

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

THE IMPACT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS ON STUDENTS'
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE: A CASE STUDY OF SAINT MONICA'S
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, MAMPONG-ASHANTI

BY

AUGUSTINA MENSAH

Dissertation submitted to the Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for award of Master of Education Degree in Guidance and Counselling

JULY 2013

APPENDICES

DECLARATION

Candidates Declaration

I hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of my own original research and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature Date.....

Name: Augustina Mensah

Supervisor's Declaration

I hereby declare that this preparation and presentation of the dissertation were supervised by me in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of dissertation laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Supervisor's Signature Date.....

Name: Mr. Eric Nyarko-Sampson

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the impact socioeconomic factors have on the academic performance of students of Saint Monica's College of Education in Mampong Ashanti. Consequently, the focus of this study was on how parental income levels impacted on the academic performance of students; the extent to which parental income influenced students' academic performance and how family size influenced students' academic performance. The population of the study comprised first and second year students, tutors and parents of the students. The sample was made of 100 students, 10 tutors and 12 parents. Student respondents were selected through the simple random sampling methods and tutors and parents were respectively selected through the purposive and convenient sampling procedures. Three separate questionnaires were used for data collection. Data collected were analysed with the use of descriptive statistical tools such as frequency tables and percentages.

The results of the study showed that parent's educational background, parent's occupation, income levels and family size have impact on the academic performance of students. Also, it was found out that poor family background has negative effect on one's academic performance since parents would not be able to provide one's academic needs as expected. It was therefore recommended that every assistance students need must be provided by their parents to ensure smooth academic work. Also, school authorities must identify needy students and assist them accordingly. In conclusion, it was realized that the findings of this study confirmed earlier studies done in the same area.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe sincere thanks to my supervisor Mr. Eric Nyarko-Sampson, who made me believe in myself and guided me through the whole process of dissertation writing. I am sure this dissertation would not have been possible without his support, understanding and encouragement I felt when working on this study.

Above all, I would also like to show gratitude to my late parents, brother and sister who gave their unequivocal support throughout, as always, for which my mere expression of thanks likewise does not suffice. I am also grateful to Mr. Appau for his technical advice, and to my friend Madam Clara Attimu for her support.

DEDICATION

To my late mother, for her endless love,
support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
ONE INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Research Questions	4
Significance of the Study	4
Delimitation of the Study	5
Limitations of the Study	6
Organisation of the Rest of the Study	6
TWO REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	7
What Constitutes Socioeconomic Factors?	7
Parental Level of Education and Students Educational Performance	10
Parental Income and Students' Educational Performance	19

	Parental Occupation and Students' Educational Performance	26
	Family Status and Students' Educational Performance	28
	Family Size and Students' Educational Performance	34
	Summary of the Literature Review	39
THREE	METHODOLOGY	42
	Research Design	42
	Population	43
	Sampling and Sampling Procedures	43
	Instrument	44
	Validation and Reliability of the Instruments	46
	Pilot Testing of Instruments	46
	Data Collection Procedures	47
	Data Analysis Procedures	48
FOUR	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	49
	Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	49
	Distribution of Respondents by Age	49
	Gender Distribution of Respondents	51
	Marital Status of Respondents	51
	Analyses of Research Questions	53
	Research Question One	54
	Research Question Two	58
	Parental Income and its Influence on Students'	

	Academic Performance	58
	Research Question Three	67
FIVE	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	73
	Summary of the Study	73
	Summary of Findings	74
	Conclusions	74
	Recommendations	75
	Suggested Areas for Further Research	75
	REFERENCES	77
	APPENDICES	
A	Questionnaire for Students	92
B	Questionnaire for Teachers	97
C	Questionnaire for Parents	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page	
1	Distribution of Respondents by Age	50
2	Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status	52
3	Teachers' Length of Service with the Ghana Education Service	53
4	Students' Responses on their Parents' Educational Background	54
5	Frequency to which Parents Provided Teaching Learning Materials to Wards	55
6	Responses on who Provides Students' Educational Needs	56
7	Teachers and Parents' Responses on how often Parents Visited their Wards at School	58
8	Responses on how Students' Parents Earned their Income	
9	Time Lines Students' Parents earned their Income	60
10	Students' Responses on Whether Parental Income as Influence on Ward's Academic Performance	61
11	Teacher and Parent's Responses on Whether Parents paid their Wards Fees Promptly	62
12	Teachers and Parents' Views on Whether Parental Income has Positive Impact on Students' Academic Performance	63
13	Teachers' Responses on the Common Occupation of Parents	65
14	Number of Siblings Student Respondents Have	67
15	Students' Views Whether Family Size Influences Academic Performance of Students	69

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Education is the best legacy a nation can give to her citizens, especially the youth. This is because the development of every nation or community depends largely on the quality of education of such a nation. It is generally believed that the basis for any true development must begin with the development of human resources. A sustained human resource development can be actualised mostly through formal education, which remains the vehicle for socio-economic development and social mobilisation in any society.

Biographies of some successful men and women such as Kwame Nkrumah, Mark Cuban and J.K. Rowling, mentioned how terribly poor their parents were financially, economically and educationally (Giang & Nisen, 2012). This state of affairs, that is, low income level, poor livelihood and low education are the factors that motivated them to be successful in their endeavours including education. There are now sons and daughters of very poor people who are of prominent standing in the society. Socioeconomic status is an important factor in students' adjustment to and performance in school. The very fact that they were poor gave them the needed motivation to strive harder and do their very best in schools for they believed that education was the key to good life later. On the other hand, students, who live in more affluent families, have higher educational aspirations and expectations, do

better academically and are more likely to continue their schooling than their less well off peers (Blake, 1989). The major influence on a person's academic achievement is his/her home atmosphere; how much reading material is available, how the parents feel about education, what they want for their children, what they do for and with their children, what and how much they talk with their children and how stable the family is, are part and parcel of the factors that influence academic performance of children. Both rich and poor families can create a climate that foster learning. "Even though family background does have a strong relationship to achievement, it may be how parents rear their children... and not the parent's occupation, income, or education that really make the difference" (White, 1982, p.471).

Families with high socio-economic status often have more success in preparing their young children for school because they typically have access to a wide range of resources to promote and support young children's development. They are able to provide their young children with high-quality child care, books, and toys to encourage children in various learning activities at home. Also, they get easy access to information regarding their children's health, as well as social, emotional, and cognitive development. In addition, families with high socioeconomic status often seek out information to help them better prepare their young children for school (Sparkes, 1999).

Statement of the Problem

The extent of students' learning may be determined by the grades a student earns over a period of learning. It is believed that a grade is a primary indicator of such learning. If a learner earns high grades it is concluded that they may also have learned a lot while low grades indicate lesser learning.

However, many experiences and studies found out that there are also several factors that would account for the grades (Hanushek, 2005; Simmons & Alexander, 1978). According to Rich (2000), no single factor can be definitely pointed out as predicting grades. It has been an interplay of so many factors – gender, IQ, study habits, age and year level. A family’s socioeconomic status is based on family income, parental educational level, parental occupation, and social status in the community (such as contact within the community, group association, and the community’s perception of the family), parent’s educational attainment, social status, number of siblings, birth order among others.

Students’ academic performance at St. Monica’s College of Education for the period 2005 – 2010 as compared with results before 2005 indicates that the school’s academic performance is declining (Personal Communication with Headmistress, 2011). Thus, according to the headmistress, for the last four years average passes were 70% and have fallen to 40%. To that end, one can say that this decline in students’ academic performance is partly attributed to their socioeconomic factors, which scholars indicate influence students learning.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to find out the effects of socioeconomic on the academic performance of the students. Specifically, the objectives of the were to determine:

- a. how parental educational background influence students’ academic performance,

- b. the extent to which parental income influences students' academic performance and
- c. how family size influence students' academic performance.

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. How does parental educational background influence the academic performance of students of Saint Monica's College of Education?
2. How can parental income influence the academic performance of students of Saint Monica's College of Education?
3. How can family size influence the academic performance of students of Saint Monica's College of Education?

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study may provide significant benefits to several groups and individuals. Firstly, educationists and educational policy makers would be enlightened the more on how the socioeconomic status of parents influence the academic performance so that they would institute the appropriate measures to ensure that students improve on their performance. The government would allocate more resources towards education as well as champion the introduction of a curriculum that would suit the communities, taking into consideration their socioeconomic status. Policy makers may formulate new educational policies on how to provide quality education to the growing need of the community.

