into account.

However, the Philippines has established programs that encourage parental involvement regardless of the barriers to promoting and implementing it. In the Philippines, as in other nations, there are public and private schools are available, Parent-Teacher Associations or also known as PTA which the DepEd Memorandum No. 74 series from 1999 governs it. Every Parent-Teacher Associations has in place systems guarantee appropriate collaboration with the members of the community, an open forum for bringing up and resolving important issues ahead, and support and help in the promotion of their shared and agreed interests for the school. To cultivate solidarity and participation frequent meetings with civic organizations, LGU or local government units, and other stakeholders are held. The PTA follows all the guidelines and rules that Department of Education implemented as a school-based organization. The PTA is both a support group and a significant school's partner, this relationship will clearly have defined by how much participation and open communication are required to promote the students' well-being.

Aside from PTA, the Brigada Eskwela program is also run Department of Education which is a yearly event that brings a variety of stakeholders' voluntary efforts together such as parents, students together with the teachers and work together as one to maintain and beautify the school before the start of the classes. The Adopt-A-School initiative began in 1998, when Republic Act 8525 was signed into law. Its purpose is to

exercise shared governance, bring education to the community level, and enhance public schools with local resources.

Student Achievement

Whitaker (2019) discussed the model originated by Hoover-Dempsey et al. (2005) about the Parent Involvement Process. According to him, family engagement procedure that starts with a decision by families to engage and concludes with student outcomes. He also mentioned that academic outcomes are included in the Student Achievement model, which many educators, parents, and policymakers consider to be the one of the greatest and important aspect of family involvement. When discussing the advantages of family involvement, the most frequently stated as distal outcomes are summative achievement indicators. Distal outcomes are assessments of students' academic learning that are both Formative, the short quizzes and even long test that evaluate the student's comprehension during the process of learning or acquiring the new skills and knowledge. Summative, the assessments that evaluate how much student has learned at the end of the whole lesson or throughout a course. Other than that, these may include also the records of the attendance, rates of academic development, the grades in each subject, GPA, results on a standardized test, rates of graduation, and rates in college admission. This also suggests that family involvement has a significant impact on socioemotional learning. Socioemotional learning is the development of a set of abilities that represent a person's capacity to control their emotions, set and achieve positive objectives and long term goals, take an interest in social perspectives, and keep positive relationships going.

Parental level of educational attainment, occupational status, and the size of a student's family has been found to have a significant impact on their performance academically (Afful, 2014; Mensah, 2013) cited by Darko-Asumadu (2021). Parents' educational level are important in schooling, according to Mallan (2009), because parents want their children to keep up with the rest of the class. As to the educational background, refers to the type and level of education received by an individual. Students with parents who have received a diploma from high school or higher perform better academically, according to Nannyonjo (2007). He evaluated the differences of student's performance whose parents did not complete elementary school to student's performance whose parents completed senior high school, or university by comparing the two. He discovered that the students performed well in school if their parents attended or completed senior high school, or university.

Beller (2008) claims that education has a significant impact on several generations. The quality and amount of time that the parents devote to their child is linked to the educational status of the parents. If the student has both parents with a low level of educational perform consistently worse than students who have both parents with a higher level of educational (Mensah, 2013). There is a high chance that that low literacy will be passed down to the following era in families where the parents have difficulty in terms of literacy (Cooter, 2006).

Having a job, on the other hand, limits the amount of time and quality with which parents can have with their children and participate in their education. There is a link between occupational level of the parents and the performance of their child in school and academically, according to Hassan's (2009) research. People who have a higher occupational level have more assets to provide the basic needs of their family, while those with a lower occupational level have lesser assets (Kalil, 2005).

Parents with a higher salary may have higher expectations and ambitions on the education and careers of their child, which can have an impact on their desire to learn (Afful, 2014). Similarly, research by Juma (2016), revealed that between the occupational level of the parents and their children's performance in school and academically, there is a significant positive correlation.

Mudassir and Abubakar (2015) looked into the influence of the occupation of the parents on secondary school students' achievement academically in Malaysia. Students whose parents have a formal job and profession have a better performance in school compare those students whose parents have only a secondary education. Parents in unskilled occupations, according to Graetz (2006), earn lower income and must often work longer shifts to support and provide the needs of their families.

In Pakistan, Muhammed (2012) investigated the influence of occupational level of the parents on the English learning of their children. The findings revealed that the parents' occupation has a positive relationship with learning English, which varies depending on their occupation. Parents said their job dictated whether or not they had enough time with their children, and to participate in their education or whether or not they could afford to pay their children's tuition and other fees (Nadenge, 2015). According to Reeves (2009) that the economic activities of parents may create problems for day students arising from a lot of work at home.

Other studies focus on the family size of the students which also affects the students' academic performance. According to Chen and Liu (2014), cited by Darko-Asumadu (2021), the size of a family has shown a slight effect on performance the performance of the students academically. The overall level of maturity mentally, as well as resources, parental responsiveness and caring have improved, all of these things will help children succeed in school. Children from large families are more likely to experience the diminishing of academic performance benefits from family resources (Chen & Liu, 2014). There are several studies relating to student's achievement, students profile and factors affecting academic performance in various disciplines.

Mbathia (2005) claims that education equips people with specific abilities that enable them to do their jobs efficiently. The more successful and rewarded a person is, the better and the more competitive that person will be. According to Owiti (2001), mindset leads to achievement, while abilities are essential for success. Intellectual capability and motivation, according to Bandura (1997), are important factors in academic performance. In relation to student motivational resources, there have been studies on self-perspective, self-respect, intrinsic motivation, activity appraisal, attributions of success and failure, self-efficacy, success expectations, learning goals, and other dimensions. The study discovered that the higher a variable's predictive value is, the closer and more particular it is to the tested scholastic subject. As a result, student self-efficacy beliefs and learning goals are seen as important elements in their academic success.

Relationship of Parental Involvement and Student Achievement

Several studies revealed that the linked parental involvement to positive student outcomes and academic performance are visible. Improved writing skill, improved reading, increased mathematics achievement skill and increased grade point average (GPA) are some of the positive outcomes. Another positive outcome, Involvement of parents has even been linked with behavioral and attitude outcome towards school including lower drop-out rates, the time spent on homework has an increase among these student and improvement of self-regulatory ability.

Online learning necessitates the absence of the teacher's physical presence; it will continue to be a mystery how to effectively support online students in staying on track with their assignments. Researches by Cavanaugh et al. (2004) and Ferdig, et al. (2005) revealed that there are indeed unique characteristics to online learning, nonetheless, it has some academic success indicators which are common in the traditional education setting, similar to McConnell (2000) and Mills (2003) studies. Given the issue of distance that comes with online learning, as well as the unpredictability shift of face-to-face mode of learning into an online mode of learning, it is not reasonable to assume that involvement of the parents in online learning will have similar effects on student achievement as it does in traditional schooling.

The relationship between parental involvement and student achievement has piqued researchers' interest for many years. However, empirical research does not reveal which forms of parental involvement are interconnected to the student's success academically. Mixed results from a different of investigations have resulted in this ambiguity. In some studies, there are particular types of parental involvement that were associated with improved and increased academic achievement, but some studies found no connection between the involvement of the parents and with the achievement of their children academically. Furthermore, parental involvement was proven to be inversely related to the success academically in many researches.

Parental educational goals for their children, home structure, communication of the parent and child discussing about school matters, and parental involvement in activities that are related to school were all investigated by Boonk (2018). They revealed that if the component of parental participation is about their child's school activities, there was no relation to student's achievement, on the other hand, other component which is "household structure" had a slight negative association. They revealed on their study that the parental involvement component which is the discussion between the parent and the child had a moderate positive impact. Among the other parental involvement components, the parental aspiration component exhibited the largest positive link with accomplishment. He also mentioned that among 8th graders, the communication between parent and child that talks about the school matters at home had the strongest positive correlation with student success. They also discovered that parental involvement in their children's educational activities had a neutral effect on academic performance. These are just a few illustrations of how findings on parental involvement and its correlation to academic achievement, like many other complex phenomena, are conflicting.

As Walker (2011) mentioned, it is critical and important to various forms of parental involvement because there are various kinds of parental involvement that can have a positive effect on the achievement of the student academically but there are or negative impact also. He also laid out his three consistent findings about parents' reasons as a result of their involvement in the education of their children. First, at home, there were parents who are involved and more active in the education of their children at home and less in school. Examples of these home-based interactions are discussions about the activities of their child as well as the other school work like how to help them in their projects and homework, reiterating the importance of education, or stating positive learning expectations for the student. On the other hand, examples of school-based interaction are attending the PTC or the teacher and parent conferences, school and classroom visitations, volunteering, or help they offer in school's programs and events. This may two may seem to be the two sides of a coin but both are very important involvement because school staff frequently characterize involvement that are specific to the school only, this may cause them to give less importance on how much time minority parents spend at home on some activities. Second, the most reliably vigorous indicators of parental involvement are relevant motivators of involvement, such as perception of the parents that their children and their children's teachers appreciate and welcome their involvement. Requests for homework assistance and with some specific assignments, and child's invitations to come to school or attend a school programs are all examples of particular invitations to participate from the teacher. Requests made directly for parental assistance from the student, as well as indicators of behaviors indicating that parental involvement is a must and required. These are frequently included in specific invitations to participate from their child. Another example of this is the direct request of the student for participation in a school performance, assistance of the parents with their child's schoolwork activities or any learning-related activities such as assignments and tasks, and the student's observable behavior when they need assistance (e.g., procrastination, frustration, having trouble with the assignment); parents' involvement behaviors have been proven to be influenced by all of these factors.

Finally, parental resources, such as energy and time, as well as parental aptitudes and knowledge for involvement, are not a reliable indicator of parental involvement. These findings suggest that, despite the lack

of resources, when parents believe their children and teachers want them to involve, they will look for another way to be included regardless of the resources they have.

METHODS

The research design used is quantitative descriptive method. Quantitative methods emphasize objective measurements and statistical, mathematical, or numerical analysis of data obtained through polls, questionnaires, and surveys, or by modifying pre-existing statistical data using computing tools, as Babbie (2010) mentioned. Its main focus is to gather numerical data and generalize it across groups of individuals or to describe a specific phenomenon.

In this research, the data was gathered through online survey questionnaire that suits the problem set in the study. This study is descriptive for it described the personal and professional profile of the respondents. This study is quantitative in nature, and it also determined the relationships between parental involvement and student achievement.

The participants of the study were comprised by parents of the students enrolled in the intermediate grade level of Diliman Preparatory School SY 2021-2022. Specifically, 128 parents of 4th grade class with a total number of 62 parents, 5th grade class with a total number of 28 parents, and 6th grade class with a total number of 38 parents. The random sampling was utilized in the selection of the respondent.

A total of 128 parents of Diliman Preparatory School in three different grade levels were the respondents of the study.

The study used the adapted and modified questionnaire checklist from the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2005) research. The questionnaire consisted of 2 parts: Part 1 indicated the profile of the respondents which included the following areas: age, sex, educational attainment, employment, work modality, monthly income, and grade level of the child they supervised. Part 2 indicated the checklist with 51 statements which entailed the extent of parental involvement extended by the parents of Diliman Preparatory School on their child focusing on the area of encouragement, modeling, reinforcement, and instruction. The researcher used the Likert Scale as the basis of respondents' ratings in the extent of parental involvement. A 6-point scale is employed: 6- strongly agree, 5- agree, 4- slightly agree, 3 - slightly disagree, 2- disagree and 1- strongly disagree. To ensure its validity for use, the researcher validated the questionnaire through the assistance of professionals in the field of education. Additionally, the instrument was tested for reliability and has a result of 0.976 Cronbach alpha which implies that the instrument is acceptable.

The researcher sent a letter for the approval on the conduct of the study to the office of the School Principals and Assistant Principal of the respondent-schools. Before the actual gathering of data, to ensure the reliability of the test, a dry run was conducted to common parents who were not part of the study. During the gathering of data, the authors with class advisers of each grade level personally distributed the instrument to the respondents. The researcher used survey questionnaire as a method of data collections. Since this study was conducted amidst the pandemic, questionnaire is distributed through online platform such as emails, messenger and google forms. The respondents were instructed to tick the corresponding box appropriate for their answer and it is manually tallied by the researcher.

The results of the study were interpreted using different statistical tools. The demographic profile of the respondents was described using frequency distribution. The results were calculated using weighted mean and independent sample t-test which assessed the parental involvement and student achievement. Moreover, to determine significant relationship between parental involvement and student achievement, Pearson correlation analysis was utilized. Finally, to further test the significant difference between sex of respondents, t-test for independent samples done. Analysis of variance was used to determine significant differences in the parental

involvement when the respondents are grouped according to age, educational attainment, employment, work modality, monthly income, and grade level of the child they supervised.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1
Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percent
Below 30	3	2.3
30 to 39	35	27.3
40 to 49	77	60.2
50 to 59	10	7.8
60 and above	3	2.3
Sex		
Male	29	22.7
Female	99	77.3
Educational attainment		
High school	3	2.3
College level	13	10.2
College graduate	85	66.4
Masteral level	20	15.6
Doctoral level	7	5.5
Employment		
Unemployed	27	21.1
Skilled worker	15	11.7
Professional	86	67.2
Work modality		
No response	26	20.7
Work from home	34	26.6
Mixed (WFH and in-person)	45	35.2
Reporting (in-person)	23	18.0
Monthly income		
Below 15,000	3	2.3
15,000 to 24,000	8	6.3
25,000 to 34,000	12	9.4
35,000 to 49,000	9	7.0
50,000 to 74,000	23	18.0
75,000 to 99,000	13	10.2
100,000 to 150,000	30	23.4
Grade of child they supervised		
4	62	48.4
5	28	21.9
6	38	29.7

Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, employment, work profile, income, grade level of child they supervised.

From the total number of respondents, 77 or 60.2 percent fell within the age bracket of 40-49 years; 35 or 27.3 percent of the respondents are 30-39 years old; 10 or 7.8 percent of the respondents are 50-59 years old; 3 or 2.3 percent of the respondents are below 30 years old and 60 and above. This means that there are more parents at the age of 40-49 years old that served as respondents of the study, followed by the parents at the age of 30-39 years old.

As to their sex, 29 or 22.7 percent of the respondents are male and 99 or 77.3 percent are female. The results clearly indicate that there was an uneven distribution of respondents according to sex for there were more female parents than male.

In terms of educational attainment, 85 or 66.4 percent of the respondents were college graduate; 20 or 15.6 percent of the respondents were from Master's level; 13 or 10.2 percent of the respondents were from college level; 7 or 5.5 percent of the respondents were from Doctoral level and 3 or 2.3 percent of the parents were from high school level. This means that there are more respondents from college graduate than the rest of the educational attainment of the respondents.

In terms of employment, table shows 86 or 67 percent of the respondents are professionals; 27 or 21.1 percent are unemployed and 15 or 11.7 percent of the respondents are skilled worker. This means that there are more respondents who are working as professional than as skilled worker and unemployed respondents.

As to the work modality of the respondents, 45 or 35.2 percent of the respondents have a work modality of mixed which is a combination of work from home modality and in-person work modality; 34 or 26.6 percent of the respondents are work from home; 23 or 18.0 percent of the parents are reporting (in-person). However, 26 or 20.7 percent of the respondents had no response in terms of their work modality. This means that there are more parents who have a work modality of mixed or work from home and in-person work modality. It is closely followed by the respondents who have a work modality of work from home.

In terms of the respondents' monthly income, 30 or 23.4 percent of the respondents have a monthly income of 100,000 to 150, 000. It is closely followed by 23 or 18.0 percent of the respondents have a monthly income of 50,000 to 74,000. This means that the biggest percentage of the respondents have a monthly income of 100,000 to 150, 000. The profile helps in examining the capability and comprehension of parental support for the academic endeavors of their children.

Table shows 48.4 percent of the child they supervised were in 4th grade, 38 (29.7%) were in 6th grade, and 28 (21.9%) were in 5th grade. The above result is not surprising because there were more students in grade 4 who are enrolled compare to other grade level this School year 2021-2022.

