INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
Volume VI, Issue 5 May 2026, eISSN: 2799-0664

Forms of Parental Involvement and Their Relationship to Learning Interest among Students from Under-Resourced Families

MALOU JEAN J. BULANDRES
Saint Vincent's College Incorporated

Abstract — This study developed and validated an instrument, identifying the types of parental involvement and how it is correlated with the learning interest of students in under-resourced families in Dipolog City. Data were sampled using a quota sampling method and elementary students in grades four to six whose parents were enrolled in the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) were sampled. The tool revealed two general constructs, one of autonomy-supportive and the other one of controlling parental involvement. The three factors of autonomy supportive involvement, namely responsive communication, promoting self-regulation, and promoting learning choices, and the two factors of controlling involvement, namely high expectations and restrictiveness, are obtained based on the exploratory factor analysis. The autonomy-supportive factors and the restrictiveness factor had a positive predictive value on the learning interest of students, but the high expectations did not (Jensen et al., 2011). These findings contribute our knowledge of the impact of the various parental involvement styles on the intrinsic motivation and academic engagement of the economically disadvantaged students. The validated tool can be used in further studies and interventions that facilitate parental functions in under-resource learning settings.

Keywords : parental involvement, autonomy-supportive involvement, controlling involvement, exploratory factor analysis, learning interest

I. INTRODUCTION

Parental involvement plays an important role in children's academic success, particularly among under-resourced families. Although parents in impoverished contexts are often described as caring and supportive despite economic and educational challenges (Sengonul, 2022), such

views are frequently anecdotal rather than empirically grounded (Castro et al., 2015). Recent meta-analyses highlight that home-based parental support—especially in fostering motivation—positively influences the learning interests of the students from under-resourced families.

In the Philippines, poverty remains a critical barrier to educational attainment. Reports from the World Bank (2022) and the Asian Development Bank (Aldaba, 2009; PSA, 2023) show that families facing unstable employment, health issues, and geographic isolation experience limited access to quality education, resulting in lower enrollment and completion rates. Epstein's (2011) model of parental involvement outlines six areas—parenting, communication, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and community collaboration—that guide how parents can support children's learning. Contemporary interpretations emphasize creating supportive home environments, participating in school initiatives, and engaging community resources to reinforce learning beyond school (Gitonga et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024; Gaspar, 2025).

Given these insights, this study aims to develop and validate an instrument that identifies the types of parental involvement influencing students' learning interests in under-resourced Filipino families. Strengthening school–family partnerships is especially significant in mitigating learning losses exacerbated by poverty and the COVID-19 pandemic (Sivabalan et al., 2024).

Literature Review

Parental involvement has been widely recognized as a vital contributor to students' academic success. Studies consistently show that active and supportive parenting enhances children's motivation, academic self-esteem, and engagement in school activities (Diaz, 2023; Dungca et al., 2024). Such involvement fosters stronger parent–child relationships, improves problem-solving and decision-making skills, and encourages positive school behaviors (Omarkhanova et al., 2024). Supportive home environments and authoritative parenting—combining warmth with structure—are particularly linked to better academic attitudes and emotional resilience (Sharma, 2024).

Contextual factors strongly shape how parents engage in their children's education. Socioeconomic status (SES) influences both the type and extent of involvement; parents in low-

SES families often face economic and psychological pressures that limit school participation (Şengönül, 2022). Interestingly, parental warmth acts as a protective factor in low-SES settings, while in higher-SES families, it shows a more complex relationship with achievement outcomes (Ogg & Anthony, 2020; Chen et al., 2024). Cultural norms and parental education levels also affect engagement, with better-educated parents being more active in their children's schooling (Careemdeen, 2024; Kantova, 2024). Supportive school climates further enhance parent–school collaboration and community partnerships (Epstein & Sanders, 2022; Hill & Taylor, 2004).