Secondly, school administrators would have access to quality information to aid them in taking decisions on their students relative to their

socioeconomic backgrounds. In the same vein, teachers would understand students better and apply the proper strategies to boost the academic performance of their students.

Parents would realise their proper role in the education of their children. With the results of this study in mind, parents would know and take an active role in the educational issues as major stakeholders by promoting conducive environment for the students to get quality education. They would be able to guide them on their studies, with special emphasis on their academic performance. Lastly, students would become more aware of the socioeconomic factors that influence their academic performance and take the right steps to adjust to that situation.

Delimitation of the Study

There are several factors that affect students' academic performance but the study was delimited to the impact of socioeconomic factors on students' academic performance - case study of teacher trainees of St. Monica's College of Education, in the Mampong Municipality in the Ashanti-Region of Ghana. The case study was to enable the researcher to thoroughly investigate the problem. Conditions in the home were also considered. With regard to conditions in the home, there are varied existing environmental and personal factors that affect student's academic performance but the study focused on socioeconomic factors such as parental educational level, parental occupation, parental income and family size that affect students' academic performance. Also, the scope of the study was delimited to first (1st) and second (2nd) year students. The reason for using first and second years was that they were

available on campus for regular studies as compared to the third year students who were out for off-campus teaching practice.

Limitation of the Study

The researcher encountered a number of problems which include the following: the researcher faced the problem of clarifying questions to some of the students who found it difficult to understand the questionnaire. This consumed much of the researcher's time and resource. This also affected the validity of some questions in case students do not ask for clarification. Some parents also felt there would never be any improvement in the academic performance of the students even if they respond to the questionnaire and therefore, they were unwilling to do so.

Organisation of the Rest of the Study

Chapter two was devoted to the review of literature that were related issues the socio-economic factors that influence the academic performance of students. Chapter three focuses on the method to be used to gather data in the study. It is made up of the area of study, Descriptions of the instrument, validity and reliability of the instrument and Administration of the instrument as the research design, while the next chapter, which is chapter four, is about presentation and discussion of findings. Chapter five, which is the final chapter, is made up of summary, conclusions, recommendations and suggested area for further study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is composed of the theoretical review conceptual framework and reviews some of the works of different authors. In conducting this review, the following study variables were of utmost important; parents education, income, occupation and family size. In this section the researcher sought to know what other researchers have found out about what constitute socio-economic factors, parents level of education, their income level, occupational attainment and family size.

What Constitutes Socioeconomic Factors?

Socioeconomic factors are the elements that determine the economic activity of societies. Socioeconomic factors are the sectors of an individual's activities and understanding that shape him as an economically active person. Culture, social understanding, religion and education are the main elements that are explored by socioeconomics. They present the economic activity and the economic classes within a society and indicate the stage of development of multiculturalism and integration within the developed states and the developing economies (Amato, 1987; Mukherjee, 1995; Williams, Penelope, Connell & White, 1991).

Education is among the main factors of socio-economics. Through education individuals gain skills, knowledge and motivation, the three elements necessary for professional realization. This is why education is a

socioeconomic factor. It shapes individuals as potential professionals and increases their economic awareness. Furthermore, through education, economic development occurs. Then also, most times, educated individuals from a social group are seen to be actively involved in economic decision-making processes in their society (Ainley, Graetz, Long & Batten, 1995).

Moreover, one's career and earning capacity are a set of elements that influence one's socioeconomic status. A person belongs to a certain social class which is determined by his income and occupation. For example, lawyers and judges are in the top social class because their earning capacity is ranked above the income of, for instance, a mechanic. These factors are significant for the formation of different social layers and are narrowly related with education.

There are many avenues for teachers, parents, and administration to venture down as they are trying to evade the roadblocks to student achievement. These avenues can be looked at as possible explanations for a lack of student achievement on the end of semester examination. A quote mentioned in an article from Rouse and Barrow (2006), states how Martin Luther King, Jr. in 1967 felt concerning socioeconomic status of students and its affects on their education. Luther was quoted as saying that 'the job of the school is to teach so well that one's family background is no longer an issue'.

To magnify the effects of socioeconomic status, White (1982, p.472) states, "the family characteristic that is the most powerful predictor of school performance is socioeconomic status (SES); the higher the SES of the student's family, the higher his academic achievement." There are many studies that support that general statement about socioeconomic status. Studies

as early as Gough (1946) find that there is a correlation of 0.30 between status and achievement, showing a slight positive relationship.

More recent studies such as those of Farmer (2006); Sutton and Soderstrom (2001) show that independent variables that schools cannot control, including low income, are good for predicting achievement scores. In contrast, some studies do not find significant relationships among socioeconomic status and student achievement. White, Reynolds, Thomas, and Gitzlaff (1993) state that then “knowledge of a student’s SES provides only modest assistance in accurately predicting his or her performance on standardized tests”.

In the same vein, Nye and Hedges (2002) as well as White (1982) find that socioeconomic status is more of a predictor at early stages of education, and much less of a predictor as the students progress into the later stages of education, where other variables become more of a factor in student achievement scores than being economically disadvantaged. According to Nye and Hedges (2002), the Department of Education in the United determines the quality of schools based on scores obtained from Semester Examinations. Sutton and Soderstrom (2001) make a statement that shows a strong belief about this process by stating that educators, and especially legislators and the public, should consider examination results when comparing student achievement among school districts, and rank them accordingly. These researchers feel that comparing schools and school districts in this way will favour schools that serve advantaged students, and adversely affect schools with a large population of economically disadvantaged students.

Parental Level of Education and Students' Educational Performance

In most parts of the world, the process of educational attainment involves coordinating decisions on many dimensions e.g. curriculum placement, curriculum choice, participation in extracurricular activities and post secondary school choice. Successful passage through or navigation of this complicates system is partly dependent on parental assistance (Baker & Stevenson, 1986). Ineffective or inadequate parental assistance may lead a child to feel overwhelmed consequently to withdraw from school.

Researches on status attainment have shown that high educational" aspirations of parents are associated with high aspirations in children, and that this association accounts for a significant part of the association father's and son's educational attainment (Sewell & Shah, 1968). Students with families where parents have less education tend systematically perform worse than students whose parents have more education.

Nannyonjo (2007) makes some analysis to prove that students whose parents had some level of education tend to perform better academically. He compared the performance of students whose parents did not finish primary school and those who finished senior four or senior six or university and found that the latter performed considerably better. The highest increase in the test scores was for students whose fathers had a university degree. When this is compared to earlier research by Hanushek (2005), it was found that a mother's education has a significant effect on students test scores. Fathers' education had a stronger influence than mothers'. Those results possibly reflect the ability of parents to support the students' school work, and likely interactions of literate parents with their children in school related or literacy nurturing

activities as well as their ability to support their children with home work or help with difficult homework questions.

Similarly, Okumu, Nakajjo and Isoke (2008), in a study of socioeconomic determinants of second cycle schools found that high academic attainment of a mother and father significantly reduces chances of second cycle school dropout for students in rural and urban areas. For a mother, this phenomenon could be attributed to the fact that educated mothers reduce the time spend doing household chores while increasing the time spend with their children than their uneducated counterparts. Also, educated mothers are more effective in helping their children in academic progress. While for fathers it's attributed to the fact that educated fathers are also interested in their children thus they would be willing to spend time more in helping their children in academic problems. Educated fathers are as well aware of the social net works necessary for their children to engage into relatively human capital intensive activities yielding high returns to education.

Comings, Shrestha and Smith (1992) analysed the Nepalese National Literacy Programme and Schultz (1993) reviewed constraints benefits and policies of women's education in developing countries. These studies have pointed out that educated mothers were more likely to send their children to school. Burchfield (1996) evaluated the impact of literacy on women's empowerment in Nepal and reported an increase in school attendance and enrolment in Nepal when the children's parents had participated in the literacy programme. Studies on the effectiveness of people's literacy movement in Bangladesh by Cawthera (1997) showed a noted increase in school attendance when children's parents attended literacy classes. Also, an evaluation made by

Bekman (1999) on mother-child programme in Turkey review showed a greater impact, when literacy courses introduced parents to the ways of helping their children in school and the school curriculum. Beder (1999) investigated the outcomes and impacts associated with adult literacy education in America and reported that the participants have a positive influence on involvement in their children's education. Besides learners perceived that, their personal goals are achieved through participation in adult literacy education.