Table 2
Parental Involvement in Terms of Encouragement

Indicator	Mean	VI	Rank
We encourage the child...			
when he or she doesn't feel like doing schoolwork.	5.30	A	13
when he or she has trouble organizing schoolwork.	5.38	A	10
to try new ways to do schoolwork when he or she is having a hard time.	5.55	SrA	6
to be aware of how he or she is doing with schoolwork.	5.57	SrA	4
when he or she has trouble doing schoolwork.	5.48	A	8
to look for more information about school subjects.	5.54	SrA	7
to develop an interest in schoolwork.	5.56	SrA	5
to believe that he/she can do well in school.	5.71	SrA	2
to stick with problems until he/she solves it.	5.37	A	11

to believe that he/she can learn new things.	5.77	SrA	1
to ask other people for help when a problem is hard to solve.	5.36	A	12
to explain what he/she thinks to the teacher.	5.43	A	9
to follow the teacher's directions.	5.66	SrA	3
Composite mean	5.51	SrA	

Legend: 5.50-6.00 =strongly agree; 4.50-5.49=agree; 3.50-4.49 = slightly agree; 2.50-3.49= slightly disagree; 1.50-2.49= disagree; 1.00-1.49= strongly disagree; SrA - Strongly agree; A - Agree

Table 2 presents the parental involvement in terms of encouragement with a composite mean of strongly agree (mean =5.51). The focus of this scale was on expressive support of the parents and motivation for the student's desire to learn and in school, as well as enthusiasm for learning and a different of learning tools. Based on the table, the item "to believe that he/she can learn new things." Got the highest mean of 5.77 that is verbally interpreted as "strongly agree". As a result, parents of the vast majority of students are constantly encouraging them to learn. The preceding findings suggest that parents support the educational goals of their children and this was confirmed by Baidoo-Anu's (2018) findings, which state that parents should support and motivate their children to pursue education. According to Liu et al. (2010), the focus of parental encouragement is parents' expressive affective encouragement for the student to engage in any activities that are related in learning and school related. While the item "to believe that he/she can do well in school." Got the second highest mean of 5.71 with verbal interpretation "strongly agree". That is to mean, parents can help their children develop confidence in their ability to learn or academic self-efficacy by encouraging them to persevere in their studies.

Furthermore, the indicator "to follow the teacher's directions." Got the third highest mean of 5.66. This shows that the parent believes that presence and the teacher's assistance has some implications on the student's development which can influence also the success of their children academically in school.

However, the item "when he or she doesn't feel like doing schoolwork." Got the lowest mean of 5.30 this means that parents needs to be aware about strategies that may employ to facilitate their children doing schoolwork. This lends support to the idea that when parents prioritize schoolwork, their child's academic work ethic takes precedence over the knowledge gained from collaborative projects and assignments.

In addition to this, the item "to ask other people for help when a problem is hard to solve." Got 5.36 mean which falls on the 12th rank which means that in this category, knowledge and self-perceived skills appear to play a role in respondents' decisions about how involved they want to be with their child's schoolwork, as exposed by Hoover - Dempsey (2005). They were more enthusiastic about participating in the activity if they thought their skills were adequate, a finding that is in line with parents' tendencies to place a greatest value on the academic achievement of their child. Parents who felt their aptitudes were insufficient, most probably they will seek assistance from other members of the family, ask their child to get more information at school or to their teacher, or seek additional help on their own. An example of this is when the parents ask their child to call their teacher or call a member of their family or maybe close friend who has more expertise or knowledge about the subject. Likewise, parents with less resources in their families may face difficulties in this area, because less knowledgeable support systems are more likely to provide fewer suggestions for dealing with each specific involvement issue.

Also, on the 11th rank, the indicator "to stick with problems until he/she solves it" resulted 5.37 mean clearly depicted that parents prefer control and give direct aid or interference in the context of schoolwork. According to Gonida and Cortina (2014), in terms of types of involvement connected to instruction, it's possible that what parents do and why they do it differ significantly. There were parents who may support the autonomy of their children by providing scaffolding that allows them to come up with solutions on their own,

as well as parents who have the ability to exert control over their children through the use of commands, directives and orders or by trying to interfere with assignments by providing correct answers.

Table 3
Parental Involvement in Terms of Modeling

Indicator	Mean	VI	Rank
We show the child that we...			
like to learn new things.	5.69	SrA	4.5
know how to solve problems.	5.69	SrA	4.5
enjoy figuring things out.	5.63	SrA	6
do not give up when things get hard	5.73	SrA	1
ask others for help when a problem is hard to solve.	5.41	A	9.5
can explain what we think to others.	5.41	A	9.5
can learn new things.	5.71	SrA	2.5
want to learn as much as possible.	5.71	SrA	2.5
like to solve problems.	5.61	SrA	8
try different ways to solve a problem when things get hard.	5.62	SrA	7
Composite mean	5.57	SrA	

Legend: 5.50-6.00 =strongly agree; 4.50-5.49=agree; 3.50-4.49 = slightly agree; 2.50-3.49= slightly disagree; 1.50-2.49= disagree; 1.00-1.49= strongly disagree; SrA - Strongly agree; A - Agree

Table 3 shows the parental involvement in terms of modeling with a composite mean of strongly agree (mean =5.57).

The respondents strongly agree with the modeling in item “do not give up when things get hard” with the highest mean of 5.73, clearly shows that the parents believe that if they show this attributes to their children then it maximizes the chances of their children to learn not to quit in this competitive environment. In connection with this, it only proves that the part of parents' academic involvement for their children is their viewpoints about what kind of role they ought to play in the education of their child. Strickland (2015) stated that parents' conviction about what they ought to do about the education of their children make up parental-role construction for involvement, which supports my point of view. He also stated that two factors influence role construction: how favorably they remember their school experiences and the convictions they have shape about what they ought to do to assist their child succeed academically. The items “want to learn as much as possible.” And “can learn new things” are rank the same respectively with the mean of 5.71. Parents who accept they have the capacity to learn new skills are more likely to encourage their children to do so as well, which will support them in their efforts to persevere in the face of new and sometimes challenging school work. They are less likely to persist if they do not hold this belief. This is similar to what Strickland (2015) stated, that parents with a better level of self-efficacy are usually very persistent in helping their children get through difficult situations. Individuals choose what they, as parents and guardians, are anticipated to do to assist their children perform well in school. He examined how parents utilize their convictions in their capacities to assist their child (self-efficacy), in addition to this is their perceptions and life encounters (social cognition) to decide what role they will play within the educational lives of their child.

In contrast, items namely, “like to solve problems.” On the 8th rank gained 5.61 total mean. It is evident that the influence in the area of problem solving isn't view as vital factor in parental modeling. The types of involvement activities that parents choose to participate in are influenced by their own opinions about their abilities and their knowledge. If the type of involvement matches with their perceptions about their abilities and knowledge, parents are more likely to take action and involve themselves; however, parents may be afraid to act if they consider their abilities or knowledge are lacking.

Lastly, “can explain what we think to others” and “ask others for help when a problem is hard to solve”. On the same rank (9.5) with mean of 5.41. This beliefs of the parents about clear communication and expressing their thoughts, values of the individual and the family, goals and objectives, aspirations and expectations is important in shaping students’ beliefs and behaviors related to learning which is one form of involvement. Furthermore, based from the model offered by Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1995, 1997), asking for help is viewed as one of the dimensions of the social success in school, this means that successful students know how to seek assistance when they are stumped and know how to work collaboratively with their peers in the classroom. This implies that these qualities are necessary for the success academically.

Table 4
Parental Involvement in Terms of Reinforcement

Indicator	Mean	VI	Rank
We show this child we like it when he or she ...			
wants to learn new things.	5.78	SrA	1
tries to learn as much as possible.	5.77	SrA	2.5
has a good attitude about doing his or her homework.	5.77	SrA	2.5
keeps working on homework even when he or she doesn’t feel like it.	5.30	A	13
asks the teacher for help.	5.45	A	11
explains what he or she thinks to the teacher.	5.52	SrA	10
explains to us what he or she thinks about school.	5.58	SrA	7
works hard on homework.	5.61	SrA	6
understands how to solve problems.	5.64	SrA	4
sticks with a problem until he or she solves it.	5.41	A	12
organizes his or her schoolwork.	5.62	SrA	5
checks his or her work.	5.57	SrA	8
finds new ways to do schoolwork when he or she gets stuck.	5.55	SrA	9
Composite mean	5.58	SrA	

Legend: 5.50-6.00 =strongly agree; 4.50-5.49=agree; 3.50-4.49 = slightly agree; 2.50-3.49= slightly disagree; 1.50-2.49= disagree; 1.00-1.49= strongly disagree; SrA - Strongly agree; A - Agree

Table 4 shows the parental involvement in terms of reinforcement. The composite mean, 5.58 presents that the respondents of this study strongly agree with reinforcement to develop and maintain their child’s attributes which can result with positive learning outcomes.

The indicator “wants to learn new things.” got the highest mean of 5.78, followed by the items “tries to learn as much as possible” and “has a good attitude about doing his or her homework” ranked the same with the mean of 5.77 and lastly the item “keeps working on homework even when he or she doesn’t feel like it” which gained the lowest mean of 5.30. It mirrors behaviorist learning concepts, which highlight the implications of the consequences that will occur as a result of a particular action and how they behave, which greatly helps in the formation of specific behavioral patterns of their child. When it comes to student education, these reinforcement theories explained that if children’s attitude and behavior or any learned behavioral patterns are regularly reinforced with positive reward then children will repeat the same attitude and behavior (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005). They also motivate students to engage in actions that enhance and sustain student characteristics linked to positive success or learning outcomes. Parental reinforcement, according to Liu et al. (2010), could be a powerful motivator for students to be positive in their responsibility in terms of learning and to be persistent in order to meet learning objectives. Parents can set a good example for their children by demonstrating their enthusiasm for school and the importance of

education. They have the ability to motivate students to stay focused on their educational tasks and to be adamant about solving any difficulties they may encounter during the learning process. Parental reinforcement may help in the establishment and development of great attitude, behavior and habits in learning such as focus and perseverance during the learning process in an online mode of learning.

Table 5
Parental Involvement in Terms of Instruction

Indicator	Mean	VI	Rank
We teach this child ...			
to go at his or her own pace while doing schoolwork.	5.54	SrA	14
to take a break from his or her work when he or she gets frustrated.	5.58	SrA	11.5
how to check homework as he or she goes along.	5.59	SrA	9.5
how to get along with others in his or her class.	5.69	SrA	5
to follow the teacher's directions.	5.73	SrA	1.5
how to make his or her homework fun.	5.58	SrA	11.5
how to find out more about the things that interest him or her.	5.62	SrA	8
to try the problems that help him or her learn the most.	5.59	SrA	9.5
to have a good attitude about his or her homework.	5.71	SrA	3
to keep trying when he or she gets stuck.	5.55	SrA	13
to stick with his or her homework until he or she finishes it.	5.39	A	15
to work hard.	5.66	SrA	6
to communicate with the teacher when he or she has questions.	5.70	SrA	4
to ask questions when he or she doesn't understand something	5.73	SrA	1.5
to make sure he or she understands one part before going onto the next.	5.64	SrA	7
Composite mean	5.62	SrA	

Legend: 5.50-6.00 =strongly agree; 4.50-5.49=agree; 3.50-4.49 = slightly agree; 2.50-3.49= slightly disagree; 1.50-2.49= disagree; 1.00-1.49= strongly disagree; SrA - Strongly agree; A - Agree

Table 5 shows the parental involvement in terms of instruction. The composite mean, 5.62 shows that the learners; parents are strongly agreeing with Instruction as their parental involvement which it manifests the bond and connection of the parents and their child during involvement in schoolwork and activities such as doing homework as the parent and child engage in collaborative thinking about learning outcomes, processes, and strategies.

Based on the table, the respondents teach their child to ask questions when he or she doesn't understand something and to follow the teacher's directions. It resulted at the mean of 5.73. This is clear indication that the respondents believe that one of the vital variables that can impact the achievement of the students academically is the student-teacher interaction. Curtis (2013) found that having a facilitator or teacher available to assist students with unique needs was very important when taking online courses.

Third to the rank was "to have a good attitude about his or her homework" with a total mean of 5.71 and verbal interpretation of strongly agree. Respondents chose this variable because they believe that the students who has a positive attitude towards academics can result in a positive attitude towards their homework and schoolwork, higher rate of homework completion, fewer problems with homework, and higher academic achievement. As mentioned by Gonida and Cortina (2014), that theories and studies they claim that involvement of the parents and guardians in assignments of their children is advantageous to success and education only in specific circumstances and for specific groups of people. The extent to which homework is

involved (e.g., autonomous support, interfering), the level of education (e.g., primary school student vs. high school students), and the student's knowledge level (e.g., low, neutral and high achieving) in addition to this is the subject matter (e.g., science, language, math) have all been identified as critical factors in the literature.

On the other hand, statement that falls under the lowest part was “to stick with his or her homework until he or she finishes it” with a composite mean of 5.39 and a verbal interpretation of agree. This is closely followed by second lowest statement “to go at his or her own pace while doing schoolwork” with a total mean of 5.54 and strongly agree as verbal interpretation. Parents tend to like spend less time doing and completing their child's homework. The above result is not surprising because, as stated by Boonk et al. (2018), it is questionable how involvement of parents in the schoolwork and activities of their child may benefit them, because there was a weak correlation result between this type of involvement and in child's success. They also stated that research has shown that helping children with their homework has no significant relationship with achievement or is negatively related to achievement.

Table 6
Summary Table on Level of Parental Involvement

Indicator	Mean	VI	Rank
Encouragement	5.51	SrA	4
Modeling	5.57	SrA	3
Reinforcement	5.58	SrA	2
Instruction	5.62	SrA	1

Legend: 5.50-6.00 =strongly agree; 4.50-5.49=agree; 3.50-4.49 = slightly agree; 2.50-3.49= slightly disagree; 1.50-2.49= disagree; 1.00-1.49= strongly disagree; SrA - Strongly agree; A – Agree

Table 6 presents that summary on level of parental involvement wherein; the respondents strongly agree with the instruction as their parental involvement with the mean of 5.62 and parental involvement such as reinforcement with the mean of 5.58, modeling parental involvement which gained the mean of 5.57. On the other hand, respondents strongly agree with encouragement parental involvement which gained the mean of 5.51.

According to Neitzel and Stright (2001), focusing the child's interest on the problem, offering an overview of the task goal, clarifying the task, and providing directions and assistance suitable to the child's level of competence and development are all important aspects of instruction. They also mentioned that the effectiveness of parental instructions has been associated to success of their children on both the autonomous problem-solving tasks and task being instructed.