Among under-resourced families, poverty remains a major barrier to effective parental involvement. Economic hardship, unstable employment, and low social capital often restrict parents' ability to interact with schools, leading them to rely more on home-based strategies to support learning (Gordon & Cui, 2014; Garcia & De Guzman, 2020). Cultural variations and communication barriers also constrain participation, underscoring the need for context-specific and culturally responsive approaches to engagement (Bartolome et al., 2023). The family process model suggests that poverty disrupts parenting behaviors and, consequently, children's academic outcomes (Cooper, 2010; Carneiro et al., 2025). Strengthening school–family communication can therefore play a crucial role in enhancing student learning among under-resourced groups.

Overall, the literature underscores both the benefits and complexities of parental involvement. While existing studies affirm its positive effects on academic engagement, less is known about how parental support functions within poverty-stricken contexts. This gap highlights the need to develop valid measures that capture the unique indicators and forms of parental involvement among under-resourced Filipino families.

II. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a cross-sectional, non-experimental quantitative design to examine parental involvement and its relationship to students' learning interest among under-resourced families in Dipolog City. Guided by the Organismic Integration Theory (OIT), the study developed and validated an instrument measuring autonomy-supportive and controlling parental behaviors as

perceived by students. The design allowed the collection of data at a single point in time, providing insights into how different forms of parental involvement influence students' engagement despite existing socioeconomic constraints.

Participants

The participants were 187 elementary students from Grades 4 to 6 (ages 8–14; $M = 10.21$, $SD = 1.22$), enrolled in four public schools in Dipolog City—Estaka Central, Barra, Galas, and Cogon Elementary Schools. All belonged to families registered under the government's *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program* (4Ps). Demographic data confirmed varied economic backgrounds, with monthly household incomes ranging from ₱3,000 to ₱15,000. A quota sampling technique was used to ensure adequate representation and statistical power for the exploratory factor analysis.

Measures

Parental Involvement. A 59-item instrument was developed to assess autonomy-supportive and controlling parental involvement. Items reflected behaviors such as active listening, providing academic choices, and setting expectations. A 4-point Likert scale (1 = Never to 4 = Always) was used, translated into Cebuano to match participants' first language.

Interest in Learning. The *Student Learning Interest Scale* (Swarni & Sujati, 2024) consisting of 17 items was adapted and translated into Cebuano through forward–backward translation. Responses were rated on the same 4-point scale, and psychometric properties were established during analysis.

Procedures

Three educational psychology experts reviewed the initial item pool for content validity. After revision and translation, the measures were pilot-tested for clarity and factor structure.

Permissions to conduct the study were obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent and participating school principals. Parental consent and student assent forms, written in Cebuano, ensured voluntary participation. Data collection occurred during regular school hours, using self-administered questionnaires in quiet classroom settings. Students were assured of confidentiality and anonymity to encourage honest responses.

Data Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted using Principal Axis Factoring with Promax rotation to identify underlying constructs of parental involvement. Sampling adequacy was confirmed using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and Bartlett's test of sphericity. Descriptive statistics, Pearson's correlation, and multiple regression analyses were used to examine relationships among study variables and test the predictive effects of parental involvement on learning interest.

Ethical Considerations

The study followed ethical protocols under Saint Vincent College and DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2021. Written consent and assent ensured informed participation. Data were collected anonymously, stored securely, and will be destroyed three years post-study. Participation was voluntary with no link to 4Ps benefits, and student welfare was safeguarded through appropriate monitoring and referral procedures.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Factor Structure of Parental Involvement

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted in order to determine the underlying constructs of parental involvement in under-resourced families. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was used to assess sampling adequacy and the appropriateness of the data for

factor analysis, alongside Bartlett's test of sphericity. The KMO value ranges from 0 to 1 (Field, 2005), where 0 indicates that factor analysis is not appropriate, and values closer to 1 suggest strong correlations, supporting reliable factor extraction.

Autonomy-Supportive Parental Involvement

The KMO value of autonomy-supportive parental involvement was 0.822, indicating good suitability for factor analysis. The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant, $\chi 2(276) = 1615.352$, $p<.001$, indicating that the variables are correlated enough to proceed with factor analysis. Both tests confirmed the data were suitable for factor analysis.