Egbo (2000) reported of Nigerian women's account of their daily routine, which brought out the contrast in the routines of children of literate and illiterate women in Nigeria. Carr-Hill, Okech, Katahoire, Kakooza, Ndidde and Oxenham (2001) who evaluated the adult literacy in Uganda reported that literacy class graduates were nearly twice as likely to discuss schoolwork and check homework of their children.

Burchfield, Hua, Iturry and Rocha (2002) studied the effect of integrated literacy and basic education programmes on the participation of women in social and economic development in Bolivia. The study compared women participants and non-participants in an integrated literacy and basic education programme in Bolivia. The study noted that though both literate and non-literate parents believed strongly in education for their children, literate parents were more likely to be able to support children in practical ways, such as meeting teachers and discussing progress with children. They were more likely to help their children in homework, to visit their child's school and to read to them, although reading to children is not a common educational practice. The study concluded that in both the experimental and the control

group more educated women had greater involvement with their children's educational activities than less educated women.

Fiedrich and Jellema (2003) studied on literacy, gender and social impact and empowerment in Uganda. The study pointed out husbands' comments that their wives are now educating their children with more diligence are likely to refer wife being stricter, including physical punishment, rather than teaching children how to read and write. Studies have evaluated the impact of family literacy programmes in relation to parents supporting children's education in South Africa (Desmond, 2004) revealed greater impacts when literacy courses are introduced to parents for helping their children in school and the school curriculum

Zill, Collins, West and Hausken (1995) indicate that "Low maternal education and minority- language status are most consistently associated with fewer signs of emerging literacy and a greater number of difficulties in preschoolers." Having inadequate resources and limited access to available resources can negatively affects families' decision regarding their young children's development and learning. As a result, children from families with low socioeconomic status are at greater risk of entering kindergarten unprepared than their peers from families with median or high socioeconomic status.

More educated mothers, it is argued, are more likely than fathers with the same level of education to make higher inputs of time and goods into the production function of their children's cognitive achievement, both in terms of quantity and quality of inputs. The more educated the mother, the more efficient her use of time spent with the child. Education may increase

women's bargaining power within the household, giving them more control over family income, again increasing home investments in the child. And the impact of each parent may differ for sons and daughters, it is argued, due to differences in aspirations and expectations, for example a well educated mother acting as a role model for her daughters (Akanle, 2007).

More recent literature such as Carneiro, Meghir and Peyer (2007) show that mother's education increases the child's performances in both math and reading at ages 7–8 years, but these effects are not seen at ages 12–14 years. They also find that, maternal education also reduces the incidence of behavioural problems and reduces grade repetition, but they find no effect on obesity. More educated mothers are more likely to invest in their children through books, providing musical instruments, special tutoring, or availability of computer. Even though they work more, more educated mothers do not spend less time with their children, breast feeding, reading, or taking them on outing.

In a rather simple but illustrative manner, the linkage between parental education and household resources, on the one hand, and children's education, on the other, Becker and Tomes (1986) point out that parents' concern for the economic capabilities and success of their children prompts them to invest resources in the children's education, health, motivation and other credentials. These expenditures influence the human capital and earnings of children later in life. School attendance is one measure of investment in human capital (Thomas, Beegle, Frankenberg, Sikoki, Strauss & Teruel, 2003).

Parental education is a decisive factor in the educational attainment of their children. Beller (2008) points out that there is a strong intergenerational

correlation in education. The quantity and quality of time devoted by parents to their children is positively related to the parents' education status. Parents' attributes also influence family income, which in turn affects the quality and quantity of goods that bear directly on home investment (Leibowitz, 1974). The amount of family income or household resources allocated to children and the timing of their distribution ultimately affects the schooling attainments of children (Haveman & Wolfe, 1995).

Robinson (1993) and Engin-Demir (2009) argued that sizable research has consistently shown that students' academic achievement has influenced by background of family characteristics such as socio-economic status of parents level of education, occupation and income. From these factors parental level of education and income has been the most significant source of disparities in female students' performance. As indicated on the Third International Mathematics and Science study (TIMSS) tests, students from economically disadvantaged families and families where parents had less level of education have systematically performed worse than other students.

Schiller, Khmelkov and Wang (2002) also argued that regardless of national context, parents who were well educated appear better able to provide their children with the academic and social support important for educational success when compared to parents with less educated. In other words, poverty, low level of parental education, parental and neighbourhood negative attitude towards schooling in general, children among from disadvantaged background have significantly poor academic achievement (Currie, 1995; Gregg & Machin, 1999) whereas children with high level of parental education have greater access to a wide variety of economic and social resources (family

structure, home environment, parent-child interaction) that can be drawn upon to help their children succeed in school (Coleman, 1988, 1991, 2006; McNeal, 1999). Higher family income is associated with higher students' achievement (Hanushek, 1992). The writers argued that several studies have demonstrated an increased number of children in the family lead to less favourable child outcome, it is reasonable to suppose through the mechanism of resource dilution (Blake, 1989). Children from the larger families have been found to have less resource for their education. Thus, resource in this context refers the amount of the time and quantity of material resources that parents are able to invest in their children (Teachman, Paasch, Day & Carver, 1996). Consequently, when the number of children increases, parents can only offer fewer resources per child. Under such conditions, all forms of family capital, financial, human and social are more finely spread across the children (Coleman, 1991). Favourable home environments and lower levels of verbal facility (Parcel & Menagham, 1994) as well as highest rates of behaviour problem and lower levels of education achievement (Downey, 1995).

Simmons and Alexander (1978) from their findings concluded that the determinants of students of student achievement appear to be basically the same in both developing and developed countries. Likewise, economic development had no effect on the relationship between children's social background and their academic achievement. In contrast, Engin- Demir (2009) stated that in developed nations cross-national research has indicated, the relative effects of home and school have relationship between a child's social background (parents' education, family structure) and his or her academic achievement is stronger than that of developing nations whereas, (Robinson,

1993; Sukon & Jawahir, 2005) school-related factors have been found to be more significant than out – of – school factors in explaining achievement variance in developing countries.

Even though the majority of the literature on parents' education pertains to the direct, positive influence on achievement (Jimerson, Egeland & Teo, 1999; Luster, Rhoades & Haas, 1989), the literature also suggests that it influences the beliefs and behaviours of the parent, leading to positive outcomes for children and youth (Eccles, 1993). Alexander, Entwisle and Bedinger (1994) found that parents of moderate to high income and appreciable educational background held beliefs and expectations that were somewhat in tandem with their children educational performance as opposed parents of low income status. What had been seen is that parents of low-income families instead had high expectations and performance beliefs that did not correlate well with their children's actual school performance.

Alexander et al (1994) suggested that the parents' abilities to form accurate beliefs and expectations regarding their children's performance are essential in structuring the home and educational environment so that they can excel in post-schooling endeavours. Halle, Kurtz-Costes and Mahoney (1997), using a sample of low-income minority families, also found that mothers with higher education had higher expectations for their children's academic achievement and that these expectations were related to their children's subsequent achievement in math and reading. Halle et al (1994) found that these more positive beliefs and expectations predicted higher amounts of achievement-related behaviours by mothers in the home as well as more positive perceptions of achievement by the children.

Research on parenting also has shown that parent education is related to a warm, social climate in the home. Klebanov, Brooks-Gunn and Duncan (1994) found that both mothers' education and family income were important predictors of the physical environment and learning experiences in the home but that mothers' education alone was predictive of parental warmth. Likewise, Smith, Brooks-Gunn and Klebanov (1997) found that the association of family income and parents' education with children's academic achievement was mediated by the home environment. The mediation effect was stronger for maternal education than for family income. Thus, these authors posited that education might be linked to specific achievement behaviours in the home (e.g., reading, playing). Corwyn and Bradley (2002) also found that maternal education had the most consistent direct influence on children's cognitive and behavioural outcomes with some indirect influence through a cognitively stimulating home environment. Corwyn and Bradley (2002), however, examined only two, quite broad aspects of family mediators: learning stimulation and parental responsiveness. Mediation might have emerged if other parent behaviours' and attitudes were examined.

Parents' education level directly correlates to the importance and influence of education in their wards lives. Educated parents can assess a male or female's academic strength and weaknesses to help that child improve overall academic performance. The educated parent also sets expectations of academic performance that propel students forward in their achievement levels. However, even if educated, parents that struggled academically and do not think of formalized education may have negative attitudes toward education that can still hinder the individual academically.

Parental Income and Students' Educational Performance

According to Kakuru (2001), Kasente (2003), universal primary education decisions that are taken tend to deny some children of school going age from getting access to primary education. At the higher level of education, most girl children who get access tend to come from middle and above gentle families. The students themselves hardly make decisions but rather it is their parents, guardians and relatives.