Table 7
Significant Difference in the Parental Involvement when Grouped by Profile

Profile variables	Encouragement	Reinforcement	Instruction	Modeling
Age group	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Below 30	5.26 (0.82)	5.59 (0.71)	5.56 (0.51)	5.57 (0.49)
30 to 39	5.46 (0.52)	5.58 (0.49)	5.63 (0.43)	5.62 (0.50)
40 to 49	5.54 (0.54)	5.59 (0.42)	5.62 (0.44)	5.62 (0.44)
50 to 59	5.56 (0.48)	5.65 (0.44)	5.67 (0.44)	5.54 (0.51)
60 and above	5.72 (0.25)	5.28 (0.18)	5.29 (0.17)	5.50 (0.20)
F-value	0.44	0.418	496	0.127
Verbal interpretation	NS	NS	NS	NS
Sex				
Male	5.36 (0.49)	5.45 (0.41)	5.44 (0.34)	5.47 (0.42)
Female	5.56 (0.53)	5.63 (0.44)	5.67 (0.44)	5.65 (0.46)

t-value	1.833	1.927	2.573*	1.889
Verbal interpretation	NS	NS	Sig	NS
Educational attainment				
High school	5.26 (0.92)	5.62 (0.48)	5.67 (0.33)	5.73 (0.46)
College level	5.21 (0.67)	5.32 (0.50)	5.35 (0.58)	5.38 (0.48)
College graduate	5.51 (0.49)	5.56 (0.43)	5.61 (0.40)	5.58 (0.47)
Masteral	5.63 (0.52)	5.73 (0.40)	5.69 (0.44)	5.77 (0.32)
Doctoral	5.92 (0.13)	5.92 (0.20)	6.00 (0.00)	5.89 (0.30)
F-value	2.740*	2.940*	2.992*	2.3080
Verbal interpretation	Sig	Sig	Sig	NS
Employment				
Unemployed	5.60 (0.55)	5.65 (0.40)	5.67 (0.38)	5.64 (0.46)
Skilled worker	5.09 (0.61)	5.20 (0.48)	5.29 (0.52)	5.27 (0.60)
Professional	5.56 (0.47)	5.63 (0.42)	5.65 (0.41)	5.66 (0.41)
F-value	6.102**	7.098**	5.073**	5.239**
Verbal interpretation	Sig	Sig	Sig	Sig
Work modality				
No response	5.51 (0.61)	5.59 (0.46)	5.64 (0.40)	5.58 (0.49)
Work from home	5.55 (0.52)	5.57 (0.43)	5.60 (0.44)	5.64 (0.39)
Mixed (WFH and in-person)	5.52 (0.53)	5.62 (0.46)	5.62 (0.46)	5.66 (0.48)
Reporting (in-person)	5.46 (0.45)	5.53 (0.42)	5.60 (0.42)	5.50 (0.44)
F value	0.1120	0.2140	0.0530	0.7370
Verbal interpretation	NS	NS	NS	NS
Monthly income				
Below 15,000	5.15 (0.71)	5.31 (0.60)	5.29 (0.50)	5.27 (0.64)
15,000 to 24,000	4.87 (0.77)	5.20 (0.34)	5.20 (0.51)	5.30 (0.46)
25,000 to 34,000	5.66 (0.39)	5.62 (0.44)	5.64 (0.46)	5.56 (0.57)
35,000 to 49,000	5.28 (0.80)	5.64 (0.39)	5.65 (0.46)	5.57 (0.53)
50,000 to 74,000	5.55 (0.44)	5.53 (0.47)	5.59 (0.43)	5.55 (0.48)
75,000 to 99,000	5.61 (0.40)	5.69 (0.36)	5.59 (0.43)	5.66 (0.41)
100,000 to 150,000	5.61 (0.40)	5.71 (0.40)	5.75 (0.32)	5.72 (0.38)
F-value	2.836**	1.6150	1.8770	1.2440
Verbal interpretation	Sig	NS	NS	NS
Grade of child				
4	5.49 (0.54)	5.59 (0.43)	5.62 (0.38)	5.58 (0.45)
5	5.58 (0.52)	5.58 (0.43)	5.60 (0.49)	5.67 (0.48)
6	5.51 (0.53)	5.58 (0.47)	5.62 (0.46)	5.60 (0.45)
F-value	0.274	0.014	0.016	0.346
Verbal interpretation	NS	NS	NS	NS

Legend: *Significant at .05 level; **Significant at .01 level, NS Not significant

Table 7 presents the comparative analysis in the parental involvement when respondents are grouped by profile. When the students were divided into groups based on their sex, since the computed value was less than 0.05 alpha level, it was determined that there was a significant difference in instruction. This indicates that the responses vary significantly and the results are reliant on the test results, it was discovered that female have a better instruction compared to male. In a family system, male and female parents have different function in order to maintain harmony. Males typically take on the role of breadwinner, working outside to

support the family, whilst female parents are typically the primary caretakers, caring for and meeting the needs of the children, they are more involved in activities such as household activities, social activities, play and companionship personal care, and achievement-related activities. As stated in the study of Swenson (2016), females began to educate their child as they got more educated and needed to apply their learning in ways other than as housewives and mothers.

On the other hand, when grouped according to educational attainment, there was a significant difference observed on encouragement, reinforcement and instruction because the resulted p-value was less than the alpha level. This implies that the responses vary statistically, it was found out that respondents who are from high school level have a better encouragement, respondents who are from college level have a better reinforcement and instruction as their involvement as a parents to their child.

However, as to employment, there was a significant difference observed on parental encouragement reinforcement instruction and modeling. This depicted that employment of parents helped their children with school activities by guiding them. Furthermore, depending on their employment, parents' contributions to their children's education varied.

Finally, when grouped according to monthly income, it can be seen that there was a significant difference on encouragement. Parents are crucial to their academic success of their children by supplying the necessary support whether its moral, financial or material support to inspire their children to have a goal to achieve success academically in school. As mentioned by Liu. et al. (2020) on a meta-analysis study, showed that there was a positive correlation between socioeconomic status and achievement academically among China students. However, another study found that low socioeconomic status could be mitigated by family involvement activities as an example is the parental encouragement. As a result, parental income may play a secondary role in our study participants' lives when compared to the importance of parental encouragement.

Table 8
Correlation Between Parental Involvement and Child's Performance

Dimensions	Correlation coefficient	P-value	VI	Decision
Encouragement	.056	.534	Negligible direct	NS
Reinforcement	-.021	.814	Negligible inverse	NS
Instruction	-.018	.844	Negligible inverse	NS
Modeling	-.016	.858	Negligible inverse	NS

Legend: 1.00=Perfect relationship; 0.70-0.79=Very strong relationship; 0.40-0.69=Strong relationship; 0.30-0.39=Moderate relationship; 0.20-0.29=Weak relationship; 0.01-0.19=Negligible relationship. NS – not significant

Table 8 illustrates the result of comparing the variables of parental involvement with child's performance. In the table it can be gleaned up that computed correlation coefficient significantly shows a unanimous decision of accepting the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between parental involvement and child performance because the p-value is greater than the critical value of 0.05. This means that the respondent's parental involvement does not influence their child's performance. Despite the fact that the study looked at the influence of parental involvement on student achievement, it's possible that parents are more involved because their children are doing well in school. This does not necessarily imply a cause-and-effect correlation between parental involvement and student achievement, nor does it imply a directional influence. The result is congruent to the result presented on Table 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Table 9
Proposed Action Plan to Promote Parental Involvement in Diliman Preparatory School (Private School)

Objectives	Activity	Success/ Performance Indicators	Persons Involved
A. Encouragement			
To connect with the students' parents, familiarize them with teaching style and classroom of their child and share an important idea, goal or aspect of the school with the parents; families. To enable parents to learn how to support the learning and education of their child.	Open House or Parent Night Participants of the said event will interact with the teachers and other staff of the school. Teachers will share tips and additional information on how parents can provide the support to their child at home and how they can monitor student learning through progress book	• Parents have improved knowledge and feel more empowered • Parents feel more supported and informed	• Parents • Human Resource • Teachers • Principal and Assistant Principal • Office of the School Affairs (OSA)
	Interactive Homework Teachers will assign interactive homework which will include also interactive writing and reading. For example, students can interview their parents or any family members about a topic related to history and culture from civics and culture subject reading in class. Family learning focuses on intergenerational learning and encourages members of a family to learn together as a family.	• Students will have positive attitudes towards homework, higher rates of school homework completion. • Parents will become more acquainted with their students' classroom activities.	• Parents • Students • Teachers • Subject Coordinator • Admin
B. Modeling			
Objectives To clarify roles and	Charter for Parents A Charter for Parents is a	• Improved collaboration	• Parents • Human

responsibilities, as well as to encourage collaboration among parents and other stakeholders.	joint declaration that enumerates a variety of commitments that will serve as the foundation for the school's objectives, mission, and vision. This Parents' Charter will be implemented through parent workshops, focus groups, and practitioner consultation, with quality assurance provided by the Parental Involvement Committee.	between school and parent, and teacher and parent relationship. • Improved parental confidence in their willingness to help their child learn.	Resource • Teachers • Principal and Assistant Principal • Office of the School Affairs (OSA)
C. Reinforcement			
To improve communication with parents and families and to promote student characteristics related and connected with positive achievement or learning outcome by reinforcing them and help them maintain it.	Parent Conferences Create a short- life working group to develop a comprehensive communication plan for parents or parent's conferences Schedule. Review of school handbook Review of the school handbook to include childcare settings and about the learning, and seek the views of parents and other family members.	• Improved communication channels so that a larger number of parents can be reached. • Improved communication with parents at school/workplace. An informative and user-friendly school handbook • Appropriate standardized communication procedures were developed. • Parents feel valued and consulted	• Parents • Human Resource • Teachers • Principal and Assistant Principal • Office of the School Affairs (OSA)
D. Instruction			
To increase families' access to evidence-based family learning opportunities, workshops, and programs	Family Learning Delivery Plan The school will create a Family Learning Delivery System (FLDS). The following programs and workshops will be part	• Children, parents, and families will have better outcomes. • Improved achievement and	• Parents • Human Resource • Teachers • Principal and Assistant Principal

	of the plan. • Comprehension • Numeracy • English as a Second Language (ESOL) • Assisting parents in achieving the better the possible results for their children • Promoting Community Participation • Developing one's knowledge, skills, confidence, and resilience	attainment • Parents now have more knowledge and feel more empowered.	• Office of the School Affairs (OSA)
--	--	--	--

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are formulated.

1. In terms of profiling, most of the respondents are 40 to 49 years old, female, College graduate, employed as professionals, have a mixed (WFH and in-person) work modality, have a monthly income of 100,000 to 150, 000 and the child they supervised were in 4th grade.
2. The parental involvement in terms of encouragement, the respondents are strongly agreeing that they encourage their child to believe that he or she is capable of learning new things, to believe that he or she can succeed in school, and to follow the teacher's directions. In terms Modeling, the respondents are strongly agreeing that they show their child that they when things get tough, don't give up, they want to gain as much knowledge as possible, and they can learn new things. As to the parental involvement in terms of Reinforcement, the respondents are strongly agreeing that they show their child that they like it when their child is eager to learn new things and skills, tries to learn everything there is to know, and is enthusiastic about completing his or her homework. Finally, in terms of Instruction, the respondents are strongly agreeing that they teach their child to ask questions when they are unsure about something. and adhere to the teacher's instructions.
3. There was a significant difference on instruction when grouped according to sex. Females have significantly higher level of parental involvement in terms of instruction than males. However, when grouped according to educational attainment, parents who are from high school level the parental involvement in terms of encouragement is significantly higher while parents who are from college level the parental involvement in terms of reinforcement and instruction is also significantly higher. Finally, when grouped according to monthly income, parents who have a monthly household income of 35,000 to 49,000 have significantly higher level of parental encouragement than the rest of the monthly household income.
4. There was no significant relationship between parental involvement and child performance.
5. The proposed activities, events and workshops were designed to encourage and support parental involvement in Diliman Preparatory school (Private School)

RECOMMENDATIONS

With the foregoing conclusions, it is recommended that

1. The proposed set activities, events and workshops of the researcher as the output of this study is subject to enhance parental involvement may be tabled for discussion and utilization by the school's management and administration.
2. Parents may adapt educative programs that is proposed by the school management and administration to be educated and trained about importance of instilling a culture of involvement in school and learning-related activities in order to emphasize the importance of parental involvement.
3. The energy and time are the components of life setting. To reach busy, tired parents, the school may use a variety of techniques and methods. Parents may be kept informed using new and advanced platform such as Facebook and Viber. The importance of participation among the parent should be emphasized throughout all efforts to improve involvement, with the goal of making parents believe they have a greater responsibility to assist their children academically.
4. The school may use informal surveys for the Parents should thoroughly define the different kinds and forms of involvement that are presently occurring and those that are strongly wish to happen. The school will only be able to develop programs after that which may effectively increase involvement and, as a result, achievement.
5. The school may use informal surveys for the teachers to see if their viewpoints about parental involvement are consistent with the indicated perceptions of the parents about parental involvement. As a result, school administrators can decide which methods, programs, and activities to encourage teachers to use.
6. For the future researchers, they may use the results of this study as their reference in their future study.
7. Other studies of a similar topic may be conducted to validate the findings of the study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, all thanks go to the Almighty God for His love, blessing and bountiful successes upon my life.

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the help and support of my thesis adviser, Dr. Merlita Medallon. Thank you for your continuous guidance, expertise and invaluable advice which encouraged and made this challenging accomplishment more obtainable; I would have been lost without you. To Dr. Arnie Villena and Dr. Beverly Caiga, thank you for their selfless patience, contributions, collaboration, suggestions and for providing me thoughtful feedback on my research. I also wish to thank to Dr. Francis Kayode Ashipaoloye for his support, consideration, and immeasurable dedication throughout my course work. His leadership views shared throughout my journey will forever serve as a reminder to be a true advocate for the most valuable asset, our students.

Lastly, I would like to thank my students, especially their parents who participated in my study. I appreciate you taking the time to respond to the surveys and helping make my study possible.

References

- Afful, S. O. (2014). Socio-economic background and academic performance of children in basic schools in Asikuma-OdobenBrakwa District, Ghana (Doctoral dissertation). University of Education, Winneba: Winneba.
- Alampay, L. (n.d.) Parenting in the Philippines. Ateneo De Manila University (Research).
- Altschul, Inna. (2012). Linking Socioeconomic Status to the Academic Achievement of Mexican American Youth Through Parent Involvement in Education. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*. 3. 13-30. <https://doi.org/10.5243/jsswr.2012.2>
- Babbie, Earl R. *The Practice of Social Research*. 12th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage, 2010; Muijs, Daniel. *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*. 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publications, 2010.
- Baidoo-Anu, D. (2018). Perceived School Environmental, Home Conditions and Academic Performance of Junior High School Students in Asikuma-Odoben-Brakwa District, Ghana. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 24(2), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.9734/iesbs/2018/39617>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company. American Psychological Association, 23, 604.
- Bartolome, M. T., Mamat, N., & Masnan, A. H. (2017). Parental involvement in the Philippines: A review of literatures. *Southeast Asia Early Childhood Journal*, 6, 41-50. <https://doi.org/10.37134/saecj.vol6.5.2017>
- Beller, E. (2008). *Bringing intergenerational social mobility research into the 21st Century: Why mothers matter*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Blair, S. L. (2014). Parental involvement and children's educational performance: A comparison of Filipino and U.S. Parents. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. University of Toronto Press. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcfs.45.3.351>
- Boonk, L., Gijssels, H. J. M., Ritzen, H., & Brand-Gruwel, S. (2018). A review of the relationship between parental involvement indicators and academic achievement. *Educational Research Review*, 24, 10–30. <http://doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.001>
- Brossard, M., Cardoso, M., Kamei, A., Mishra, S., Mizunoya, S., & Reuge, N. (2020). Parental Engagement in Children's Learning. *Innocenti Research Briefs*, 09, 1–6. Retrieved from https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/IRB_2020-09_CL.pdf
- Bulkley, K., & Fidler, J. (2003). A decade of charter schools: From theory to practice. *Educational Policy* 17 (3): 317–42.
- Cavanaugh, C., Gillan, K. J., Kromrey, J., Hess, M., & Blomeyer, R. (2004). The effects of distance education on k-12 student outcomes: A meta-analysis. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates
- Chen, Z., & Liu, R. X. (2014). Comparing Adolescent Only Children with Those Who Have Siblings on Academic Related Outcomes and Psychosocial Adjustment. *Child Development Research*, 2014, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/578289>
- Cooter, K. S. (2006). When Mama Can't Read: Counteracting Intergenerational Illiteracy. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(7), 698–702. <https://doi.org/10.1598/rt.59.7.9>
- Curtis, H. (2013). A Mixed Methods Study Investigating Parental Involvement and Student Success in High School Online Education [Review of A Mixed Methods Study Investigating Parental Involvement and Student Success in High School Online Education]. ERIC - Education Resources Information Center. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED562926>
- Darko-Asumadu, Daniel Ampem and Sika-Bright, Solomon. "Parental Involvement and Pupils' Academic Performance in the Cape Coast Metropolis, Ghana" *Open Education Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2021, pp. 96-109. <https://doi.org/10.1515/edu-2020-0142>
- Enteria, O. C., & Tagyam, R. P. (2020). Parental Involvement in the Education Development of Indigenous People in Selected Elementary Schools in the Northern Part of Mindanao, Philippines. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, 13(2), 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2020/v13i230304>
- Ferdig, R. E., DiPietro, M., & Papanastasiou, E. (2005). *Teaching and learning in collaborative virtual high schools*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.
- Gonida, E. N., & Cortina, K. S. (2014). Parental involvement in homework: Relations with parent and student achievement-related motivational beliefs and achievement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 376–396. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12039>
- Graetz, J. (2006). The impact of parents' background on their children's education. *Educational Studies* 268. *Saving Our Nation, Saving Our Schools: Public Education for Public Good*.
- Green, C.L. & Hoover-Dempsey, K. (2007). Why do parents homeschool? A systematic examination of parental involvement. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(2), 264-285.
- Hassan, J. E. (2009). Parents' socio-economic status and children's academic performance. Report of Norwegian Social Research, NOVA Notat, 7(09).
- Hoover-Dempsey, K.V., & Sandler, H. M. (1995). Parental involvement in children's education: Why does it make a difference? *Teachers College Record*, 97(2), 310–331.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K.V., & Sandler, H. M. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? *Review of Educational Research*, 67(1), 3–42.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K.V., & Sandler, H. M. (2005). Final Performance Report for OERI grant # R305T010673: The Social context of parental involvement: A path to enhanced achievement. Paper presented to Project Monitor, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Walker, J. M. T., Sandler, H. M., Whetsel, D., Green, C. L., Wilkins, A. S., et al. (2005). Why do parents become involved? Research findings and implications. *Elementary School Journal*, 106(2), 105-130.
- Juma, S. O. (2016). Influence of parental socio-economic status on students' academic performance in public secondary schools in Tana River County, Kenya. Unpublished Thesis