Principal Axis Factoring was used as the extraction method because the data distribution was slightly skewed, and an oblique rotation method, Promax, was applied, allowing factors to correlate. In Table 1, seven factors satisfied Kaiser's criterion of eigenvalues greater than 1.0. However, due to thin item distribution across factors except factors 1, 2, and 3, further exploration led to selecting a three-factor solution that produced cleaner factor loadings of the items.

The three-factor model for autonomy-supportive parental involvement explained a total of 21.3% of the variance. Specifically, Factor 1 accounting for 8.2% of the variance, Factor 2 explaining 6.6%, and Factor 3 also accounting for 6.6%. These three factors together representing the proportion of variance in the data explained by the model according to the rotated factor solution.

TABLE 1
AUTONOMY-SUPPORTIVE PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT FACTOR CHARACTERISTICS – ROTATED SOLUTION

	Eigenvalues	Sum of Sq. Loadings	Proportion variance	Cumulative Variance
Factor 1	5.737	1.957	0.082	0.082
Factor 2	1.662	1.584	0.066	0.148
Factor 3	1.380	1.576	0.066	0.213
Factor 4	1.240	1.444	0.060	0.273
Factor 5	1.178	1.167	0.049	0.322
Factor 6	1.153	1.032	0.043	0.365
Factor 7	1.017	0.909	0.038	0.403

Factor 1, **Responsive Communication**, represents behaviors where parents actively engage in meaningful conversations with their children through inquiry, listening, and responding to their educational experiences and feelings. This is a two-way communication in which parents not only hear their children but also validate, support, and encourage them through timely and meaningful verbal communication. It involves parents engaging in open dialogues, asking questions, acknowledging children's perspectives, and providing feedback that promotes understanding and emotional connection, particularly about schoolwork and learning.

Factor 2, **Encouragement of Self-Regulation**, reflects parental behaviors that encourage self-regulation in their children. Specifically, these behaviors help children effectively manage their own learning goals, regulate their behaviors, and confidently engage in new learning activities, boosting their children's self-confidence and motivation to take initiative in learning. This parenting style helps children to learn how to control their attention, emotions, and actions independently in order to achieve learning goals and adapt to challenges that fosters independence and self-directed learning.

Factor 3, **Support for Learning Choices**, demonstrates parental encouragement for children to ownership of their learning by independently deciding how, when, and what they want to study. This factor centers on parental respect for their children, giving them the freedom and trust to make choices regarding their educational activities. This supportive approach encourages intrinsic motivation, accountability, and a sense of responsibility among children, and enables them to be self-directed learners and take the initiative proactively and confidently in their educational activities.

Controlling Parental Involvement

The controlling parental involvement's KMO measure was even higher at 0.865, showing good sampling adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant, $\chi 2(276) = 2082.494$, $p<.001$, supporting the factorability of the data. Principal Axis Factoring was used as the extraction method because the data distribution was slightly skewed, and an oblique rotation method, Promax, was applied, allowing factors to correlate.

In Table 2 below, seven factors met Kaiser's criterion of eigenvalues greater than 1.0. These factors explained a meaningful amount of variance, however the distribution of items across these factors was also thin except for Factors 1 and 2, which had more substantial item loadings and clearer conceptual meaning. The two factors explained a cumulative variance of 19.5%, with Factor 1 accounting for 12.2% and Factor 2 explaining 7.3%. These two factors together represent the proportion of variance in the data explained by the model according to the rotated factor solution.