For children who are not enrolled in school, there are explanations for what drives the decision taken by their parents and guardians. For example, some studies found investment in children to be related to house hold income. Bjorkman (2005) depicted the correlation between district incomes in students' enrolment as follows: For low levels of income very few female students attended education and there is a large gab between male and female student's enrolment. The differential treatment of student's education was explained by the returns to education, and the share of the student's income transferred to his or parents. On the other hand, the differential treatment of male's verses female's students are related to the fact that parents' value of child labour where females bear the bulk of the additional work required at home.

Income shocks do not only affect investment in student's education but also student's performance. When families are constrained by fewer resources and there are differences in females and male's access to resources, students learning is consequently affected. According to Bjorkman (2005), a negative income shock has two effect on the female student's performance: marginal females will be withdrawn from school than males and the resources (food)

provided will fall more for females than for males. As such only brighter females reach grade seven. On the other hand, as females are provided with less resources within the household, or alternatively, have to spend more time on domestic work as compared to males and this effect causes females to perform worse on the test as compared to males.

According to Alissa and Gregg (2010), student's test scores are lower when poverty persists across the generations, and highest when material advantage is long-lasting. On the other hand, while good social skills also appeared to be linked across generations, these do not make a significant direct contribution to the current gap in cognitive test scores between rich and poor students. Alissa and Gregg found that the gap in attainment between students from the poorest and richest background grew particularly fast during basic school years. By age 11 years, only around three quarters of children from poorest families reached the expected level of stage two compared with 7% of children from richest families. Thus, students from poor homes who performed well in key stage tests at age seven were more likely to perform better age eleven. On the other hand, children from poor homes who performed badly at age seven were less likely to improve on their performance subsequently since the low income status would have adverse effects on them.

Similarly, Akanle (2007) identified parental income in his work to be a cogent factor upon which the academic success of secondary school students lies. He found parental income not to be sufficient to sustain the academic and personal social life of the student in sub rural school areas. This to a large extent affects the psychological balance or homeostatic balance in the

classroom, which causes low concentration, low perception, frustration, sickness and emotional disability in academic performance of the students.

Therefore when a student is deprived of the essential needs the student may be found to perform poorly in school work. Johnston, Ganzeboom and Treiman (2005) found that in urban areas, most poor families can hardly afford the cost of water, resulting in students from poor families being sent on long treks in search of water, often having to stand in long queues and consequently being late or absent from school. Therefore students' welfare at school is a determinant of child retention.

The literature on achievement has consistently shown that parent education is important in predicting children's achievement (Klebanov et al, 1994; Haveman & Wolfe, 1995; Smith et al., 1997). The mechanisms for understanding this influence, however, have not been well studied. In general, family process models (Linver, Brooks-Gunn, & Kohen, 2002; Yeung, Linver, & Brooks-Gunn, 2002) have examined how parenting behaviours, such as the structure of the home environment, influence children's achievement outcomes. Others have focused on specific behaviours such as harsh parenting, nurturing, and warmth (Conger, Ebert-Wallace, Sun, Simons, McLoyd & Brody, 2002; Mistry et al., 2002).

There has been less work on how factors like parental beliefs such as achievement expectations or efficacy might function as links between socioeconomic status (SES) and achievement outcomes (for an exception, see Halle et al., 1997). The studies that do exist generally examine young children in low-income or at-risk populations and focus on income-related variables as the moderator variables and family stress as a mediator to achievement

outcomes (Conger et al., 2002; Mistry et al., 2002). Thus, researchers have very little understanding of how parent education may influence the beliefs and behaviours of parents of school-age children (the age at which decisions about course selection and supplemental education such as tutoring might be beneficial to later college attendance).

Research, particularly, that of Buckingham (1999) and Rich (2000), on the relationship between parental income and educational outcomes can broadly be divided into research on general educational attainment and borrowing constraint for college enrolment. Studies on educational attainment usually find that an increase in parental income modestly increases the educational attainment of children. Most of these effects occur before high school. There is no strong evidence that the income effects are greater for children from low-income families compared to children from high-income families, or that income effects vary by age of child.

Socioeconomic status may therefore also be linked to family structure. As sole parent families on average have lower levels of income, are headed by parents with lower educational attainment and are less likely to be in the labour force, children from these families are likely to have lower educational performance (Rich, 2000). Other factors in sole parent families that are likely to adversely affect educational outcomes of children compared to those from two-parent families are said to include: reduced contact between the child and non-custodial parent; the custodial parent having less time to spend with children in terms of supervision of school-work and maintaining appropriate levels of discipline; the lack of an appropriate role model, especially for males; increased responsibilities on children such as childcare roles, domestic

duties which impede the time available for school work; and the nature of parent-child relationships in sole parent families may cause emotional and behavioural problems for the child (Buckingham, 1999; Rich, 2000).

The influence of family structure has been found to be only weakly associated with educational attainment, however, once controlling for other variables. It is more detrimental when children in sole parent families also experience a range of other risk factors such as low income (Sparkes, 1999).

Acemoglu and Pischke (2001) find that family income, rather than other factors related to family background, explains 27 percentage points of the 36 percentage point difference in the enrolment rates of children in a four-year college. These effects are different between rich and poor family.

Ramey and Ramey (1994) described the relationship of family socioeconomic status to children's readiness for school. Across all socioeconomic groups, parents face major challenges when it comes to providing optimal care and education for their children. For families in poverty, these challenges can be formidable. Sometimes, when basic necessities are lacking, parents must place top priority on housing, food, clothing, and health care. Even in families with above-average incomes, parents often lack the time and energy to invest fully in their children's preparation for school, and they sometimes face a limited array of options for high-quality child care—both before their children school and during the early school years. Families with low socioeconomic status often lack the financial, social, and educational supports that characterize families with high socioeconomic status.

One other research study suggests that, “students from low-income families attain less education than children from more advantaged families” (Rouse & Barrow, 2006, p.102). These researchers state that this may be a result of expectations placed on students from a low socioeconomic status. From one viewpoint, parents of a higher socioeconomic status expect their children to advance further in their educational career and these higher expectations result in a significant effect on student achievement and their own perceptions of academic success (Benner & Mistry, 2007).

In the year 1999, approximately 19% of all American children under the age of 18 were members of families with incomes below the poverty line (Buckner, Bassuk & Weinreb, 2001). Students within that low socioeconomic status may deal with environmental stressors within their neighbourhood such as feelings of insecurity about their safety, housing status, and violence within their community. Henrich, Schwab- Stone, Fanti, Jones and Ruchkin (2004) found that students who were within safe environments and did not witness violence were twice as likely to meet standards set by the state on achievement tests. Contrasting studies state that the type of neighbourhood that students live in does not greatly impact academic achievement, but urges that the relationships found cannot be ignored (Thompson, 2002).

When parents are a part of subordinate social groups, they are less able to provide supplemental resources to aid in the learning that begins in the classroom (Van Laar & Sidanius, 2001). Resources include goods and services that would enhance academic success; goods including educational videos, games, and toys; services including tutoring and other academic support. This

research also found that limited wealth exposes limited “quality and variety of enriching experiences to which lower status children are exposed”.

On the other end of the educational process, parents who are economically disadvantaged are less able to provide for further education after high school, so students may not be working to their fullest potential that would be required to enter into higher education (Rouse & Barrow, 2006)

SES is not the only key to children’s low academic achievement. Each child’s self-awareness and the child’s parents’ or guardian’s positive attitude towards their child’s education would be the key for the child’s success. “A high-achieving disadvantaged student is one who identifies with his or her own ethnic group while at the same time aspiring to middle-class values” (McDonald & Ho, 2002, p.68). Although parents’ or guardian’s support has a tremendous effect on their children’s school achievement, low-income parents participate less in schools than higher-income parents despite the benefits of parent involvement (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007). Van Velsor and Orozco also found that parental involvement in schools is associated with their children’s improvement in a variety of areas including (a) academic performance, (b) attitudes and behaviour, (c) attendance, (d) school adjustment and engagement, and (e) graduation rates.

Another study provided many facts that show substantial variations in children’s outcomes across families that are identical in parents’ education and work history, family income, family size, and other standard measures of social and economic well-being (Datcher-Loury, 1989). According to Rath, Gielen, Haynie, Solomon, Cheng, and Simons-Morton (2008), “Home and school are the major ecological settings for youth and thus provide a context to

understand factors that may relate to positive academic outcomes” (p. 82). The authors found that parental academic monitoring in a low-income, African American population appears to be associated with pro-social friends and behaviour and perceived parental engagement and support. Not only low-income, African American children, but also any other children need high parental support to increase their success. Matuszek (1977) also stated that parental involvement in education has a positive influence on the children’s academic achievement. After his literature review of 18 articles, Matuszek found that parents’ involvement in their children’s school work can be effective in improving the academic achievement of children from low socioeconomic status.