- Kalil, A. (2005). Unemployment and job displacement: The impact on families and children. *Ivey Business Journal*, 2, 1-5.
- LaRocque, M., Kleiman, L., & Darling, S. M. (2011). Parental Involvement: The Missing Link in School Achievement. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 55(3), 115–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10459880903472876>
- Liu, F., Black, E., Algina, J., Cavanaugh, C., & Dawson, K. (2010). The validation of one parental involvement measurement in virtual schooling. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 9(2), 105–132.
- Liu, J., Peng, P., & Luo, L. (2020, March 1). The Relation Between Family Socioeconomic Status and Academic Achievement in China: A Meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09494-0>
- Mallan, D. (2009). Relationship between socio-economic performance and students' academic performance of Senior Secondary Schools in Kebbi (Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation). Usmanu. Danfodiyo University: Sokoto.
- Mbathia, M. (2005). "Cream for Law and Medicine." The Standard. Nairobi: The Standard Ltd.
- McConnell, D. (2000). Implementing computer supported cooperative learning. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Mensah, M. K., & Kuranchie, A. (2013). Influence of Parenting Styles on the Social Development of Children. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.5901/ajis.2013.v2n3p123>
- Mills, S. (2003). Implementing Online Secondary Education: An Evaluation of a Virtual High School. In C. Crawford et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference 2003* (pp. 444-451). Chesapeake, VA: AACE. Retrieved from <http://www.editlib.org/p/17933>
- Mudassir, A. & Abubakar, N. (2015). The impact of parents' occupation on academic performance of secondary school students. *Multilingual Academic Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1).
- Muhammed, R. (2012). Impact of parents' profession on their children's learning English in Pakistan. *International Journal of Learning & Development*, 2(1).
- Nadenge, M. G. (2015). Relationship between parental socioeconomic status and student academic achievement: A case study of selected schools in urban informal settlements in Westlands division, Nairobi County. University of Nairobi: Kenya.
- Nannyonjo, H. (2007). Education inputs in Uganda: An analysis of factors influencing learning achievement in grade six. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Ndirangu, L. M., and Kibaara T. 2014. Parental Involvement in their Children's Academic Achievement in Public Secondary Schools: A Case of Kieni- West Sub- County, Nyeri County-Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2 (11): 411-424.
- Neitzel, C., & Stright, A. D. (2003). Mothers' scaffolding of children's problem solving: Establishing a foundation of academic self-regulatory competence. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 17(1), 147–159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.17.1.147>
- Owiti, D. S. O. (2001). Gender difference in attitudes toward Mathematics: A case of secondary schoolstudents in Eldoret Municipality, Uasin Gishu District, Kenya. Unpublished M.Phil. Thesis, Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya.
- Reeves, D. (2009). High performance in high poverty schools: 90/90/90 and beyond. Denver, CO: Center for Performance Assessment
- Roblyer, M. D., & Marshall, J. C. (2003). Predicting the success of virtual high school students: Preliminary results from an educational success prediction instrument. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education* 35(2): 241–256.
- Russell, G. (2004). Virtual schools: A critical view. In C. Cavanaugh (Ed.), *Development and management of virtual schools: Issues and trends* (pp. 1–25). Hershey, PA: Idea Group.
- Strickland, S. (2015). The Effects of Parental Motivations on Home- Based and School-Based Parental Involvement [Review of The Effects of Parental Motivations on Home- Based and School-Based Parental Involvement. Education Commons. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>
- UNESCO (2020). Education: from Disruption to Recovery. Paris: UNESCO.
- Walker, J. M., Wilkins, A. S., Dallaire, J. R., Sandler, H. M., & Hoover-Dempsey, K. V. (2005). Parental involvement: Model revision through scale development. *The Elementary School Journal*, 106(2), 85-104.
- Whitaker, M. C. (2019). The hoover-dempsey and sandler model of the parent involvement process. In *The Wiley Handbook of Family, School, and Community Relationships in Education* (pp. 419–443). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119083054.ch20>
- World Health Organization. (02 March 2021). WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID) Dashboard. <https://covid19.who.int>
- www.deped.gov.ph

Appendix A. Questionnaire

SET A. COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES (QUESTIONNAIRE)

Part I. Profile of the Respondents

Directions: For each statement, please check the column to which you feel is a characteristic or is true to you.

Name: _____

- 1.1 Age
- 1.2 Gender
- 1.3 Educational Attainment
- 1.4 Employment
- 1.5 Work modality
- 1.6 Monthly Household Income

Name of the child supervised: _____

Grade level of child: _____

Part II: The questionnaire

The following statements describe your parental involvement in the education of your child. Please read each of the statements and assess if it measures the identified variable. Scale will be from: (6) strongly agree (5) agree (4) slightly agree (3) slightly disagree (2) disagree (1) strongly disagree

We encourage this child...		6	5	4	3	2	1
1.	... when he or she doesn't feel like doing schoolwork.						
2.	... when he or she has trouble organizing schoolwork.						
3.	... to try new ways to do schoolwork when he or she is having a hard time.						
4.	... to be aware of how he or she is doing with schoolwork.						
5.	... when he or she has trouble doing schoolwork.						
6.	... to look for more information about school subjects.						
7.	... to develop an interest in schoolwork.						
8.	... to believe that he/she can do well in school.						
9.	... to stick with problems until he/she solves it.						
10.	... to believe that he/she can learn new things.						

11.	... to ask other people for help when a problem is hard to solve.						
12.	... to explain what he/she thinks to the teacher.						
13.	... to follow the teacher's directions.						
We show this child that we ...		6	5	4	3	2	1
14.	... like to learn new things.						
15.	... know how to solve problems.						
16.	... enjoy figuring things out.						
17.	... do not give up when things get hard						
18.	... ask others for help when a problem is hard to solve.						
19.	... can explain what we think to others.						
20.	... can learn new things.						
21.	... want to learn as much as possible.						
22.	... like to solve problems.						
23.	... try different ways to solve a problem when things get hard.						
We show this child we like it when he or she ...		6	5	4	3	2	1
24.	... wants to learn new things.						
25.	... tries to learn as much as possible.						
26.	... has a good attitude about doing his or her homework.						
27.	... keeps working on homework even when he or she doesn't feel like it.						
28.	... asks the teacher for help.						
29.	... explains what he or she thinks to the teacher.						
30.	... explains to us what he or she thinks about school.						
31.	... works hard on homework.						
32.	... understands how to solve problems.						
33.	... sticks with a problem until he or she solves it.						

34.	... organizes his or her schoolwork.						
35.	... checks his or her work.						
36.	... finds new ways to do schoolwork when he or she gets stuck.						
We teach this child ...		6	5	4	3	2	1
37.	... to go at his or her own pace while doing schoolwork.						
38.	... to take a break from his or her work when he or she gets frustrated.						
39.	... how to check homework as he or she goes along.						
40.	... how to get along with others in his or her class.						
41.	... to follow the teacher's directions.						
42.	... how to make his or her homework fun.						
43.	... how to find out more about the things that interest him or her.						
44.	... to try the problems that help him or her learn the most.						
45.	... to have a good attitude about his or her homework.						
46.	... to keep trying when he or she gets stuck.						
47.	... to stick with his or her homework until he or she finishes it.						
48.	... to work hard.						
49.	... to communicate with the teacher when he or she has questions.						
50.	... to ask questions when he or she doesn't understand something						
51.	... to make sure he or she understands one part before going onto the next.						

Appendix B. Statistical Output

529

Frequencies**Notes**

Output Created		25-FEB-2022 10:19:56
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data.
Syntax		FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=Age Sex Education Employment Workmode Income Grade /ORDER=ANALYSIS.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.00

Statistics

		Age	Sex	Educational attainment	Employment	Work modality	Monthly income	Grade of child
N	Valid	128	128	128	128	128	128	128
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Frequency Table**Age**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below 30	3	2.3	2.3	2.3
	30 to 39	35	27.3	27.3	29.7
	40 to 49	77	60.2	60.2	89.8
	50 to 59	10	7.8	7.8	97.7
	60 and above	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	29	22.7	22.7	22.7
	Female	99	77.3	77.3	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Educational attainment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High school	3	2.3	2.3	2.3
	College level	13	10.2	10.2	12.5
	College graduate	85	66.4	66.4	78.9
	Masteral	20	15.6	15.6	94.5
	Doctoral	7	5.5	5.5	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Employment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unemployed	27	21.1	21.1	21.1
	Skilled worker	15	11.7	11.7	32.8
	Professional	86	67.2	67.2	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Work modality

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	26	20.3	20.3	20.3
	Work from home	34	26.6	26.6	46.9
	Mixed (WFH and in-person)	45	35.2	35.2	82.0
	Reporting (in-person)	23	18.0	18.0	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Monthly income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below 15,000	3	2.3	2.3	2.3
	15,000 to 24,000	8	6.3	6.3	8.6
	25,000 to 34,000	12	9.4	9.4	18.0
	35,000 to 49,000	9	7.0	7.0	25.0
	50,000 to 74,000	23	18.0	18.0	43.0
	75,000 to 99,000	13	10.2	10.2	53.1
	100,000 to 150,000	30	23.4	23.4	76.6
	Above 150,000	30	23.4	23.4	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Grade of child

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	2	1.6	1.6	1.6
3	1	.8	.8	2.3
4	59	46.1	46.1	48.4
5	28	21.9	21.9	70.3
6	35	27.3	27.3	97.7
7	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

MEANS TABLES=AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Age Sex Education Employment Workmode Income Grade

/CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

Means

Notes

Output Created		25-FEB-2022 10:34:20
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	For each dependent variable in a table, user-defined missing values for the dependent and all grouping variables are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Cases used for each table have no missing values in any independent variable, and not all dependent variables have missing values.
Syntax		MEANS TABLES=AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Age Sex Education Employment Workmode Income Grade /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.05

Case Processing Summary

	Cases
--	-------

	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Encouragement * Age	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Reinforcement * Age	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Instruction * Age	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Modeling * Age	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Encouragement * Sex	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Reinforcement * Sex	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Instruction * Sex	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Modeling * Sex	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Encouragement * Educational attainment	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Reinforcement * Educational attainment	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Instruction * Educational attainment	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Modeling * Educational attainment	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Encouragement * Employment	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Reinforcement * Employment	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Instruction * Employment	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Modeling * Employment	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Encouragement * Work modality	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Reinforcement * Work modality	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Instruction * Work modality	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Modeling * Work modality	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Encouragement * Monthly income	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Reinforcement * Monthly income	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Instruction * Monthly income	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Modeling * Monthly income	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Encouragement * Grade of child	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Reinforcement * Grade of child	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Instruction * Grade of child	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%
Modeling * Grade of child	128	100.0%	0	0.0%	128	100.0%

Encouragement Reinforcement Instruction Modeling * Age

Age		Encouragement	Reinforcement	Instruction	Modeling
Below 30	Mean	5.2564	5.5897	5.5556	5.5667
	N	3	3	3	3
	Std. Deviation	.82251	.71058	.50918	.49329
30 to 39	Mean	5.4571	5.5756	5.6305	5.6152
	N	35	35	35	35
	Std. Deviation	.52370	.48702	.42872	.49714
40 to 49	Mean	5.5365	5.5927	5.6166	5.6242
	N	77	77	77	77
	Std. Deviation	.53715	.42047	.43704	.44038
50 to 59	Mean	5.5615	5.6538	5.6733	5.5400
	N	10	10	10	10

	Std. Deviation	.47977	.44152	.43597	.50596
60 and above	Mean	5.7179	5.2821	5.2889	5.5000
	N	3	3	3	3
	Std. Deviation	.24727	.17765	.16777	.20000
Total	Mean	5.5144	5.5855	5.6157	5.6109
	N	128	128	128	128
	Std. Deviation	.52720	.44064	.42946	.45351

Encouragement Reinforcement Instruction Modeling * Sex

Sex		Encouragement	Reinforcement	Instruction	Modeling
Male	Mean	5.3581	5.4483	5.4391	5.4724
	N	29	29	29	29
	Std. Deviation	.48879	.41121	.34435	.41995
Female	Mean	5.5602	5.6256	5.6674	5.6515
	N	99	99	99	99
	Std. Deviation	.53158	.44284	.43955	.45695
Total	Mean	5.5144	5.5855	5.6157	5.6109
	N	128	128	128	128
	Std. Deviation	.52720	.44064	.42946	.45351

Encouragement Reinforcement Instruction Modeling * Educational attainment

Educational attainment		Encouragement	Reinforcement	Instruction	Modeling
High school	Mean	5.2564	5.6154	5.6667	5.7333
	N	3	3	3	3
	Std. Deviation	.91772	.48038	.33333	.46188
College level	Mean	5.2071	5.3207	5.3503	5.3769
	N	13	13	13	13
	Std. Deviation	.66572	.50199	.57864	.47714
College graduate	Mean	5.5086	5.5638	5.6054	5.5835
	N	85	85	85	85
	Std. Deviation	.48969	.43284	.40069	.47162
Masteral	Mean	5.6346	5.7269	5.6900	5.7650
	N	20	20	20	20
	Std. Deviation	.52105	.39968	.43651	.31669
Doctoral	Mean	5.9231	5.9231	6.0000	5.8857
	N	7	7	7	7
	Std. Deviation	.13323	.20352	.00000	.30237
Total	Mean	5.5144	5.5855	5.6157	5.6109

N	128	128	128	128
Std.	.52720	.44064	.42946	.45351
Deviation				

Encouragement Reinforcement Instruction Modeling * Employment

Employment		Encouragement	Reinforcement	Instruction	Modeling
Unemployed	Mean	5.6040	5.6467	5.6731	5.6432
	N	27	27	27	27
	Std. Deviation	.54756	.40212	.38447	.46038
Skilled worker	Mean	5.0872	5.2010	5.2947	5.2667
	N	15	15	15	15
	Std. Deviation	.61116	.48283	.52002	.56960
Professional	Mean	5.5608	5.6333	5.6537	5.6609
	N	86	86	86	86
	Std. Deviation	.47446	.41552	.40636	.40652
Total	Mean	5.5144	5.5855	5.6157	5.6109
	N	128	128	128	128
	Std. Deviation	.52720	.44064	.42946	.45351

Encouragement Reinforcement Instruction Modeling * Work modality

Work modality		Encouragement	Reinforcement	Instruction	Modeling
No response	Mean	5.5089	5.5947	5.6400	5.5833
	N	26	26	26	26
	Std. Deviation	.61156	.46285	.40130	.49453
Work from home	Mean	5.5475	5.5710	5.5979	5.6402
	N	34	34	34	34
	Std. Deviation	.52129	.43045	.43940	.38750
Mixed (WFH and in-person)	Mean	5.5179	5.6188	5.6207	5.6622
	N	45	45	45	45
	Std. Deviation	.53152	.45743	.45568	.48397
Reporting (in-person)	Mean	5.4649	5.5311	5.6047	5.4986
	N	23	23	23	23
	Std. Deviation	.45002	.41858	.41886	.44147
Total	Mean	5.5144	5.5855	5.6157	5.6109
	N	128	128	128	128