TABLE 2
CONTROLLING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT FACTOR CHARACTERISTICS – ROTATED SOLUTION

	Eigenvalues	Sum of Sq. Loadings	Proportion variance	Cumulative Variance
Factor 1	6.828	2.924	0.122	0.122
Factor 2	1.618	1.748	0.073	0.195
Factor 3	1.450	1.525	0.064	0.258
Factor 4	1.252	1.156	0.048	0.306
Factor 5	1.126	1.137	0.047	0.354
Factor 6	1.067	0.978	0.041	0.394
Factor 7	1.013	0.953	0.040	0.434

Factor 1, **High Expectations**, represents parental behaviors characterized by intense academic pressure, setting high and sometimes excessive standards, and negative reactions when children's performance falls short. These items describe parental pressure to excel academically even at the expense of the child's happiness, making unilateral decisions about projects, comparisons with other children, strict rules on study time, and expectations of perfection. These behaviors suggest a controlling style grounded in achievement demands and strict performance expectations.

Factor 2: **Restrictiveness**, reflects controlling behaviors related to imposing strict rules and limitations on children's academic and social activities, enforcing compliance often without child negotiation or autonomy. Examples include setting strict study rules at home, pushing the child to study harder, reminding them of college admission requirements linked to obedience, requiring completing homework for rewards, and monitoring friendships. This factor captures parental restrictiveness and tight control over children's schooling and social interactions.

The structure of these two factors provides a clear and interpretable model of controlling parental involvement to, distinguishing between pressure to achieve and restrictive controlling behaviors. This factor solution aligns with theoretical conceptualizations of controlling parenting and provides a strong basis for further research on parental involvement in the learning interest of students from under-resourced families.

Predictive Analysis

Correlation analyses showed that autonomy-supportive factors positively correlated with students' learning interest ($r = .42–.51$, $p < .001$), while restrictiveness showed a moderate positive link ($r = .43$, $p < .001$). In contrast, high expectations had no significant correlation with learning interest, suggesting that excessive academic pressure might not foster motivation.

A multiple regression was conducted with the five parental involvement factors predicting students' interest in learning as shown in Table 2 below. All three autonomy-supportive factors significantly and positively predicted interest in learning. Responsive communication had a positive effect ($B = 0.26$, $p < .001$), meaning better responsive communication by parents is associated with higher student interest. Encouragement of self-regulation also positively predicted interest ($B = 0.19$, $p < .001$). Support for learning choices was a positive predictor as well ($B = 0.17$, $p < .001$).

TABLE 3
MULTIPLE REGRESSION RESULTS FOR AUTONOMY SUPPORTIVE AND CONTROLLING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PREDICTING INTEREST IN LEARNING

Predictor	*B*	*SE B*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Responsive communication	0.26	0.05	5.13	< .001	[0.16, 0.36]
Encouragement of self-regulation	0.19	0.05	3.83	< .001	[0.09, 0.29]
Support for learning choices	0.17	0.05	3.41	< .001	[0.07, 0.26]
High expectations	-0.08	0.05	-1.64	0.103	[-0.18, 0.02]
Restrictiveness	0.23	0.05	4.19	< .001	[0.12, 0.33]

Restrictiveness positively predicted interest in learning (B = 0.23, p < .001), indicating that some parental control through setting restrictions may relate to increased interest. Whereas high expectations did not significantly predict interest (B = -0.08, p = 0.103), indicating that pressuring children with high academic demands does not have a significant effect on their interest in learning. The overall regression model was statistically significant, explaining 47% of the variance in interest in learning, F (5,186) = 34.304, p <.001, with an adjusted R2=0.472, meaning these parental involvement factors collectively have a strong influence on students' learning interest.

Autonomy-Supportive Parental Involvement identified three distinct factors, responsive communication, encouragement of self-regulation, and support for learning choices. Emerged as robust predictors of students' learning interest. Responsive communication (active listening, validation) fosters emotional security and self-efficacy, creating conditions for sustained motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2017; Avitasari & Sulistyarin, 2024). Encouragement of self-regulation equips children with goal-setting and persistence skills essential for academic success (Jansen et al., 2019; Watson et al., 2015). Support for learning choices promotes ownership and intrinsic engagement by respecting children's autonomy in educational decisions (Deci & Ryan, 2000;

Bubic et al., 2021). These dimensions collectively explain why autonomy-supportive parenting remains effective even amid economic hardship.