A family’s financial status influences a number of factors that can help or hinder a child in gaining an education. Wealthy families have the financial resources to send a son or daughter to high-quality schools, hire tutors and obtain supplemental education sources. Students from low-income families may not be able to attend school because no school is available. Where school is available, the teachers may have insufficient education or training. Financial stress on the parents can cause a child to leave school early to work. Worries about the financial lack at home can negatively affect low-income students’ ability to learn.

Parental Occupation and Students’ Educational Performance

Checchi and Salvi (2010) found that in Ghana some negative correlation emerged with the probability of enrolment and low income jobs. In Mauritania they found that, there is also positive association with household head working as public employee, which is typically associated with less

volatile higher earnings. For Uganda, the coefficients of both father and mother education exhibited a nicely increasing trend, suggesting an increase pressure on educating the off spring, especially when the main source of income comes from ‘transfer’, which helps to raise school attendance.

However, one third of Ugandans classified as unemployed were actually taking up unpaid family jobs. Okumu et al (2008) found that a large percentage of economically active persons are economically unproductive, thereby vindicating the household’s dependence burden and that educated workers accept only high quality jobs and possibly experience long spells of unemployment and or migration. This squeezes out the households resources, resulting into student’s in the family dropping out of school. Horn (1992) in his contribution presented findings from the British Educational Research Association’s Annual Conference that examined pupil – placement decisions in English and Maths in 44 secondary and 124 primary schools.

Their analysis included information on pupils prior attainment, gender, ethnicity and home neighbourhood and found that working class students are more likely to be placed in lower sets than middle – class students who have the test results, and that, students from middle – class backgrounds more likely to be assigned to higher sets, irrespective of their prior attainment.

The schools said that prior attainment and perceived ability were the main criteria on which decisions on socioeconomic factors of students were based. However, over half the pupils with low prior attainment in English ended up in middle or high sets. It was seen that teacher judgement and students behaviour influenced setting decisions but social class was more important. This phenomenon is present in Uganda where students who wish to

transfer from rural to urban schools are often placed lower classes due to perceived low attainment in their previous schools (Okumu et al., 2008).

To approximate the extent to which individuals are affected by period of instability, Kasente (2003) calculated the number of years of the respondents primary schooling age (7-14 years) that overlap with the period 1971-1979. They expected that the higher the exposure to Amin's era, the lower the education level. Similar pattern was found by other studies as well in Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Nicaragua and Turkey where there were greater negative change in school enrolment in boys than for girls. So parents are typically less motivated to send their children to school during periods of disorder because of unstable occupations.

To conclude this review, there is a huge complexity of reasons why students from low- socioeconomic status are less likely to excel in education. These range from family and community expectations due to possible returns of educations for the family, financial hardship, ambivalent attitudes to education, poor attendance patterns due to need for child labour. Likewise there are also many reasons why students from high socioeconomic status excel in education. These include ability to literate parents to support students with home and school work, monitoring and supervision of student's school work and access to information and social networks necessary for their children's success in life.

Family Status and Students' Educational Performance

Family background is key to a students' life and outside of school, is the most important influence on students learning and includes factors such as socioeconomic status, two-parent versus single-parent households, divorce,

parenting practices and aspirations, maternal characteristics, family size, and neighbourhood (Majoribanks, 1996). The environment at home is a primary socialization agent and influences a child interest in school and aspirations for the future.

The socio-economic status (SES) of a child is most commonly determined by combining parents' educational level, occupational status and income level (Jeynes, 2002). Studies have repeatedly found that SES affects student outcomes (Baharudin & Luster, 1998; Jeynes, 2002; Eamon, 2005, Majoribanks, 1996; McNeal, 2001). Students who have a low SES earn lower test scores and are more likely to drop out of school (Eamon, 2005). Low SES students have been found to score about ten percent lower on the National Assessment of Educational Programs than higher SES students. SES has also been shown to override other educational influences such as parental involvement (McNeal, 2001). It is believed that low SES negatively affects academic achievement because low SES prevents access to vital resources and creates additional stress at home (Eamon, 2005; Majoribanks, 1996; Jeynes, 2002). The economic hardships that caused by low SES lead to disruptions in parenting, an increasing amount of family conflict, and an increased likelihood of depression in parents and single-parent household (Eamon, 2005). For these reasons SES is closely tied to home environment and one could argue that SES dictated the quality of home life for children.

Previous research has shown that children from single-parent homes do not perform as well in school as children from two-parent households (Majoribanks, 1996). There are several different explanations for this achievement gap. Single-parent households have less income and there is a

lack of support for the single-parent which increases stress and conflicts (Majoribanks, 1996). Single parents often struggle with time-management issues due to balancing many different areas of life on their own. Some research has also shown that single-parents are less involved with their children and therefore give less encouragement and have lower expectations of their children than two-parent households (Majoribanks, 1996).

Divorce has also been found to negatively affect academic achievement (Jeynes, 2002). Jeynes (2002) found that students whose parents had divorced were among those who scored lowest on standardized test. Possible explanations for this relationship are that divorce can cause a family's SES level to decrease and parental connections are harmed.

Research shows that supportive and attentive parenting practices positively affect academic achievement (Eamon, 2005). In addition, high parent aspirations have been associated with increasing students' interest in education (Majoribanks, 2005). The effect of parental involvement in their children's school has on academic achievement is less clear (Domina, 2005). Parental involvement in school has been linked to both positive and negative influences on academic achievement (Domina, 2005; McNeal, 2001). Explanations for this discrepancy are not conclusive. It is thought that the type of involvement may make a difference and that in some cases parents become involved after their child has already had academic difficulties (Domina, 2005; McNeal, 2001). Other recent research has found more conclusively that while parental involvement may not help academic scores, it does help prevent behavioural problems (Domina, 2005).

Parental involvement in their child's education has been linked to increased levels of academic performance in the classroom (Angelides, Theophanous & Leigh, 2006; Patrikakou, 2004). According to Patrikakou (2004), increased levels of parental expectations for high academic achievement led to increased student achievement, as well as an increase in the amount of time spent completing homework outside of the classroom. This demonstrates the belief that parent expectations are very powerful, as they encourage students to excel academically (Catsambis, 2001).

Due to the repetition of research findings indicating that parental involvement has a positive effect on student performance, the world of education is being integrated with family life. Whereas education and school once existed as a separate entity from other parts of the community, there is now a major push to intertwine all of the separate spheres of society into a solid, interdependent environment because of the obvious benefits for everyone involved (Bobetsky, 2003). According to Fantuzzo, McWayne and Perry (2004), home-based family involvement in a child's education has been the strongest predictor of a child's motivation to learn and do well in school.

In a continuation of Bronfenbrenner's work regarding the ecology of human development, Epstein (1995) introduced the concept of overlapping spheres theory to encourage a collaborative environment between each segment of a child's world. Epstein described three main spheres that have the potential to either function together or separately, depending on the goals of society: school, family, and community.

Epstein (1995) stated that when the three spheres come together and work towards a common goal, such as improving a child's education, a

“family-like school” can be created. With this type of environment, children would receive similar messages from school, home and community regarding expectations and achievement, thus increasing their frequency and effectiveness. Christenson (2004) also stated that applying the principles from ecological systems theory can improve a child’s learning, as well as meet the demands of federal legislation such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), when parents and teachers begin to consult with one another and build intervention practices for students.

A family must grow together with the school and community to prepare proper citizens within a democratic society. The family structure must provide a base from which children can take root as well as wings. There is much to be addressed within the family structure and the task is of a continuing nature. Educators in their pursuit for successful test scores should not overlook the connection between school and home. Researchers, Fiedrich and Jellema (2003) assessed data from the new Child Well-Being Topical Module of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), collected in the fall of 1994. They tested the data within established conceptual frameworks using logistic regression correlated with children's current well-being status indicated by their current grade and age. Their findings identified the expected background correlates of the children’s’ well-being, in addition to showing associations between child well-being and household stressors, family characteristics, and participation in enrichment activities.