Std. Deviation	.52720	.44064	.42946	.45351
-------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Encouragement Reinforcement Instruction Modeling * Monthly income

Monthly income		Encouragement	Reinforcement	Instruction	Modeling
Below 15,000	Mean	5.1538	5.3077	5.2889	5.2667
	N	3	3	3	3
	Std. Deviation	.70501	.60079	.50037	.64291
15,000 to 24,000	Mean	4.8654	5.2048	5.2019	5.3042
	N	8	8	8	8
	Std. Deviation	.76675	.53888	.50881	.45962
25,000 to 34,000	Mean	5.6603	5.6218	5.6406	5.5556
	N	12	12	12	12
	Std. Deviation	.39011	.43694	.45675	.57372
35,000 to 49,000	Mean	5.2821	5.6393	5.6467	5.5667
	N	9	9	9	9
	Std. Deviation	.80310	.39239	.45666	.53385
50,000 to 74,000	Mean	5.5518	5.5318	5.5942	5.5522
	N	23	23	23	23
	Std. Deviation	.44471	.47186	.42683	.48041
75,000 to 99,000	Mean	5.6095	5.6929	5.5882	5.6641
	N	13	13	13	13
	Std. Deviation	.40395	.35530	.42913	.41106
100,000 to 150,000	Mean	5.6077	5.7077	5.7547	5.7222
	N	30	30	30	30
	Std. Deviation	.40470	.39709	.31796	.38340
Above 150,000	Mean	5.5718	5.5564	5.6289	5.6733
	N	30	30	30	30
	Std. Deviation	.50125	.43405	.44280	.40593
Total	Mean	5.5144	5.5855	5.6157	5.6109
	N	128	128	128	128
	Std. Deviation	.52720	.44064	.42946	.45351

Encouragement Reinforcement Instruction Modeling * Grade of child

Grade of child	Encouragement	Reinforcement	Instruction	Modeling
----------------	---------------	---------------	-------------	----------

1	Mean	5.6154	5.5385	5.6667	5.7000
	N	2	2	2	2
	Std. Deviation	.32636	.32636	.47140	.14142
3	Mean	5.0000	6.0000	5.0000	6.0000
	N	1	1	1	1
	Std. Deviation	.	.	.	.
4	Mean	5.4915	5.5870	5.6244	5.5791
	N	59	59	59	59
	Std. Deviation	.54224	.43827	.38470	.45553
5	Mean	5.5769	5.5775	5.6046	5.6738
	N	28	28	28	28
	Std. Deviation	.52025	.42932	.48762	.48103
6	Mean	5.5033	5.5886	5.6164	5.5905
	N	35	35	35	35
	Std. Deviation	.54244	.47853	.47382	.46340
7	Mean	5.6154	5.4872	5.7111	5.7000
	N	3	3	3	3
	Std. Deviation	.42829	.47001	.26943	.26458
Total	Mean	5.5144	5.5855	5.6157	5.6109
	N	128	128	128	128
	Std. Deviation	.52720	.44064	.42946	.45351

ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Age
/MISSING ANALYSIS.

Oneway

Notes

Output Created		25-FEB-2022 10:34:39
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.

Syntax	ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Age /MISSING ANALYSIS.	
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Encouragement	Between Groups	.498	4	.125	.440	.779
	Within Groups	34.800	123	.283		
	Total	35.299	127			
Reinforcement	Between Groups	.330	4	.083	.418	.796
	Within Groups	24.328	123	.198		
	Total	24.659	127			
Instruction	Between Groups	.372	4	.093	.496	.738
	Within Groups	23.051	123	.187		
	Total	23.424	127			
Modeling	Between Groups	.107	4	.027	.127	.972
	Within Groups	26.013	123	.211		
	Total	26.120	127			

ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Education
/MISSING ANALYSIS.

ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Education
/MISSING ANALYSIS
/POSTHOC=SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).

Oneway**Notes**

Output Created	25-FEB-2022 10:35:27	
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

Syntax	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
		ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Education /MISSING ANALYSIS /POSTHOC=SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.05
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.07

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Encouragement	Between Groups	2.888	4	.722	2.740	.032
	Within Groups	32.410	123	.263		
	Total	35.299	127			
Reinforcement	Between Groups	2.152	4	.538	2.940	.023
	Within Groups	22.507	123	.183		
	Total	24.659	127			
Instruction	Between Groups	2.077	4	.519	2.992	.021
	Within Groups	21.347	123	.174		
	Total	23.424	127			
Modeling	Between Groups	1.824	4	.456	2.308	.062
	Within Groups	24.296	123	.198		
	Total	26.120	127			

Post Hoc Tests**Multiple Comparisons****Scheffe**

Dependent Variable	(I) Educational attainment	(J) Educational attainment	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Encouragement	High school	College level	.04931	.32879	1.000	-.9790	1.0776
		College graduate	-.25219	.30155	.951	-1.1953	.6909
		Masteral	-.37821	.31782	.841	-1.3722	.6158
		Doctoral	-.66667	.35423	.475	-1.7745	.4412
	College level	High school	-.04931	.32879	1.000	-1.0776	.9790
		College graduate	-.30150	.15287	.425	-.7796	.1766
		Masteral	-.42751	.18288	.250	-.9995	.1444

	College graduate	Doctoral	-.71598	.24065	.071	-1.4686	.0367
		High school	.25219	.30155	.951	-.6909	1.1953
		College level	.30150	.15287	.425	-.1766	.7796
		Masteral	-.12602	.12757	.913	-.5250	.2730
	Masteral	Doctoral	-.41448	.20185	.382	-1.0458	.2168
		High school	.37821	.31782	.841	-.6158	1.3722
		College level	.42751	.18288	.250	-.1444	.9995
		College graduate	.12602	.12757	.913	-.2730	.5250
		Doctoral	-.28846	.22543	.802	-.9935	.4166
	Doctoral	High school	.66667	.35423	.475	-.4412	1.7745
		College level	.71598	.24065	.071	-.0367	1.4686
		College graduate	.41448	.20185	.382	-.2168	1.0458
		Masteral	.28846	.22543	.802	-.4166	.9935
Reinforcement	High school	College level	.29467	.27399	.885	-.5622	1.1516
		College graduate	.05158	.25129	1.000	-.7343	.8375
		Masteral	-.11154	.26485	.996	-.9399	.7168
		Doctoral	-.30769	.29519	.896	-1.2309	.6155
	College level	High school	-.29467	.27399	.885	-1.1516	.5622
		College graduate	-.24309	.12739	.460	-.6415	.1553
		Masteral	-.40621	.15240	.138	-.8828	.0704
		Doctoral	-.60237	.20054	.067	-1.2296	.0248
	College graduate	High school	-.05158	.25129	1.000	-.8375	.7343
		College level	.24309	.12739	.460	-.1553	.6415
		Masteral	-.16312	.10631	.672	-.4956	.1694
		Doctoral	-.35928	.16821	.341	-.8853	.1668
	Masteral	High school	.11154	.26485	.996	-.7168	.9399
		College level	.40621	.15240	.138	-.0704	.8828
		College graduate	.16312	.10631	.672	-.1694	.4956
		Doctoral	-.19615	.18785	.895	-.7837	.3914
	Doctoral	High school	.30769	.29519	.896	-.6155	1.2309
		College level	.60237	.20054	.067	-.0248	1.2296
		College graduate	.35928	.16821	.341	-.1668	.8853
		Masteral	.19615	.18785	.895	-.3914	.7837
Instruction	High school	College level	.31637	.26683	.843	-.5182	1.1509
		College graduate	.06130	.24473	1.000	-.7041	.8267
		Masteral	-.02333	.25793	1.000	-.8300	.7834
		Doctoral	-.33333	.28748	.853	-1.2324	.5658

	College level	High school	-.31637	.26683	.843	-1.1509	.5182
		College graduate	-.25507	.12406	.381	-.6431	.1329
		Masteral	-.33970	.14842	.270	-.8039	.1245
		Doctoral	-.64970*	.19530	.030	-1.2605	-.0389
	College graduate	High school	-.06130	.24473	1.000	-.8267	.7041
		College level	.25507	.12406	.381	-.1329	.6431
		Masteral	-.08463	.10353	.955	-.4084	.2392
		Doctoral	-.39463	.16381	.221	-.9070	.1177
	Masteral	High school	.02333	.25793	1.000	-.7834	.8300
		College level	.33970	.14842	.270	-.1245	.8039
		College graduate	.08463	.10353	.955	-.2392	.4084
		Doctoral	-.31000	.18295	.581	-.8822	.2622
	Doctoral	High school	.33333	.28748	.853	-.5658	1.2324
		College level	.64970*	.19530	.030	.0389	1.2605
		College graduate	.39463	.16381	.221	-.1177	.9070
		Masteral	.31000	.18295	.581	-.2622	.8822
Modeling	High school	College level	.35641	.28467	.814	-.5339	1.2467
		College graduate	.14980	.26109	.988	-.6668	.9664
		Masteral	-.03167	.27517	1.000	-.8923	.8289
		Doctoral	-.15238	.30670	.993	-1.1116	.8068
	College level	High school	-.35641	.28467	.814	-1.2467	.5339
		College graduate	-.20661	.13236	.657	-.6206	.2073
		Masteral	-.38808	.15834	.206	-.8833	.1071
		Doctoral	-.50879	.20836	.209	-1.1604	.1429
	College graduate	High school	-.14980	.26109	.988	-.9664	.6668
		College level	.20661	.13236	.657	-.2073	.6206
		Masteral	-.18147	.11046	.611	-.5269	.1640
		Doctoral	-.30218	.17476	.562	-.8488	.2444
	Masteral	High school	.03167	.27517	1.000	-.8289	.8923
		College level	.38808	.15834	.206	-.1071	.8833
		College graduate	.18147	.11046	.611	-.1640	.5269
		Doctoral	-.12071	.19518	.984	-.7311	.4897
	Doctoral	High school	.15238	.30670	.993	-.8068	1.1116
		College level	.50879	.20836	.209	-.1429	1.1604
		College graduate	.30218	.17476	.562	-.2444	.8488
		Masteral	.12071	.19518	.984	-.4897	.7311

*, The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets**Encouragement**Scheffe^{a,b}

Educational attainment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
		1
College level	13	5.2071
High school	3	5.2564
College graduate	85	5.5086
Masteral	20	5.6346
Doctoral	7	5.9231
Sig.		.102

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.132.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

ReinforcementScheffe^{a,b}

Educational attainment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
		1
College level	13	5.3207
College graduate	85	5.5638
High school	3	5.6154
Masteral	20	5.7269
Doctoral	7	5.9231
Sig.		.096

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.132.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

InstructionScheffe^{a,b}

Educational attainment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
College level	13	5.3503	
College graduate	85	5.6054	5.6054
High school	3	5.6667	5.6667
Masteral	20	5.6900	5.6900
Doctoral	7		6.0000
Sig.		.610	.459

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.132.
 b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Modeling

Scheffe^{a,b}

Educational attainment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
		1
College level	13	5.3769
College graduate	85	5.5835
High school	3	5.7333
Masteral	20	5.7650
Doctoral	7	5.8857
Sig.		.262

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.132.
 b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Employment
 /MISSING ANALYSIS
 /POSTHOC=SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).

Oneway

Notes

Output Created		25-FEB-2022 10:35:41
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.

Syntax	ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Employment /MISSING ANALYSIS /POSTHOC=SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).	
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.06

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Encouragement	Between Groups	3.140	2	1.570	6.102	.003
	Within Groups	32.159	125	.257		
	Total	35.299	127			
Reinforcement	Between Groups	2.515	2	1.257	7.098	.001
	Within Groups	22.144	125	.177		
	Total	24.659	127			
Instruction	Between Groups	1.759	2	.879	5.073	.008
	Within Groups	21.665	125	.173		
	Total	23.424	127			
Modeling	Between Groups	2.020	2	1.010	5.239	.007
	Within Groups	24.100	125	.193		
	Total	26.120	127			

Post Hoc Tests**Multiple Comparisons****Scheffe**

Dependent Variable	(I) Employment	(J) Employment	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Encouragement	Unemployed	Skilled worker	.51681*	.16334	.008	.1122	.9215
		Professional	.04317	.11189	.928	-.2340	.3204
	Skilled worker	Unemployed	-.51681*	.16334	.008	-.9215	-.1122
		Professional	-.47364*	.14193	.005	-.8252	-.1220
	Professional	Unemployed	-.04317	.11189	.928	-.3204	.2340
		Skilled worker	.47364*	.14193	.005	.1220	.8252
Reinforcement	Unemployed	Skilled worker	.44570*	.13554	.006	.1099	.7815
		Professional	.01345	.09285	.990	-.2166	.2435
	Skilled worker	Unemployed	-.44570*	.13554	.006	-.7815	-.1099
		Professional	-.43225*	.11777	.002	-.7240	-.1405
	Professional	Unemployed	-.01345	.09285	.990	-.2435	.2166
		Skilled worker	.43225*	.11777	.002	.1405	.7240

Instruction	Unemployed	Skilled worker	.37842*	.13407	.021	.0463	.7106
		Professional	.01946	.09184	.978	-.2081	.2470
	Skilled worker	Unemployed	-.37842*	.13407	.021	-.7106	-.0463
		Professional	-.35897*	.11649	.010	-.6476	-.0704
	Professional	Unemployed	-.01946	.09184	.978	-.2470	.2081
		Skilled worker	.35897*	.11649	.010	.0704	.6476
Modeling	Unemployed	Skilled worker	.37654*	.14140	.032	.0262	.7268
		Professional	-.01764	.09686	.984	-.2576	.2223
	Skilled worker	Unemployed	-.37654*	.14140	.032	-.7268	-.0262
		Professional	-.39419*	.12286	.007	-.6986	-.0898
	Professional	Unemployed	.01764	.09686	.984	-.2223	.2576
		Skilled worker	.39419*	.12286	.007	.0898	.6986

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

Encouragement

Scheffe^{a,b}

Employment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Skilled worker	15	5.0872	
Professional	86		5.5608
Unemployed	27		5.6040
Sig.		1.000	.954

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 26.012.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Reinforcement

Scheffe^{a,b}

Employment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Skilled worker	15	5.2010	
Professional	86		5.6333
Unemployed	27		5.6467
Sig.		1.000	.993

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 26.012.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

InstructionScheffe^{a,b}

Employment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Skilled worker	15	5.2947	
Professional	86		5.6537
Unemployed	27		5.6731
Sig.		1.000	.986

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 26.012.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

ModelingScheffe^{a,b}

Employment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Skilled worker	15	5.2667	
Unemployed	27		5.6432
Professional	86		5.6609
Sig.		1.000	.990

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 26.012.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Workmode
 /MISSING ANALYSIS
 /POSTHOC=SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).

Oneway**Notes**

Output Created	25-FEB-2022 10:35:59	
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

Cases Used		Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Workmode /MISSING ANALYSIS /POSTHOC=SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.04

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Encouragement	Between Groups	.095	3	.032	.112	.953
	Within Groups	35.204	124	.284		
	Total	35.299	127			
Reinforcement	Between Groups	.127	3	.042	.214	.886
	Within Groups	24.531	124	.198		
	Total	24.659	127			
Instruction	Between Groups	.030	3	.010	.053	.984
	Within Groups	23.394	124	.189		
	Total	23.424	127			
Modeling	Between Groups	.458	3	.153	.737	.532
	Within Groups	25.662	124	.207		
	Total	26.120	127			

ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Income
 /MISSING ANALYSIS
 /POSTHOC=SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).