The dual nature of controlling parental involvement revealed differential effects. High expectations characterized by academic pressure and perfectionism did not predict learning interest, supporting evidence that coercive control undermines intrinsic motivation through stress and external compliance (Grolnick & Pomerantz, 2022; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010).

Surprisingly, restrictiveness (structured rules, monitoring) positively predicted interest, challenging conventional OIT predictions. In under-resourced contexts, moderate behavioral control may function as protective scaffolding, providing predictability and academic discipline amid instability (Cooper, 2010; Gordon & Cui, 2014). Filipino families often perceive such structure as future-oriented guidance rather than oppression (Garcia & De Guzman, 2020), suggesting cultural adaptation of controlling practices.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study hypothesized that autonomy-supportive parental involvement, characterized by specific indicators such as active listening, providing choices, engaging in collaborative decision-making would be positively associated with students' interest in learning, while controlling parental involvement, including micromanaging homework and setting higher expectations would have a negative association. The findings provide support for the first hypothesis, since all three aspects of autonomy-supportive involvement, including responsive communication, encouragement of self-regulation, and support of learning choices, had a significant and positive effect on the interest of the students in learning.

On the other hand, the second hypothesis was partially supported. The restrictiveness was found to be positively correlated with the interest to learn among controlling parental involvement variables, but high expectations had no significant effects on the students' learning interest. This suggests that certain controlling behaviors like setting clear limits may serve a motivational role among students from under-resourced families, while overly demanding academic pressures may not enhance or might even hinder student motivation.

REFERENCES

[1.] Aldaba, F. T. (2009). Poverty in the Philippines: Causes, constraints and opportunities. https://www.adb.org/publications/poverty-philippines-causes-constraints-and-opportunities

[2.] Avitasari, I., & Sulistyarini, D. (2024). The Role of Family Communication and Parenting on Children's Social Behavior. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8(10), 1180-1185. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8100099

[3.] Bubic, A., Tošic, A., & Mišetic, I. (2021). The Role of Parental Self-Efficacy in Explaining Children's Academic Outcomes. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 11(4), 189-212. https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.860

[4.] Careemdeen, J. D. (2024). Parental educational level in shaping student participation in lesson activities: A multifaceted study. *OUSL Journal*, 19(1). https://doi.org/10.4038/ouslj.v19i1.7605

[5.] Carneiro, Pedro, Sarah Cattan, and Henrique Neves. "Theoretical and empirical perspectives on the link between poverty, parenting and children's outcomes." Fiscal Studies 46, no. 1 (2025): 9-35. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-5890.12404

[6.] Castro, M., Expósito-Casas, E., López-Martín, E., Lizasoain, L., Navarro-Asencio, E., & Gaviria, J. L. (2015). Parental involvement on student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational research review*, 14, 33-46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.01.002

[7.] Chen, X., Chen, Y., Yu, X., Wei, J., & Yang, X. (2024). The impact of family socioeconomic status on parental involvement and student engagement during COVID-19 in promoting academic achievement: A longitudinal study in Chinese children. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 246, Article 105992. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2024.105992

[8.] Cooper, C. E. (2010). Family poverty, school-based parental involvement, and policy-focused protective factors in kindergarten. Early childhood research quarterly, 25(4), 480-492. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2010.01.003

[9.] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The" what" and" why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological inquiry, 11(4), 227-268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

[10.] Diaz, L. B. (2023). Current Approaches for Engaging Parents in Students' Academic Performance: Basis for Parental Engagement Policy. American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation, 2(4), 32-41. https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v2i4.1817

[11.] Dungca, J. L., Agbayani, G. Y., Muñoz, A. L. G., Carreon, B. M. D., Antonio, F. D., Tiqui, J. A. S., ... & Galang, J. R. F. (2024). Parental Involvement in Curricular Performance of Students at Risk. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(6), 2258-2275. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.06.27

[12.] Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Sheldon, S. B., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., ... & Williams, K. J. (2018). School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action. Corwin Press. https://www.corwin.com/books/school-family-and-community-pa-242535