Children's successful progress in the school system is one important marker for their well-being. Falling behind or being retained in a grade may be a first indication of potential risk for an off-time transition to adulthood

(Mukherjee, 1995). Falling behind while in school may also serve as a predictor of future negative academic achievement and social adjustment outcomes (Alexander et al., 1997).

Children must be nurtured and educated in areas of academics with high expectations. High educational standards must increase in order for the success of our democracy to continue. Specific parental activities within the school have been found to be successful. Lonoff (1971) found the practice of parental involvement in the school environment, whether it is in activities such as field trips, cafeteria, sports, or other areas, promoted success. Sizemore, Brossard and Harrigan (1983) even suggested that having parents sit in on classroom instruction promotes academic success.

Another important determinant, which should not be neglected, is the family. Family is the primary social system for children for all cultures across the region. Rollins and Thomas (1979) found that high parental control were associated with high achievement.

Phillips (1998) also found that parental education and social economic status have an impact on student achievement. Students with parents who were both college-educated tended to achieve at the highest levels. Income and family size were modestly related to achievement (Ferguson, 1991). Peng and Wright's (1994) analysis of academic achievement, home environment (including family income) and educational activities, concluded that home environment and educational activities explained the greatest amount of variance.

Family Size and Students' Educational Performance

Clark (1983) defined a family as any group of people that are related by blood or marriage especially a group of two grown-up people and their children. Usually, there are two major types of family: Nuclear family and extended family. Nuclear family consists of only the husband and his wife together with their children while Extended family consists of the husband, the wife, the children and other relations living together in a large family compound (Rouse & Barrows, 2006).

Nuclear family type is mostly practiced in Europe, America and some other parts of the world where a young man and his wife alone start to live separately from their parents and start giving birth to children. The extended family type is common in Africa where groups of blood related people live together. Amato (1987) posited that the nature of family from which a child belongs has a lot of influence on the general life pattern of the child. There are many studies carried out to determine the effect of the nature of family on the academic work of the students' and these studies have shown positive results which are being applied by classroom teachers and educational counsellors or psychologists to guide children's learning. For example, studies of Fuligni (1997), Rouse and Barrows (2006) at the guidance and counselling department, University of Florida indicate that the smaller a family structure is, the more success recorded by the children as regards the academic pursuit. The reason for this is that more concentrations are given by parents to fewer children than the families where the children are many.

The negative relationship between family size and educational achievements typically found in literature is however not necessarily proof of a negative effect of the number of children. The number of children is a choice

variable of the parents and it might be that certain characteristics of parents, such as their educational attainments, affect both the number of children as well as the educational attainments of those children. This can cause a negative correlation between the number of siblings and future educational achievement, even if no causal effect of the number of siblings exists. Consequently a simple ordinary least squares regression of educational attainment on the number of children in a family will likely give biased and inconsistent results (Cole & Hoffer, 1987).

Recent studies have also used twins or the sex mix of children as instruments to identify the effect of the number of children; Angrist and Evans (1998) to identify the effect on parents. Labour supply, Black, Devereux and Salvanes (2005), Angrist, Lavy and Schlosser (2005) and Dalton and Glauber (2005) to estimate the effect on educational achievements of children. No study has however identified the effect of family size on years of education for the United States or for the Netherlands. Also because the literature using instruments to identify the effect of family size is still relatively sparse, it is certainly important to apply this methodology to different data sets, from various countries. Like many studies, these papers found a negative correlation.

Some economists emphasize the constraints on available parental time and resources, which can cause a negative effect of birth order on educational outcomes Becker (1981), Behrman (1997). Later born children have to share the available time and resources with their siblings for a larger part of their childhood, than earlier born children. Some empirical studies have indeed found a negative effect (Behrman & Taubman, 1986; Black, Devereux &

Salvanes, 2005), but others have found no systematic effect of birth order on educational attainment (Hauser & Sewel, 1985).

Although some other studies, particularly that of Black, Devereux and Salvanes (2005), have also investigated the effect of birth order, hardly any study has investigated what is behind the estimated birth order effects. To investigate if restrictions on parental time and resources are behind the birth order effects, an interaction term of birth order with parental education is included in the analysis. Higher educated parents have on average more resources and the restrictions will be less severe, which is expected to decrease the negative effect of birth order. Also competition between siblings for scarce parental time is expected to be more severe if the age gap between children is smaller. Therefore the effect of the time between births is investigated, taking into account the possible endogeneity of the space between births, by using the presence of twins as instrument.

The results show that both the Netherlands and for the United States, the negative effect of birth order does not differ significantly between children with higher or lower educated parents. Also the average number of months between subsequent births has no significant effect on the educational attainment of a child. Nor does the average space between births affect the negative effect of birth order on educational attainment (Angrist, Lavy & Schlosser, 2005).

There is an extensive theoretical literature about the trade-off between child quality and quantity, dating back to the models of Becker and Lewis (1973) and Becker and Tomes (1976). The idea behind these theoretical models is that if parents have more children, investing a certain amount in per-

child quality, for example their education, is more expensive, than if they have fewer children. If parents decide to have 'n' children, investing an amount 'x' in child quality gives a total cost of investment in child quality of 'n . x'. When there is an (exogenous) increase in the number of children n, the total cost of investing a certain amount in per-child quality becomes higher and for a given budget constraint parents will lower the investment in per-child quality. This indicates that there is a negative relation between child quantity and child quality.

However, parents not only have an influence on child quality through investment of resources, but also through transmission of their endowments. The endowment of a child depends on many separate factors; the endowment of his father, the endowment of his mother and the environment in which he is raised. If parents with lower endowments have a higher preference for child quantity than parents with higher endowments, and therefore also have more children, this can cause a negative correlation between child quantity and child quality, by way of the effect of parental endowments on child quality. Children of parents with low endowments will in this case have on average more siblings and a lower educational attainment, even though there may be no causal effect of the number of children on educational attainment (Hauser & Sewel, 1985).

Studies conducted on educational attainment of children and the size of the family indicated that children from large families attain less schooling on the average than those children with few brothers and sisters. This negative effect of family size on educational attainment persists after the socioeconomic characteristics of the families are statistically controlled (Blake, 1989).

These studies assumed that large families spread their resources:- economic, cultural and effectiveness more thinly than do families with fewer children. This suggests that parents who have many children invest less money, time, emotional and psychic energy, and attention on each child (Blake, 1989). Blake (1989) hypothesizes that the negative effect of family size on educational attainment in U. S. is weaker among Catholics than among Protestants because the Catholic community extend various kinds of support to its members such as family-based tuition in its parochial school & and parish network that distribute used clothing for children. Community support reduces the negative effect of family size because the dilution of resources from the nuclear family is countered by resources from an external source (i.e. the community). Cole and Hoffer (1987) reported that among students attending Catholic schools, family size is only weakly related to school achievement. Blake (1989) also found that among U.S. Jews, the effect of family size on educational attainment is weak. She attributed this to the value orthodox Judaism placed on large families and extended periods of schooling.

The size of families has some effect of academic performance of students. Students who come from larger families tend to have lower levels of achievement and lower levels of secondary graduation, on average than children who come from smaller families. The argument is that parents of many children cannot afford to divide quality time with their children. Value added quality time is hard to set aside to oversee the academic aspect of the children. On the other hand, parents with two to three kids can afford the time to develop their children academic capabilities because their time is only shared with less number of children (Cole & Hoffer, 1987).

From the full discussions and revelations from studies carried out on family structure, parental practices, family size and children academic or educational attainment and health, it is obvious that children who live with single-parents or step-parents receive less parental encouragement and attention with respect to educational activities than children who live with both biological parents. This also means that children from non-intact families report lower educational expectations on the part of their parents, less monitoring of schoolwork by mothers and fathers and less over all supervision of social activities than children from intact families (Cole & Hoffer, 1987).

It was also discovered by Blake (1989) that children from large families attain less school on the average than children with fewer brothers and sisters. Based on the conclusions made, it is recommended that the National Women Commission and the Women League should mount family support programme that will promote family life, enhance parental practices and plan families.

Summary of the Literature Review

The role education plays in the economy of every country cannot be overemphasized. That is why the governments are undertaking educational reforms in many countries including Ghana. Better academic performance is an essential ingredient for education to be regarded as being qualitative. The academic performance of students on the other hand is affected by certain socioeconomic factors.

Throughout this literature review studies reveal that the success in the education of students though multifaceted, is simple to comprehend. A quote mentioned in an article from Rouse and Barrows (2006), states how Martin Luther King Jr. in 1967 felt concerning socioeconomic status and its effects on

education.” The job of the school is to teach so well that family background is no longer an issue”.