Oneway**Notes**

Output Created		25-FEB-2022 10:36:34
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128

Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Income /MISSING ANALYSIS /POSTHOC=SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.09
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.12

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Encouragement	Between Groups	5.011	7	.716	2.836	.009
	Within Groups	30.288	120	.252		
	Total	35.299	127			
Reinforcement	Between Groups	2.122	7	.303	1.615	.138
	Within Groups	22.536	120	.188		
	Total	24.659	127			
Instruction	Between Groups	2.312	7	.330	1.877	.079
	Within Groups	21.112	120	.176		
	Total	23.424	127			
Modeling	Between Groups	1.767	7	.252	1.244	.284
	Within Groups	24.353	120	.203		
	Total	26.120	127			

Post Hoc Tests**Multiple Comparisons**

Scheffe

Dependent Variable	(I) Monthly income	(J) Monthly income	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Encouragement	Below 15,000	15,000 to 24,000	.28846	.34012	.998	-1.0115	1.5884
		25,000 to 34,000	-.50641	.32430	.930	-1.7459	.7330

		35,000 to 49,000	-.12821	.33493	1.000	-1.4083	1.1519
		50,000 to 74,000	-.39799	.30840	.975	-1.5767	.7807
		75,000 to 99,000	-.45562	.32179	.958	-1.6855	.7743
		100,000 to 150,000	-.45385	.30422	.945	-1.6165	.7089
		Above 150,000	-.41795	.30422	.965	-1.5807	.7448
		Below 15,000	-.28846	.34012	.998	-1.5884	1.0115
	15,000 to 24,000	25,000 to 34,000	-.79487	.22931	.111	-1.6713	.0815
		35,000 to 49,000	-.41667	.24412	.891	-1.3497	.5164
		50,000 to 74,000	-.68645	.20621	.147	-1.4746	.1017
		75,000 to 99,000	-.74408	.22576	.156	-1.6069	.1187
		100,000 to 150,000	-.74231	.19991	.065	-1.5064	.0217
		Above 150,000	-.70641	.19991	.097	-1.4705	.0576
	25,000 to 34,000	Below 15,000	.50641	.32430	.930	-.7330	1.7459
		15,000 to 24,000	.79487	.22931	.111	-.0815	1.6713
		35,000 to 49,000	.37821	.22154	.891	-.4685	1.2249
		50,000 to 74,000	.10842	.17891	1.000	-.5754	.7922
		75,000 to 99,000	.05079	.20112	1.000	-.7179	.8195
		100,000 to 150,000	.05256	.17160	1.000	-.6033	.7084
		Above 150,000	.08846	.17160	1.000	-.5674	.7443
	35,000 to 49,000	Below 15,000	.12821	.33493	1.000	-1.1519	1.4083
		15,000 to 24,000	.41667	.24412	.891	-.5164	1.3497
		25,000 to 34,000	-.37821	.22154	.891	-1.2249	.4685
		50,000 to 74,000	-.26979	.19753	.966	-1.0247	.4852
		75,000 to 99,000	-.32742	.21785	.942	-1.1600	.5052
		100,000 to 150,000	-.32564	.19094	.891	-1.0554	.4041

	50,000 to 74,000	Above 150,000	-.28974	.19094	.939	-1.0195	.4400
		Below 15,000	.39799	.30840	.975	-.7807	1.5767
		15,000 to 24,000	.68645	.20621	.147	-.1017	1.4746
		25,000 to 34,000	-.10842	.17891	1.000	-.7922	.5754
		35,000 to 49,000	.26979	.19753	.966	-.4852	1.0247
		75,000 to 99,000	-.05763	.17433	1.000	-.7239	.6086
		100,000 to 150,000	-.05585	.13924	1.000	-.5880	.4763
		Above 150,000	-.01996	.13924	1.000	-.5521	.5122
	75,000 to 99,000	Below 15,000	.45562	.32179	.958	-.7743	1.6855
		15,000 to 24,000	.74408	.22576	.156	-.1187	1.6069
		25,000 to 34,000	-.05079	.20112	1.000	-.8195	.7179
		35,000 to 49,000	.32742	.21785	.942	-.5052	1.1600
		50,000 to 74,000	.05763	.17433	1.000	-.6086	.7239
		100,000 to 150,000	.00178	.16682	1.000	-.6358	.6394
		Above 150,000	.03767	.16682	1.000	-.5999	.6753
	100,000 to 150,000	Below 15,000	.45385	.30422	.945	-.7089	1.6165
		15,000 to 24,000	.74231	.19991	.065	-.0217	1.5064
		25,000 to 34,000	-.05256	.17160	1.000	-.7084	.6033
		35,000 to 49,000	.32564	.19094	.891	-.4041	1.0554
		50,000 to 74,000	.05585	.13924	1.000	-.4763	.5880
		75,000 to 99,000	-.00178	.16682	1.000	-.6394	.6358
		Above 150,000	.03590	.12972	1.000	-.4599	.5317
	Above 150,000	Below 15,000	.41795	.30422	.965	-.7448	1.5807
		15,000 to 24,000	.70641	.19991	.097	-.0576	1.4705
		25,000 to 34,000	-.08846	.17160	1.000	-.7443	.5674
		35,000 to 49,000	.28974	.19094	.939	-.4400	1.0195

		50,000 to 74,000	.01996	.13924	1.000	-.5122	.5521
		75,000 to 99,000	-.03767	.16682	1.000	-.6753	.5999
		100,000 to 150,000	-.03590	.12972	1.000	-.5317	.4599
Reinforcement	Below 15,000	15,000 to 24,000	.10288	.29339	1.000	-1.0184	1.2242
		25,000 to 34,000	-.31410	.27973	.989	-1.3832	.7550
		35,000 to 49,000	-.33162	.28891	.987	-1.4358	.7726
		50,000 to 74,000	-.22408	.26602	.998	-1.2408	.7926
		75,000 to 99,000	-.38521	.27757	.963	-1.4461	.6757
		100,000 to 150,000	-.40000	.26241	.938	-1.4029	.6029
		Above 150,000	-.24872	.26241	.996	-1.2517	.7542
	15,000 to 24,000	Below 15,000	-.10288	.29339	1.000	-1.2242	1.0184
		25,000 to 34,000	-.41699	.19780	.726	-1.1730	.3390
		35,000 to 49,000	-.43451	.21058	.748	-1.2393	.3703
		50,000 to 74,000	-.32696	.17788	.846	-1.0068	.3529
		75,000 to 99,000	-.48809	.19473	.511	-1.2324	.2562
		100,000 to 150,000	-.50288	.17244	.300	-1.1619	.1562
		Above 150,000	-.35160	.17244	.760	-1.0107	.3075
	25,000 to 34,000	Below 15,000	.31410	.27973	.989	-.7550	1.3832
		15,000 to 24,000	.41699	.19780	.726	-.3390	1.1730
		35,000 to 49,000	-.01752	.19109	1.000	-.7479	.7128
		50,000 to 74,000	.09002	.15432	1.000	-.4998	.6798
		75,000 to 99,000	-.07110	.17348	1.000	-.7342	.5919
		100,000 to 150,000	-.08590	.14802	1.000	-.6516	.4798
		Above 150,000	.06538	.14802	1.000	-.5003	.6311
	35,000 to 49,000	Below 15,000	.33162	.28891	.987	-.7726	1.4358
		15,000 to 24,000	.43451	.21058	.748	-.3703	1.2393

	25,000 to 34,000	.01752	.19109	1.000	-.7128	.7479
	50,000 to 74,000	.10754	.17039	1.000	-.5437	.7588
	75,000 to 99,000	-.05358	.18792	1.000	-.7718	.6646
	100,000 to 150,000	-.06838	.16470	1.000	-.6979	.5611
	Above 150,000	.08291	.16470	1.000	-.5466	.7124
50,000 to 74,000	Below 15,000	.22408	.26602	.998	-.7926	1.2408
	15,000 to 24,000	.32696	.17788	.846	-.3529	1.0068
	25,000 to 34,000	-.09002	.15432	1.000	-.6798	.4998
	35,000 to 49,000	-.10754	.17039	1.000	-.7588	.5437
	75,000 to 99,000	-.16113	.15037	.992	-.7358	.4136
	100,000 to 150,000	-.17592	.12011	.950	-.6350	.2831
	Above 150,000	-.02464	.12011	1.000	-.4837	.4344
75,000 to 99,000	Below 15,000	.38521	.27757	.963	-.6757	1.4461
	15,000 to 24,000	.48809	.19473	.511	-.2562	1.2324
	25,000 to 34,000	.07110	.17348	1.000	-.5919	.7342
	35,000 to 49,000	.05358	.18792	1.000	-.6646	.7718
	50,000 to 74,000	.16113	.15037	.992	-.4136	.7358
	100,000 to 150,000	-.01479	.14390	1.000	-.5648	.5352
	Above 150,000	.13649	.14390	.996	-.4135	.6865
100,000 to 150,000	Below 15,000	.40000	.26241	.938	-.6029	1.4029
	15,000 to 24,000	.50288	.17244	.300	-.1562	1.1619
	25,000 to 34,000	.08590	.14802	1.000	-.4798	.6516
	35,000 to 49,000	.06838	.16470	1.000	-.5611	.6979
	50,000 to 74,000	.17592	.12011	.950	-.2831	.6350
	75,000 to 99,000	.01479	.14390	1.000	-.5352	.5648
	Above 150,000	.15128	.11189	.968	-.2764	.5789
Above	Below 15,000	.24872	.26241	.996	-.7542	1.2517

	150,000	15,000 to 24,000	.35160	.17244	.760	-.3075	1.0107
		25,000 to 34,000	-.06538	.14802	1.000	-.6311	.5003
		35,000 to 49,000	-.08291	.16470	1.000	-.7124	.5466
		50,000 to 74,000	.02464	.12011	1.000	-.4344	.4837
		75,000 to 99,000	-.13649	.14390	.996	-.6865	.4135
		100,000 to 150,000	-.15128	.11189	.968	-.5789	.2764
Instruction	Below 15,000	15,000 to 24,000	.08697	.28397	1.000	-.9983	1.1723
		25,000 to 34,000	-.35171	.27075	.974	-1.3865	.6831
		35,000 to 49,000	-.35783	.27963	.976	-1.4266	.7109
		50,000 to 74,000	-.30531	.25748	.985	-1.2894	.6788
		75,000 to 99,000	-.29928	.26866	.989	-1.3261	.7275
		100,000 to 150,000	-.46581	.25399	.847	-1.4365	.5049
		Above 150,000	-.34000	.25399	.969	-1.3107	.6307
	15,000 to 24,000	Below 15,000	-.08697	.28397	1.000	-1.1723	.9983
		25,000 to 34,000	-.43868	.19145	.630	-1.1704	.2930
		35,000 to 49,000	-.44480	.20381	.688	-1.2238	.3342
		50,000 to 74,000	-.39228	.17217	.637	-1.0503	.2657
		75,000 to 99,000	-.38624	.18848	.755	-1.1066	.3341
		100,000 to 150,000	-.55278	.16690	.152	-1.1907	.0851
		Above 150,000	-.42697	.16690	.482	-1.0649	.2109
	25,000 to 34,000	Below 15,000	.35171	.27075	.974	-.6831	1.3865
		15,000 to 24,000	.43868	.19145	.630	-.2930	1.1704
		35,000 to 49,000	-.00613	.18496	1.000	-.7130	.7008
		50,000 to 74,000	.04640	.14937	1.000	-.5245	.6173
		75,000 to 99,000	.05243	.16791	1.000	-.5893	.6942

	100,000 to 150,000	-.11410	.14327	.999	-.6617	.4335
	Above 150,000	.01171	.14327	1.000	-.5359	.5593
35,000 to 49,000	Below 15,000	.35783	.27963	.976	-.7109	1.4266
	15,000 to 24,000	.44480	.20381	.688	-.3342	1.2238
	25,000 to 34,000	.00613	.18496	1.000	-.7008	.7130
	50,000 to 74,000	.05252	.16492	1.000	-.5778	.6828
	75,000 to 99,000	.05856	.18188	1.000	-.6366	.7537
	100,000 to 150,000	-.10798	.15941	1.000	-.7172	.5013
	Above 150,000	.01783	.15941	1.000	-.5914	.6271
50,000 to 74,000	Below 15,000	.30531	.25748	.985	-.6788	1.2894
	15,000 to 24,000	.39228	.17217	.637	-.2657	1.0503
	25,000 to 34,000	-.04640	.14937	1.000	-.6173	.5245
	35,000 to 49,000	-.05252	.16492	1.000	-.6828	.5778
	75,000 to 99,000	.00604	.14554	1.000	-.5502	.5623
	100,000 to 150,000	-.16050	.11625	.964	-.6048	.2838
	Above 150,000	-.03469	.11625	1.000	-.4790	.4096
75,000 to 99,000	Below 15,000	.29928	.26866	.989	-.7275	1.3261
	15,000 to 24,000	.38624	.18848	.755	-.3341	1.1066
	25,000 to 34,000	-.05243	.16791	1.000	-.6942	.5893
	35,000 to 49,000	-.05856	.18188	1.000	-.7537	.6366
	50,000 to 74,000	-.00604	.14554	1.000	-.5623	.5502
	100,000 to 150,000	-.16654	.13928	.984	-.6988	.3658
	Above 150,000	-.04072	.13928	1.000	-.5730	.4916
100,000 to 150,000	Below 15,000	.46581	.25399	.847	-.5049	1.4365
	15,000 to 24,000	.55278	.16690	.152	-.0851	1.1907
	25,000 to 34,000	.11410	.14327	.999	-.4335	.6617
	35,000 to 49,000	.10798	.15941	1.000	-.5013	.7172

		50,000 to 74,000	.16050	.11625	.964	-.2838	.6048
		75,000 to 99,000	.16654	.13928	.984	-.3658	.6988
		Above 150,000	.12581	.10830	.986	-.2881	.5397
	Above 150,000	Below 15,000	.34000	.25399	.969	-.6307	1.3107
		15,000 to 24,000	.42697	.16690	.482	-.2109	1.0649
		25,000 to 34,000	-.01171	.14327	1.000	-.5593	.5359
		35,000 to 49,000	-.01783	.15941	1.000	-.6271	.5914
		50,000 to 74,000	.03469	.11625	1.000	-.4096	.4790
		75,000 to 99,000	.04072	.13928	1.000	-.4916	.5730
		100,000 to 150,000	-.12581	.10830	.986	-.5397	.2881
Modeling	Below 15,000	15,000 to 24,000	-.03750	.30498	1.000	-1.2031	1.1281
		25,000 to 34,000	-.28889	.29079	.995	-1.4003	.8225
		35,000 to 49,000	-.30000	.30033	.995	-1.4478	.8478
		50,000 to 74,000	-.28551	.27653	.993	-1.3424	.7714
		75,000 to 99,000	-.39744	.28854	.964	-1.5002	.7054
		100,000 to 150,000	-.45556	.27278	.902	-1.4981	.5870
		Above 150,000	-.40667	.27278	.945	-1.4492	.6359
	15,000 to 24,000	Below 15,000	.03750	.30498	1.000	-1.1281	1.2031
		25,000 to 34,000	-.25139	.20562	.982	-1.0373	.5345
		35,000 to 49,000	-.26250	.21890	.984	-1.0991	.5741
		50,000 to 74,000	-.24801	.18491	.969	-.9547	.4587
		75,000 to 99,000	-.35994	.20243	.867	-1.1336	.4137
		100,000 to 150,000	-.41806	.17925	.608	-1.1032	.2670
		Above 150,000	-.36917	.17925	.750	-1.0543	.3159
	25,000 to	Below 15,000	.28889	.29079	.995	-.8225	1.4003

34,000	15,000 to 24,000	.25139	.20562	.982	-.5345	1.0373
	35,000 to 49,000	-.01111	.19865	1.000	-.7703	.7481
	50,000 to 74,000	.00338	.16042	1.000	-.6097	.6165
	75,000 to 99,000	-.10855	.18034	1.000	-.7978	.5807
	100,000 to 150,000	-.16667	.15387	.991	-.7548	.4214
	Above 150,000	-.11778	.15387	.999	-.7059	.4703
35,000 to 49,000	Below 15,000	.30000	.30033	.995	-.8478	1.4478
	15,000 to 24,000	.26250	.21890	.984	-.5741	1.0991
	25,000 to 34,000	.01111	.19865	1.000	-.7481	.7703
	50,000 to 74,000	.01449	.17712	1.000	-.6625	.6914
	75,000 to 99,000	-.09744	.19535	1.000	-.8440	.6492
	100,000 to 150,000	-.15556	.17121	.997	-.8099	.4988
	Above 150,000	-.10667	.17121	1.000	-.7610	.5477
50,000 to 74,000	Below 15,000	.28551	.27653	.993	-.7714	1.3424
	15,000 to 24,000	.24801	.18491	.969	-.4587	.9547
	25,000 to 34,000	-.00338	.16042	1.000	-.6165	.6097
	35,000 to 49,000	-.01449	.17712	1.000	-.6914	.6625
	75,000 to 99,000	-.11193	.15631	.999	-.7094	.4855
	100,000 to 150,000	-.17005	.12485	.966	-.6472	.3071
	Above 150,000	-.12116	.12485	.995	-.5983	.3560
75,000 to 99,000	Below 15,000	.39744	.28854	.964	-.7054	1.5002
	15,000 to 24,000	.35994	.20243	.867	-.4137	1.1336
	25,000 to 34,000	.10855	.18034	1.000	-.5807	.7978
	35,000 to 49,000	.09744	.19535	1.000	-.6492	.8440
	50,000 to 74,000	.11193	.15631	.999	-.4855	.7094