[13.] Field, A. (2005). Exploratory factor analysis. Discovering statistics using SPSS, 619-680. https://study.sagepub.com/field_dsiss4e

[14.] Garcia, A. S., & de Guzman, M. R. T. (2020). The meanings and ways of parental involvement among low-income Filipinos. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 53, 343-354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2020.08.005

[15.] Gaspar, C. R., & Sahay, D. (2025). Expanding the concept of parent involvement to special education: Considerations for inclusivity. Journal of Family Theory & Review, 17(3), 423-445. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12634

[16.] Gitonga, D. M. (2023). Level of parental involvement in Type 1-6 of Epstein Typologies in the current school practices. Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education, 7(1), 219–237. https://jriiejournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/JRIIE-7-1-021.pdf

[17.] Gordon, M., & Cui, M. (2014). School-related parental involvement and adolescent academic achievement: The role of community poverty. Family Relations, 63(5), 616-626. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12094

[18.] Grolnick, W. S., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2022). Should parents be involved in their children's schooling?. Theory Into Practice, 61(3), 325-335. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2022.2096382

[19.] Hill, N. E., & Taylor, L. C. (2004). Parental school involvement and children's academic achievement: Pragmatics and issues. Current directions in psychological science, 13(4), 161-164. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00298.x

[20.] Jansen, R. S., Van Leeuwen, A., Janssen, J., Jak, S., & Kester, L. (2019). Self-regulated learning partially mediates the effect of self-regulated learning interventions on achievement in higher education: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 28, 100292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.100292

[21.] Kantova, K. (2024). Parental involvement and education outcomes of their children. Applied Economics, 56(48), 5683-5698. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2024.2314569

[22.] Li, D., Li, Y., Zheng, Z., Zhou, X., Castro, D., Vermund, S. H., & Brault, M. A. (2024). A Proposal of Utilizing Six Types of Involvement Model to Guide Kindergarten to 12th Grade School Parental Communication and Support During a Pandemic. Medical research archives, 12(4), 10-18103. https://doi.org/10.18103/mra.v12i4.5178

[23.] Ogg, J., & Anthony, C. J. (2020). Process and context: Longitudinal effects of the interactions between parental involvement, parental warmth, and SES on academic achievement. Journal of school psychology, 78, 96-114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2019.11.004

[24.] Philippine Statistics Authority. (2023). 2023 Full Year Official Poverty Statistics of the Philippines. https://psa.gov.ph/statistics/poverty/stat-tables/released/2023

[25.] Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness. Guilford Publications. https://doi.org/10.1521/978.14625/28806

[26.] Sengonul, T. (2022). A review of the relationship between parental involvement and children's academic achievement and the role of family socioeconomic status in this relationship. Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 12(2), 32-57. https://www.pegegog.net/index.php/pegegog/article/view/1578

[27.] Sharma, R. (2024). The effects of parental involvement on student academic success. Global International Research Thoughts, 12(1), 43-48. https://doi.org/10.36676/girt.v12.i1.111

[28.] Sivabalan, Y., Pek, L. S., Nadarajan, N. T. M., Kusnek, H., Ismail, M. R., & Mee, R. W. M. (2024). A Conceptual Model of Parental Engagement IN Children's Learning Losses. Quantum Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 5(3), 73-82. https://doi.org/10.55197/qjssh.v5i3.368

[29.] Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). A theoretical upgrade of the concept of parental psychological control: Proposing new insights on the basis of self-determination theory. Developmental review, 30(1), 74-99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2009.11.001

[30.] World Bank. (2022). Overcoming Poverty and Inequality in the Philippines: Past, Present, and Prospects for the Future.

[31.] https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/52453a86-ffc1-5ffb-9e1e-e02ff64eef48

[32.] Омарханова, А., Сугиралина, А., & Есберген, Н. (2024). Investigating the impact of parental involvement on student academic achievement. Научно-педагогический журнал «Білім-Образование» Национальной академии образования имени И. Алтынсарина, 109(2), 43-52. https://doi.org/10.59941/2960-0642-2024-2-43-52