According to Robinson (1993) and Engin-Demir (2009), argued that sizable research has consistently shown that student’s academic achievement has influenced by background of family characteristics such as socioeconomic status of parents level of education, occupation and income. From these factors, parental level of education and income has been the most significant source of disparities in female student’s academic performance.

Amato (1987) posited that the nature of family from which a child belongs has a lot of influence on the general life pattern of the child. Studies have shown that when there are capital market imperfections and parents have many children they can, for a given income, invest less in each child than if they have fewer children. This can cause a negative relationship between family size and educational attainment.

Lower educational attainment has also been found to be associated with students living in public housing compared to those in private housing (Sparkes, 1999). In a study conducted by Fuligni (1997) results indicated that only a small portion of student’s success could be attributed to their socioeconomic background. A more significant correlate of their achievement was a strong emphasis on education that was shared by the students, their parents and their peers.

The reviews of literature also revealed the SES may or may not have as much of an impact on academic achievement as was stereotyped. Moreover, the primary influences on high academic achievement among low SES students are parents and peers who value and support academic success and

provide mechanism such as involvement and support for academic success to occur.

It may or may not therefore be reasonable to assume that socioeconomic status is the most powerful predictor of student's academic performance. It is therefore expected that in case where such influences are lacking in students of St. Monica's College of Education, the College must take on the responsibility of addressing the learning needs of students who may have potential to succeed in life to attain high academic performance.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter focuses on the research methodology. It describes the research design, population, sample and sample procedure, research instrument, data collection and data analysis procedures as well as the pre-testing of the research instrument.

Research Design

The research design used for this study was the descriptive survey. According to Nwana (1982) descriptive research is designed to obtain information concerning the current status of phenomena. Gay (1987) described descriptive survey as a process of collecting data in order to test hypothesis or to answer questions concerning the status of the subject of the study. Such a study reports the way things are. Descriptive survey focuses on determining the status of a defined population with respect to certain variables. Taking the purpose of the study into consideration, this design helped to clarify and interpret aspects of socioeconomic factors that influenced the academic performance of students. The descriptive survey was the most obvious and appropriate design that could help in drawing meaningful conclusions for the study.

Descriptive research was considered to be relatively appropriate for this study since it could help collect, analyse and interpret data. This design was chosen because it had the advantage of producing good amount of

responses from a wide range of people. Finally, the descriptive survey design was adopted to find out from students and teachers the socio-economic factors that affected the academic achievement of teacher trainees of St. Monica's College of Education.

Population

The population of the study was composed of students, teachers and parents of the students of who took part in the study. The total number of students was 398 and that of teachers was 30. The number of parents could not be determined because of hand it was impossible to state which of the students a single parents or double parents hence no specific was assigned.

Sample and Sampling Procedures

The sample comprised 122 respondents. This was made up of 100 students from both 1st and 2nd year classes – 50 students from each year group respectively, 10 parents and 12 teachers. Each year group of students was made up of five classes: A, B, C, D, and E. In order to come by the sample size for the study for each class, simple random sampling was used to select students. The simple random sampling is appropriate when the population of study is similar in characteristics of interest (Calvert, 2000). It involves the use of lottery method (Gay, 1981). To use this sampling technique, the researcher first had to assign a serial number to every member of the student population involved in the study. The numbers were written on slips of papers and the slips put in a container and thoroughly mixed up. The researcher then dipped hands into the container and picked out a slip. The number on the slip was selected and recorded, the slip was then thrown back into the container and the process continued again until the required sample size was selected.

In order to obtain a sample of teachers for the study, 12 teachers were purposively selected by the researcher based on the fact that the selected teachers had a fair knowledge about the students' academic output or work from 2005- 2008. the purposive sampling was used because teachers are the primary source where information about is to be source since in a boarding school, housemasters/mistresses as well as form masters and mistresses ensure that students put up appropriate behaviours and correct students when they deviate. In view of this, they know the academic progression of every student, hence, they could not be left out of the study.

Non-probability sampling procedure was used for the selection of parents, specifically, the convenient sampling method. Convenience sampling was used because it was extremely difficult or impossible to select a random sample. A convenience sample is a group of individuals who (conveniently) are available for a study. In this case, the group was chosen for the study because they were available. However it did not tend up to be the representative of the population.

Instrument

The researcher used three structured questionnaires to gather information from respondents. Kerlinger (1973) observed that the questionnaire is widely used for collecting data because it is very effective for securing factual information about practices and conditions and for inquiring into opinion and attitude of the subject. Most of the items were close-ended, though there were some open-ended items. The questionnaire for each group was in five sections, teacher's questionnaire were in five sections and that for parents was also in five sections.

Section A of the students' questionnaire sought information about their biographic data. It consisted of four items in which a number of alternatives were offered for them to select the ones which were applicable to their situation. Section B requested for the views of students on the academic background of their parents. Section C requested information on their parental income. Section D of students' questionnaire required them to provide information their parent's occupation. The final section which is Section E solicited information on students' family size.

The Section A of the teachers' questionnaire was on the biographic data such as sex, age and educational qualifications. Section B directed teachers to tick responses that concerned students' parents' educational level which influence students' performance in school. Section C requested that teachers responded to questions relating students' parental income and how it influenced students' academic performance. Section D solicited information on parental occupation of students and how they affected students' academic performance. The final section, Section E required of teachers to provide information on how family size of students affected their academic performance.

Section A of parents' questionnaire dealt with biographic data such as age, sex and personal data. Section B demanded that parents provided information about their educational attainment and how it affected their wards' academic performance. Items in Section C covered information on parental income and how it affected their wards' academic performance. Section D contained information on parents' occupation and how it influenced students' academic performance. Section E, the last section, sought information about

family size and place of residence and how they influenced their wards' academic performance.

Validation and Reliability of the Instrument

Validity is an assessment of the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. In this context, the content validity was ascertained. According to Anastasi and Urbina (1997, p. 114), "content validity" is a non-statistical type of validity that involves "the systematic examination of the test content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the behaviour domain to be measured." Based on this assertion, the supervisor of this research perused the items in the instruments and ensured that they were properly constructed and covered all the relevant areas.

Also, to ensure consistency in the responses, a reliability test was run for the three questionnaires. After the instruments have been retrieved from the pilot testing process, the responses were edited and electronically analysed via the Statistical Product and Service Solutions version 16.0. Using the Cronbach alpha, the reliability coefficient of three instruments were 0.75, 0.80 and 0.70 for tutors, students and parents respectively. The results were deemed to be reliable for the purpose they were to be used for and they could be used for the final data collection.

Pilot Testing of Instrument

The instruments were pilot tested on third (3rd) year students of St. Monica's College of Education and that gave impetus to running of the reliability tests. Before the commencement of the pilot test, permission was sought from the Principal of the College and parents were called on phones

and contacts made with them. When the green light was given, 20 students were selected from the third year class for the exercise. The selected students had comparable characteristics as the target population. Similarly, two tutors who were not part of the sample for the main study were purposefully selected and used for the piloting of the instrument. When the student respondents had been selected they were given copies of the questionnaire and were asked to complete and return same the same they which they all did. The two teachers also completed theirs the same day and returned them. On the part the parents, the questionnaires were posted to them with a return self-addressed and stamped enveloped, which they complied within two weeks. In effect, the pilot test was successful with a 100 percent return rate.

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher informed the College Principal about her intentions of carrying out a study that had to do with students, teachers, and parents on the effects of socio-economic factors on students' academic performance. The respondents were assured of confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. Based on the assurances given, the student respondents worked on their questionnaires the same day. This was done with the aid of a trained assistant. The teacher respondents allowed to send their questionnaires home and returned them the later. Within a week all the teachers had completed and returned the questionnaires. With regard to parents, as was done during the pilot test stage, their questionnaires were mailed to them and when they completed them they returned them for the analysis. At this stage too, all the respondents in the sample returned their questionnaires and gave a 100 percent return rate.

Data Analysis

All data collected were first grouped and edited for consistency for clarity of expression. Afterwards, a coding format was adopted and used to effect the variable view input on the SPSS. In the meantime, all the individual questionnaires had been coded with same responses having the same code numbers. This enhanced the data view input of the SPSS. When all the data had been keyed into the data view of the SPSS, the coded responses were keyed into the variable view to complete the input process. All items meant to answer a particular research question was analysed as such. Out of the analysed data, frequency tables and percentages were generated for the presentation of results.