	100,000 to 150,000	-.05812	.14958	1.000	-.6298	.5136
	Above 150,000	-.00923	.14958	1.000	-.5809	.5625
100,000 to 150,000	Below 15,000	.45556	.27278	.902	-.5870	1.4981
	15,000 to 24,000	.41806	.17925	.608	-.2670	1.1032
	25,000 to 34,000	.16667	.15387	.991	-.4214	.7548
	35,000 to 49,000	.15556	.17121	.997	-.4988	.8099
	50,000 to 74,000	.17005	.12485	.966	-.3071	.6472
	75,000 to 99,000	.05812	.14958	1.000	-.5136	.6298
	Above 150,000	.04889	.11632	1.000	-.3957	.4934
Above 150,000	Below 15,000	.40667	.27278	.945	-.6359	1.4492
	15,000 to 24,000	.36917	.17925	.750	-.3159	1.0543
	25,000 to 34,000	.11778	.15387	.999	-.4703	.7059
	35,000 to 49,000	.10667	.17121	1.000	-.5477	.7610
	50,000 to 74,000	.12116	.12485	.995	-.3560	.5983
	75,000 to 99,000	.00923	.14958	1.000	-.5625	.5809
	100,000 to 150,000	-.04889	.11632	1.000	-.4934	.3957

Homogeneous Subsets**Encouragement**Scheffe^{a,b}

Monthly income	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
		1
15,000 to 24,000	8	4.8654
Below 15,000	3	5.1538
35,000 to 49,000	9	5.2821
50,000 to 74,000	23	5.5518
Above 150,000	30	5.5718
100,000 to 150,000	30	5.6077
75,000 to 99,000	13	5.6095
25,000 to 34,000	12	5.6603
Sig.		.115

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 9.526.
 b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Reinforcement

Scheffe^{a,b}

Monthly income	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
		1
15,000 to 24,000	8	5.2048
Below 15,000	3	5.3077
50,000 to 74,000	23	5.5318
Above 150,000	30	5.5564
25,000 to 34,000	12	5.6218
35,000 to 49,000	9	5.6393
75,000 to 99,000	13	5.6929
100,000 to 150,000	30	5.7077
Sig.		.497

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 9.526.
 b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Instruction

Scheffe^{a,b}

Monthly income	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
		1
15,000 to 24,000	8	5.2019
Below 15,000	3	5.2889
75,000 to 99,000	13	5.5882
50,000 to 74,000	23	5.5942
Above 150,000	30	5.6289
25,000 to 34,000	12	5.6406
35,000 to 49,000	9	5.6467
100,000 to 150,000	30	5.7547
Sig.		.318

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 9.526.
 b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Modeling

Scheffe^{a,b}

Monthly income	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
		1
Below 15,000	3	5.2667

15,000 to 24,000	8	5.3042
50,000 to 74,000	23	5.5522
25,000 to 34,000	12	5.5556
35,000 to 49,000	9	5.5667
75,000 to 99,000	13	5.6641
Above 150,000	30	5.6733
100,000 to 150,000	30	5.7222
Sig.		.675

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 9.526.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Grade
 /MISSING ANALYSIS
 /POSTHOC=SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).

Oneway

Notes

Output Created		25-FEB-2022 10:36:51
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Grade /MISSING ANALYSIS /POSTHOC=SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.03

Warnings

Post hoc tests are not performed for Encouragement because at least one group has fewer than two cases.

Post hoc tests are not performed for Reinforcement because at least one group has fewer than two cases.

Post hoc tests are not performed for Instruction because at least one group has fewer than two cases.

Post hoc tests are not performed for Modeling because at least one group has fewer than two cases.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Encouragement	Between Groups	.460	5	.092	.322	.899
	Within Groups	34.839	122	.286		
	Total	35.299	127			
Reinforcement	Between Groups	.207	5	.041	.207	.959
	Within Groups	24.451	122	.200		
	Total	24.659	127			
Instruction	Between Groups	.420	5	.084	.445	.816
	Within Groups	23.004	122	.189		
	Total	23.424	127			
Modeling	Between Groups	.376	5	.075	.357	.877
	Within Groups	25.744	122	.211		
	Total	26.120	127			

CORRELATIONS

/VARIABLES=performance AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH
 /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
 /MISSING=PAIRWISE.

Correlations**Notes**

Output Created		25-FEB-2022 10:37:16
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

Cases Used		Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with valid data for that pair.
Syntax		CORRELATIONS /VARIABLES=performance AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG /MISSING=PAIRWISE.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.02

Correlations

		performance	Encourage ment	Reinforce ment	Instruc tion	Modeling
performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.056	-.021	-.018	-.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.534	.814	.844	.858
	N	125	125	125	125	125
Encouragement	Pearson Correlation	.056	1	.722**	.772**	.715**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.534		.000	.000	.000
	N	125	128	128	128	128
Reinforcement	Pearson Correlation	-.021	.722**	1	.820**	.793**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.814	.000		.000	.000
	N	125	128	128	128	128
Instruction	Pearson Correlation	-.018	.772**	.820**	1	.779**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.844	.000	.000		.000
	N	125	128	128	128	128
Modeling	Pearson Correlation	-.016	.715**	.793**	.779**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.858	.000	.000	.000	
	N	125	128	128	128	128

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

REGRESSION

```

/MISSING LISTWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT performance
/METHOD=ENTER AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH.

```

Regression

Notes

Output Created		25-FEB-2022 10:37:37
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any variable used.
Syntax		REGRESSION /MISSING LISTWISE /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10) /NOORIGIN /DEPENDENT performance /METHOD=ENTER AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.05
	Memory Required	4352 bytes
	Additional Memory Required for Residual Plots	0 bytes

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Modeling, Encouragement, Reinforcement, Instruction ^b	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: performance

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.122 ^a	.015	-.018	4.07428

a. Predictors: (Constant), Modeling, Encouragement, Reinforcement, Instruction

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	29.914	4	7.478	.451	.772 ^b
	Residual	1991.974	120	16.600		
	Total	2021.888	124			

a. Dependent Variable: performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Modeling, Encouragement, Reinforcement, Instruction

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	25.798	5.038		5.121	.000
	Encouragement	1.539	1.164	.200	1.322	.189
	Reinforcement	-.568	1.630	-.062	-.349	.728
	Instruction	-.856	1.713	-.091	-.500	.618
	Modeling	-.349	1.439	-.039	-.243	.809

a. Dependent Variable: performance

REGRESSION

/MISSING LISTWISE

/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA

/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

/NOORIGIN

/DEPENDENT performance

/METHOD=STEPWISE AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH Age Sex Education Employment Workmode Income Grade.

Regression**Notes**

Output Created		25-FEB-2022 10:38:12
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128

Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any variable used.
Syntax		REGRESSION /MISSING LISTWISE /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10) /NOORIGIN /DEPENDENT performance /METHOD=STEPWISE AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH Age Sex Education Employment Workmode Income Grade.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.04
	Memory Required	11552 bytes
	Additional Memory Required for Residual Plots	0 bytes

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Work modality	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: performance

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.192 ^a	.037	.029	3.97903

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work modality

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	74.464	1	74.464	4.703	.032 ^b
	Residual	1947.424	123	15.833		
	Total	2021.888	124			

a. Dependent Variable: performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Work modality

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		

1	(Constant)	25.521	.652		39.135	.000
	Work modality	-.772	.356	-.192	-2.169	.032

a. Dependent Variable: performance

Excluded Variables^a

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
						Tolerance
1	Encouragement	.053 ^b	.593	.554	.054	1.000
	Reinforcement	-.028 ^b	-.320	.750	-.029	.999
	Instruction	-.021 ^b	-.236	.814	-.021	1.000
	Modeling	-.024 ^b	-.271	.787	-.025	.998
	Age	-.045 ^b	-.505	.615	-.046	.998
	Sex	-.003 ^b	-.032	.974	-.003	1.000
	Educational attainment	.057 ^b	.630	.530	.057	.964
	Employment	-.045 ^b	-.370	.712	-.033	.541
	Monthly income	.049 ^b	.553	.581	.050	.999
	Grade of child	-.056 ^b	-.627	.532	-.057	.991

a. Dependent Variable: performance

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Work modality

DATASET ACTIVATE DataSet2.

```
SAVE OUTFILE='C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav'
/COMPRESSED.
ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Education
/MISSING ANALYSIS
/POSTHOC=TUKEY DUNCAN SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).
```

Oneway

Notes

Output Created		25-FEB-2022 11:11:27
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

Cases Used		Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		ONEWAY AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH BY Education /MISSING ANALYSIS /POSTHOC=TUKEY DUNCAN SCHEFFE ALPHA(0.05).
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.13
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.18

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Encouragement	Between Groups	2.888	4	.722	2.740	.032
	Within Groups	32.410	123	.263		
	Total	35.299	127			
Reinforcement	Between Groups	2.152	4	.538	2.940	.023
	Within Groups	22.507	123	.183		
	Total	24.659	127			
Instruction	Between Groups	2.077	4	.519	2.992	.021
	Within Groups	21.347	123	.174		
	Total	23.424	127			
Modeling	Between Groups	1.824	4	.456	2.308	.062
	Within Groups	24.296	123	.198		
	Total	26.120	127			

Post Hoc Tests**Multiple Comparisons**

Dependent Variable	(I) Educational attainment	(J) Educational attainment	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Encouragement	High school	College level	.04931	.32879	1.000	-.8610	.9596
		College graduate	-.25219	.30155	.919	-1.0871	.5827
		Masteral	-.37821	.31782	.757	-1.2581	.5017
		Doctoral	-.66667	.35423	.332	-1.6474	.3141
	College level	High school	-.04931	.32879	1.000	-.9596	.8610
		College graduate	-.30150	.15287	.286	-.7247	.1217
		Masteral	-.42751	.18288	.140	-.9338	.0788

	College graduate	Doctoral	-.71598*	.24065	.029	-1.3823	-.0497
		High school	.25219	.30155	.919	-.5827	1.0871
		College level	.30150	.15287	.286	-.1217	.7247
		Masteral	-.12602	.12757	.860	-.4792	.2272
	Masteral	Doctoral	-.41448	.20185	.247	-.9733	.1444
		High school	.37821	.31782	.757	-.5017	1.2581
		College level	.42751	.18288	.140	-.0788	.9338
		College graduate	.12602	.12757	.860	-.2272	.4792
	Doctoral	Doctoral	-.28846	.22543	.704	-.9126	.3357
		High school	.66667	.35423	.332	-.3141	1.6474
		College level	.71598*	.24065	.029	.0497	1.3823
		College graduate	.41448	.20185	.247	-.1444	.9733
	High school	Masteral	.28846	.22543	.704	-.3357	.9126
		College level	.04931	.32879	1.000	-.9790	1.0776
		College graduate	-.25219	.30155	.951	-1.1953	.6909
		Masteral	-.37821	.31782	.841	-1.3722	.6158
	College level	Doctoral	-.66667	.35423	.475	-1.7745	.4412
		High school	-.04931	.32879	1.000	-1.0776	.9790
		College graduate	-.30150	.15287	.425	-.7796	.1766
		Masteral	-.42751	.18288	.250	-.9995	.1444
	College graduate	Doctoral	-.71598	.24065	.071	-1.4686	.0367
		High school	.25219	.30155	.951	-.6909	1.1953
		College level	.30150	.15287	.425	-.1766	.7796
		Masteral	-.12602	.12757	.913	-.5250	.2730
	Masteral	Doctoral	-.41448	.20185	.382	-1.0458	.2168
		High school	.37821	.31782	.841	-.6158	1.3722
		College level	.42751	.18288	.250	-.1444	.9995
		College graduate	.12602	.12757	.913	-.2730	.5250
	Doctoral	Doctoral	-.28846	.22543	.802	-.9935	.4166
		High school	.66667	.35423	.475	-.4412	1.7745
		College level	.71598	.24065	.071	-.0367	1.4686
		College graduate	.41448	.20185	.382	-.2168	1.0458
Reinforcement	High school	Masteral	.28846	.22543	.802	-.4166	.9935
		College level	.29467	.27399	.819	-.4639	1.0533
		College graduate	.05158	.25129	1.000	-.6442	.7473

	Masteral	-.11154	.26485	.993	-.8448	.6217
	Doctoral	-.30769	.29519	.835	-1.1250	.5096
College level	High school	-.29467	.27399	.819	-1.0533	.4639
	College graduate	-.24309	.12739	.318	-.5958	.1096
	Masteral	-.40621	.15240	.065	-.8281	.0157
	Doctoral	-.60237*	.20054	.026	-1.1576	-.0471
College graduate	High school	-.05158	.25129	1.000	-.7473	.6442
	College level	.24309	.12739	.318	-.1096	.5958
	Masteral	-.16312	.10631	.542	-.4575	.1312
	Doctoral	-.35928	.16821	.212	-.8250	.1064
Masteral	High school	.11154	.26485	.993	-.6217	.8448
	College level	.40621	.15240	.065	-.0157	.8281
	College graduate	.16312	.10631	.542	-.1312	.4575
	Doctoral	-.19615	.18785	.834	-.7163	.3240
Doctoral	High school	.30769	.29519	.835	-.5096	1.1250
	College level	.60237*	.20054	.026	.0471	1.1576
	College graduate	.35928	.16821	.212	-.1064	.8250
	Masteral	.19615	.18785	.834	-.3240	.7163
High school	College level	.29467	.27399	.885	-.5622	1.1516
	College graduate	.05158	.25129	1.000	-.7343	.8375
	Masteral	-.11154	.26485	.996	-.9399	.7168
	Doctoral	-.30769	.29519	.896	-1.2309	.6155
College level	High school	-.29467	.27399	.885	-1.1516	.5622
	College graduate	-.24309	.12739	.460	-.6415	.1553
	Masteral	-.40621	.15240	.138	-.8828	.0704
	Doctoral	-.60237	.20054	.067	-1.2296	.0248
College graduate	High school	-.05158	.25129	1.000	-.8375	.7343
	College level	.24309	.12739	.460	-.1553	.6415
	Masteral	-.16312	.10631	.672	-.4956	.1694
	Doctoral	-.35928	.16821	.341	-.8853	.1668
Masteral	High school	.11154	.26485	.996	-.7168	.9399
	College level	.40621	.15240	.138	-.0704	.8828
	College graduate	.16312	.10631	.672	-.1694	.4956
	Doctoral	-.19615	.18785	.895	-.7837	.3914
Doctoral	High school	.30769	.29519	.896	-.6155	1.2309
	College level	.60237	.20054	.067	-.0248	1.2296
	College graduate	.35928	.16821	.341	-.1668	.8853
	Masteral	.19615	.18785	.895	-.3914	.7837

Instruction	High school	College level	.31637	.26683	.760	-.4224	1.0551
		College graduate	.06130	.24473	.999	-.6163	.7389
		Masteral	-.02333	.25793	1.000	-.7375	.6908
		Doctoral	-.33333	.28748	.774	-1.1293	.4626
	College level	High school	-.31637	.26683	.760	-1.0551	.4224
		College graduate	-.25507	.12406	.246	-.5986	.0884
		Masteral	-.33970	.14842	.156	-.7506	.0712
		Doctoral	-.64970*	.19530	.010	-1.1904	-.1090
	College graduate	High school	-.06130	.24473	.999	-.7389	.6163
		College level	.25507	.12406	.246	-.0884	.5986
		Masteral	-.08463	.10353	.925	-.3713	.2020
		Doctoral	-.39463	.16381	.120	-.8482	.0589
	Masteral	High school	.02333	.25793	1.000	-.6908	.7375
		College level	.33970	.14842	.156	-.0712	.7506
		College graduate	.08463	.10353	.925	-.2020	.3713
		Doctoral	-.31000	.18295	.441	-.8165	.1965
	Doctoral	High school	.33333	.28748	.774	-.4626	1.1293
		College level	.64970*	.19530	.010	.1090	1.1904
		College graduate	.39463	.16381	.120	-.0589	.8482
		Masteral	.31000	.18295	.441	-.1965	.8165
	High school	College level	.31637	.26683	.843	-.5182	1.1509
		College graduate	.06130	.24473	1.000	-.7041	.8267
		Masteral	-.02333	.25793	1.000	-.8300	.7834
		Doctoral	-.33333	.28748	.853	-1.2324	.5658
	College level	High school	-.31637	.26683	.843	-1.1509	.5182
		College graduate	-.25507	.12406	.381	-.6431	.1329
		Masteral	-.33970	.14842	.270	-.8039	.1245
		Doctoral	-.64970*	.19530	.030	-1.2605	-.0389
	College graduate	High school	-.06130	.24473	1.000	-.8267	.7041
		College level	.25507	.12406	.381	-.1329	.6431
		Masteral	-.08463	.10353	.955	-.4084	.2392
		Doctoral	-.39463	.16381	.221	-.9070	.1177
	Masteral	High school	.02333	.25793	1.000	-.7834	.8300
		College level	.33970	.14842	.270	-.1245	.8039
		College graduate	.08463	.10353	.955	-.2392	.4084
		Doctoral	-.31000	.18295	.581	-.8822	.2622
	Doctoral	High school	.33333	.28748	.853	-.5658	1.2324
		College level	.64970*	.19530	.030	.0389	1.2605

Modeling		College graduate	.39463	.16381	.221	-.1177	.9070
		Masteral	.31000	.18295	.581	-.2622	.8822
	High school	College level	.35641	.28467	.721	-.4318	1.1446
		College graduate	.14980	.26109	.979	-.5731	.8727
		Masteral	-.03167	.27517	1.000	-.7935	.7302
		Doctoral	-.15238	.30670	.988	-1.0015	.6968
	College level	High school	-.35641	.28467	.721	-1.1446	.4318
		College graduate	-.20661	.13236	.525	-.5731	.1598
		Masteral	-.38808	.15834	.109	-.8265	.0503
		Doctoral	-.50879	.20836	.111	-1.0857	.0681
	College graduate	High school	-.14980	.26109	.979	-.8727	.5731
		College level	.20661	.13236	.525	-.1598	.5731
		Masteral	-.18147	.11046	.473	-.4873	.1243
		Doctoral	-.30218	.17476	.420	-.7860	.1817
	Masteral	High school	.03167	.27517	1.000	-.7302	.7935
		College level	.38808	.15834	.109	-.0503	.8265
		College graduate	.18147	.11046	.473	-.1243	.4873
		Doctoral	-.12071	.19518	.972	-.6611	.4197
	Doctoral	High school	.15238	.30670	.988	-.6968	1.0015
		College level	.50879	.20836	.111	-.0681	1.0857
		College graduate	.30218	.17476	.420	-.1817	.7860
		Masteral	.12071	.19518	.972	-.4197	.6611
	High school	College level	.35641	.28467	.814	-.5339	1.2467
		College graduate	.14980	.26109	.988	-.6668	.9664
		Masteral	-.03167	.27517	1.000	-.8923	.8289
		Doctoral	-.15238	.30670	.993	-1.1116	.8068
	College level	High school	-.35641	.28467	.814	-1.2467	.5339
		College graduate	-.20661	.13236	.657	-.6206	.2073
		Masteral	-.38808	.15834	.206	-.8833	.1071
		Doctoral	-.50879	.20836	.209	-1.1604	.1429
	College graduate	High school	-.14980	.26109	.988	-.9664	.6668
		College level	.20661	.13236	.657	-.2073	.6206
		Masteral	-.18147	.11046	.611	-.5269	.1640
		Doctoral	-.30218	.17476	.562	-.8488	.2444
	Masteral	High school	.03167	.27517	1.000	-.8289	.8923

Doctoral	College level	.38808	.15834	.206	-.1071	.8833
	College graduate	.18147	.11046	.611	-.1640	.5269
	Doctoral	-.12071	.19518	.984	-.7311	.4897
	High school	.15238	.30670	.993	-.8068	1.1116
	College level	.50879	.20836	.209	-.1429	1.1604
	College graduate	.30218	.17476	.562	-.2444	.8488
	Masteral	.12071	.19518	.984	-.4897	.7311

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

Encouragement

	Educational attainment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
			1	2
Tukey HSD ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.2071	
	High school	3	5.2564	5.2564
	College graduate	85	5.5086	5.5086
	Masteral	20	5.6346	5.6346
	Doctoral	7		5.9231
	Sig.		.450	.073
Duncan ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.2071	
	High school	3	5.2564	
	College graduate	85	5.5086	5.5086
	Masteral	20	5.6346	5.6346
	Doctoral	7		5.9231
	Sig.		.129	.127
Scheffe ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.2071	
	High school	3	5.2564	
	College graduate	85	5.5086	
	Masteral	20	5.6346	
	Doctoral	7	5.9231	
	Sig.		.102	

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.132.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Reinforcement

	Educational attainment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
			1	2
Tukey HSD ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.3207	
	College graduate	85	5.5638	5.5638

	High school	3	5.6154	5.6154
	Masteral	20	5.7269	5.7269
	Doctoral	7		5.9231
	Sig.		.315	.442
Duncan ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.3207	
	College graduate	85	5.5638	5.5638
	High school	3	5.6154	5.6154
	Masteral	20	5.7269	5.7269
	Doctoral	7		5.9231
	Sig.		.082	.126
Scheffe ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.3207	
	College graduate	85	5.5638	
	High school	3	5.6154	
	Masteral	20	5.7269	
	Doctoral	7	5.9231	
	Sig.		.096	

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.132.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Instruction

	Educational attainment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
			1	2
Tukey HSD ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.3503	
	College graduate	85	5.6054	5.6054
	High school	3	5.6667	5.6667
	Masteral	20	5.6900	5.6900
	Doctoral	7		6.0000
	Sig.		.472	.318
Duncan ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.3503	
	College graduate	85	5.6054	5.6054
	High school	3	5.6667	5.6667
	Masteral	20	5.6900	5.6900
	Doctoral	7		6.0000
	Sig.		.137	.083
Scheffe ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.3503	
	College graduate	85	5.6054	5.6054
	High school	3	5.6667	5.6667
	Masteral	20	5.6900	5.6900
	Doctoral	7		6.0000
	Sig.		.610	.459

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.132.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Modeling

	Educational attainment	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
			1	2
Tukey HSD ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.3769	
	College graduate	85	5.5835	
	High school	3	5.7333	
	Masteral	20	5.7650	
	Doctoral	7	5.8857	
	Sig.		.149	
Duncan ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.3769	
	College graduate	85	5.5835	5.5835
	High school	3	5.7333	5.7333
	Masteral	20	5.7650	5.7650
	Doctoral	7	5.8857	5.8857
	Sig.		.111	.217
Scheffe ^{a,b}	College level	13	5.3769	
	College graduate	85	5.5835	
	High school	3	5.7333	
	Masteral	20	5.7650	
	Doctoral	7	5.8857	
	Sig.		.262	

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.132.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

T-TEST GROUPS=Sex(1 2)

/MISSING=ANALYSIS

/VARIABLES=AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH

/CRITERIA=CI(.95).

T-Test

Notes

Output Created	25-FEB-2022 11:18:50	
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\ELM Cancino.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>

Missing Value Handling	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	128
	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax	T-TEST GROUPS=Sex(1 2) /MISSING=ANALYSIS /VARIABLES=AveEN AveLK AveTC AveSH /CRITERIA=CI(.95).	
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.03

Group Statistics

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Encouragement	Male	29	5.3581	.48879	.09077
	Female	99	5.5602	.53158	.05343
Reinforcement	Male	29	5.4483	.41121	.07636
	Female	99	5.6256	.44284	.04451
Instruction	Male	29	5.4391	.34435	.06394
	Female	99	5.6674	.43955	.04418
Modeling	Male	29	5.4724	.41995	.07798
	Female	99	5.6515	.45695	.04593

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
Encouragement	Equal variances assumed	.360	.549	-1.833	126	.069	-.20213	.11030	-.42041	.01615
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.919	49.080	.061	-.20213	.10532	-.41377	.00952
Reinforcement	Equal variances assumed	.552	.459	-1.927	126	.056	-.17737	.09206	-.35955	.00482
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.007	48.652	.050	-.17737	.08838	-.35501	.00028
Instruction	Equal variances assumed	3.622	.059	-2.573	126	.011	-.22836	.08874	-.40397	-.05275
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.938	57.372	.005	-.22836	.07772	-.38397	-.07275
Modeling	Equal variances assumed	.307	.580	-1.889	126	.061	-.17910	.09480	-.36672	.00851
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.979	49.103	.053	-.17910	.09050	-.36096	.00276

Frequencies

Notes

Output Created	07-MAY-2022 21:23:02
Comments	

Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\DeGuzman MAELM.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	137
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data.
Syntax		FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=Age Sex Education Yearsservice teachJHS /ORDER=ANALYSIS.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.02

[DataSet1] C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\DeGuzman MAELM.sav

Statistics

		Age	Sex	Education	Yearsservice	teachJHS
N	Valid	137	137	137	137	137
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0

Frequency Table

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20 to 30 years	44	32.1	32.1	32.1
	31 to 40 years	53	38.7	38.7	70.8
	41 to 50 years	29	21.2	21.2	92.0
	51 to 60 years	11	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	137	100.0	100.0	

Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	22	16.1	16.1	16.1
	Female	115	83.9	83.9	100.0
	Total	137	100.0	100.0	

Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	BS Degree	66	48.2	48.2	48.2
	With Masteral units	30	21.9	21.9	70.1
	Masters degree	39	28.5	28.5	98.5
	Doctoral units or degree	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	137	100.0	100.0	

Yearsservice

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	1	.7	.7	.7
	1 to 5 years	51	37.2	37.2	38.0
	6 to 10 years	54	39.4	39.4	77.4
	11 to 15 years	11	8.0	8.0	85.4
	16 to 20 years	11	8.0	8.0	93.4
	more than 20 years	9	6.6	6.6	100.0
	Total	137	100.0	100.0	

teachJHS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	18	13.1	13.1	13.1
	Yes	119	86.9	86.9	100.0
	Total	137	100.0	100.0	

Descriptives**Notes**

Output Created		07-MAY-2022 21:23:18
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\DeGuzman MAELM.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	137
	Missing Value Handling	
	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	All non-missing data are used.

Syntax	DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=AveContent AveInstMaterials AvePedApproach AveAssess /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.	
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Content	137	2.42	4.00	3.4029	.44075
Instructional Materials	137	2.17	4.00	3.5242	.44866
Pedagogical Approach	137	2.33	4.00	3.6857	.42886
Assessment	137	2.20	4.00	3.3620	.49618
Valid N (listwise)	137				

T-Test**Notes**

Output Created	07-MAY-2022 21:24:09	
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\DeGuzman MAELM.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	137
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on the cases with no missing or out-of-range data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax	T-TEST GROUPS=Sex(1 2) /MISSING=ANALYSIS /VARIABLES=AveContent AveInstMaterials AvePedApproach AveAssess /CRITERIA=CI(.95).	
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.03

Group Statistics

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Content	Male	22	3.4809	.44184	.09420

	Female	115	3.3880	.44090	.04111
Instructional Materials	Male	22	3.4995	.45409	.09681
	Female	115	3.5290	.44946	.04191
Pedagogical Approach	Male	22	3.5905	.45641	.09731
	Female	115	3.7039	.42303	.03945
Assessment	Male	22	3.3545	.44048	.09391
	Female	115	3.3635	.50789	.04736

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Content	Equal variances assumed	.175	.677	.905	135	.367	.09291	.10263	-.11007	.29588
	Equal variances not assumed			.904	29.565	.373	.09291	.10278	-.11713	.30295
Instructional Materials	Equal variances assumed	.364	.547	-.281	135	.779	.02941	.10476	-.23659	.17777
	Equal variances not assumed			-.279	29.419	.782	.02941	.10549	-.24504	.18622
Pedagogical Approach	Equal variances assumed	.827	.365	1.138	135	.257	.11346	.09969	-.31061	.08369
	Equal variances not assumed			1.081	28.329	.289	.11346	.10500	-.32843	.10151
Assessment	Equal variances assumed	1.328	.251	-.077	135	.939	.00893	.11589	-.23812	.22026
	Equal variances not assumed			-.085	32.651	.933	.00893	.10518	-.22301	.20514

Oneway**Notes**

Output Created	07-MAY-2022 21:24:23	
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\DeGuzman MAELM.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>

	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	137
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		ONEWAY AveContent AveInstMaterials AvePedApproach AveAssess BY Age /MISSING ANALYSIS.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Content	Between Groups	.692	3	.231	1.192	.315
	Within Groups	25.728	133	.193		
	Total	26.420	136			
Instructional Materials	Between Groups	.372	3	.124	.611	.609
	Within Groups	27.004	133	.203		
	Total	27.376	136			
Pedagogical Approach	Between Groups	.491	3	.164	.888	.449
	Within Groups	24.522	133	.184		
	Total	25.013	136			
Assessment	Between Groups	.871	3	.290	1.185	.318
	Within Groups	32.611	133	.245		
	Total	33.483	136			

Oneway**Notes**

Output Created		07-MAY-2022 21:24:36
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\DeGuzman MAELM.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	137

Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax	ONEWAY AveContent AveInstMaterials AvePedApproach AveAssess BY Education /MISSING ANALYSIS.	
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.03

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Content	Between Groups	.924	3	.308	1.606	.191
	Within Groups	25.496	133	.192		
	Total	26.420	136			
Instructional Materials	Between Groups	1.095	3	.365	1.847	.142
	Within Groups	26.281	133	.198		
	Total	27.376	136			
Pedagogical Approach	Between Groups	.345	3	.115	.620	.603
	Within Groups	24.668	133	.185		
	Total	25.013	136			
Assessment	Between Groups	1.578	3	.526	2.192	.092
	Within Groups	31.905	133	.240		
	Total	33.483	136			

Oneway**Notes**

Output Created	07-MAY-2022 21:24:51	
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\DeGuzman MAELM.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	137
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

Cases Used		Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		ONEWAY AveContent AveInstMaterials AvePedApproach AveAssess BY Yearsservice /MISSING ANALYSIS.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.04

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Content	Between Groups	1.102	5	.220	1.140	.342
	Within Groups	25.318	131	.193		
	Total	26.420	136			
Instructional Materials	Between Groups	1.437	5	.287	1.452	.210
	Within Groups	25.938	131	.198		
	Total	27.376	136			
Pedagogical Approach	Between Groups	.323	5	.065	.342	.886
	Within Groups	24.690	131	.188		
	Total	25.013	136			
Assessment	Between Groups	2.255	5	.451	1.892	.100
	Within Groups	31.228	131	.238		
	Total	33.483	136			

Oneway**Notes**

Output Created	07-MAY-2022 21:25:04	
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\USER\OneDrive - lpulaguna.edu.ph\Documents\De Guzman MAELM.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	137
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

Cases Used		Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		ONEWAY AveContent AveInstMaterials AvePedApproach AveAssess BY teachJHS /MISSING ANALYSIS.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.04

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Content	Between Groups	.273	1	.273	1.412	.237
	Within Groups	26.146	135	.194		
	Total	26.420	136			
Instructional Materials	Between Groups	.024	1	.024	.120	.730
	Within Groups	27.351	135	.203		
	Total	27.376	136			
Pedagogical Approach	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.989
	Within Groups	25.013	135	.185		
	Total	25.013	136			
Assessment	Between Groups	.105	1	.105	.426	.515
	Within Groups	33.377	135	.247		
	Total	33.483	136			