The same format was used for the analysis of the three research questions. Thus, every item that was meant to answer a research question was edited to match the objectives of a research question. In the end, all three research questions are duly answered.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the data collected and analysed on the effects socio-economic factors have on the academic performance of students of Saint Monica's College of Education in Ashanti Mampong are presented in this chapter. The presentation is divided into two main sections, which are the demographic characteristics of respondents and the analysis of research questions.

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The demographic characteristics of respondents (teachers, parents and students) are presented in this section. The responses are presented in such a way that common ones are displayed in the same table. However, the responses on the gender distribution of respondents are presented in prose. Consequently, the information on the age and marital status of all respondents are found in Tables 1 and 2. Apart from these, the others are presented separately because they do not have any commonality.

Distribution of Respondents by Age

The responses elicited from teachers, parents and students on their respective ages are presented in Table 1. It is evident from Table 1 that out of the 12 teachers, 9 (74.6%) were between the ages of 21-40 years. This means that majority of the teachers whose ages fall between these ranges are a bit

younger as compared to the remaining three. According traditional belief in Ghanaians, the three teachers who were over 40 years are claimed to be old and mature.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by Age

Age range in years	Teachers N (%)	Parents N (%)	Students N (%)
Up to 20	-	-	17 (17.0)
21-30	2 (16.3)	-	69 (69.0)
31-40	7 (58.3)	4 (40.0)	14 (14.0)
41-50	2 (16.7)	4 (40.0)	-
51 and above	1 (8.3)	2 (20.0)	-
Total	12 (100)	10 (100)	100 (100)

The significance of teacher respondents' age is that once most of them are below age 50, they have between 10 and 40 years to serve in the Ghana Education Service. The majority of the teachers who formed part of the study were between the ages of 31-40 years this means that the respondents who were teachers used for the study are young and have more energy and strength to help students improve upon their academic performance and also have more years ahead of them to go for pension.

Again, from Table 1 it can be observed that the ages of 4 (40.0%) out of the 10 parents were between 31-40 years. Also, the table shows that age of the remaining 6 (60.0%) were 41 years or above. It is significant to note that once respondents had been able to educate their children to the College level, irrespective of their age, they have some experience that is relevant to the issue under study.

Finally, Table 1 shows that the ages of 17% of the student respondents were below 21 years. This means that they are younger and may not be so experienced in life; however, since they have made to the College, they can contribute meaningfully to the issue under discussion. The remaining 83% are relatively older as students of a College of Education. It is likely some of them have worked for sometime before coming to school.

Gender Distribution of Respondents

The second demographic characteristic, which is common to all respondents, is their gender distribution. Data collected on the gender distribution of respondents showed that out of the 12 teachers, 6 were female and the remaining 6 were males. This means that number of males' teachers used for the study at St. Monica's College of Education is the same the number of female teachers used for the study from the College.

Also, the result on the gender distribution of parents showed that out of the 10 parents, six representing 60.0% were males whilst four representing 40.0% were females. To conclude one can say that male parents used for the study are more than females. It should be noted that students of St. Monica's College of Education are all females and students' respondents were females.

Marital Status of Respondents

The third common demographic data about respondents was their marital status. The responses collated on this subject are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 shows that 7 (58.3%) of the respondents were married, whilst 5 (41.7%) were single. This implies that majority of the teachers of St. Monica's College used for the study were married.

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status

Marital status	Teachers	Parents	Students
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Single	5 (41.7)	8 (80.0)	35 (35.0)
Married	7 (58.3)	2 (20.0)	62 (62.0)
Divorced	-	-	3 (3.0)
Total	12 (100)	10 (100)	100 (100)

It is observed from Table 2 that out of 10 parents who took part in the study, 8 were married, whilst 2 single. This shows that majority of students' parents are legally married and therefore they are responsible. This can help improve academic performance of students.

The information of the marital status of students as detailed in Table 2 indicates that the majority (62%) were married. Also, the table shows that 35 of the student respondents representing 35.0% were single. Again, 3.0% of the students were divorced. One can conclude by saying that majority of the female students are single. From the teachers' questionnaire, they were asked to state the number of years they have taught in the Ghana Education Service. Their responses are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 depicts that out of the 12 respondents, 6 representing (50.0%) have been in the teaching service from 11 to 15 years. Also, it is observed that 3 representing (25.0%) have also been in the teaching service from 1-5 years. Again, 16.7% have been in the teaching profession for 21 years or above; whilst one respondent had been in the teaching service for between 16-20 years. From the data one can conclude by saying that most teachers of St.

Monica’s College of Education have been in the teaching service between 11-15 years.

Table 3: Teachers’ Length of Service with the Ghana Education Service

Years of service	Frequency	Percentage
1-5	3	25.0
11-15	6	50.0
16-20	1	8.3
21 and above	2	16.7
Total	12	100.0

Responses by parents in respect of their educational background showed that 40.0% had attended school up to the secondary school level and 60.0% to the tertiary levels. What this means is that the parents of students are fairly educated to understand what education is all about. In this sense, it is believed that such parents are in a better position to give their wards the needed assistance in their educational pursuits.

On the part of students, they were asked to state their respective year of study. The responses students gave indicated that 50 each were in year one and two respectively. This response only went to confirm what was anticipated at the beginning of the work.

Analyses of Research Questions

Three research questions were used to guide data collection for the study. In the presentation of the results, each research question will serve as a subsection whereby the objective of the research question is stated and the items that answer it presented as elicited from teachers, parents and students.

Research Question One: How does parental educational background influence the academic performance of students of Saint Monica’s College of Education?

The essence of research question one was to explore how parents/guardians’ educational background influenced students’ academic performance. Students were asked of the educational levels of their parents and that was used to form the basis for the remaining items. The responses students gave relating to their parents’ educational background are presented in Table 4.

The table shows that majority of respondents (34.0%) had parents who have had secondary education whilst 28.0% stated that their parents have had primary education. Also, Table 4 shows that 21.0% of student respondents indicated that their parents have education beyond the secondary education level.

Table 4: Students’ Responses on their Parents’ Educational Background

Educational background	Frequency	Percentage
No schooling	17	17.0
Primary education	28	28.0
Secondary education	34	34.0
Post secondary education	21	21.0
Total	100	100.0

Seventeen percent (17.0%) of respondents revealed that their parents had no form of schooling. This is attested to by Desmond (2004), Bahudin and Luster (1998) and Eamon (2005) that the level of education of a parent could impact on the ward’s academic performance.

Nannyonjo (2007) in a study found that the higher the educational level of parents, the more positive attention they have towards children's education. Also researches on status attainment have shown that, high educational aspirations of parents are associated with high aspiration in their wards and that this association account for a significant part of the association with the father's and son's educational attainment (Swell & Shah, 1968).

Owing to the background given by students on their parents' educational levels, teachers were asked whether parents provided their wards with the necessary teaching and learning materials. The responses collated from this question indicated that 75.0% readily provided the teaching and learning resources to students and the remaining 25.0% answered in the negative. From the educational background displayed in Table 4, the revelation that a quarter of parents did not readily provide their wards' educational needs is not surprising because, 17% with no education and 28% with primary education attest to that fact.

On this same issue, parents were asked how often they provided teaching learning materials (TLMs) for their wards. The responses parents gave are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Frequency to which Parents Provided Teaching Learning Materials to Wards

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Every semester	1	10.0
When necessary	5	50.0
Seldom	4	40.0
Total	10	100.0

The responses as given by parents indicated that 40.0% of them hardly supplied the educational needs of their wards. However, it is seen that 60.0% provided their wards educational needs as and when they required them or the beginning of the semester. When this is tied in with the educational levels of parent participant gave, the results should have shown all of them indicating they provided the needs when necessary. All the same they did not say the educational needs were not provided at all. Meaning whatever the case was, their wards needs were provided but as prompt as the question demanded. This factor may be dependent on the parents' income levels which are discussed elsewhere in this presentation.

Another item that was used to measure the educational background of parents and its influence on the academic work of wards was how often parents visited their children at school. Before this item then, students had been asked who have been responsible for their educational needs. Students' responses to the question are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Responses on who Provides Students' Educational Needs

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Mother only	34	34.0
Father only	42	42.0
Guardian	18	18.0
Both father and mother	6	6.0
Total	100	100.0

From Table 6, it is seen that 42.0% of student respondents indicated that their father provided their educational needs whilst for 34.0% their

mothers did. Furthermore, the table shows that 18.0% of respondents revealed their educational needs were provided by guardians and only six percent indicated theirs were provided by both father and mother. It must be said that traditionally, in Ghana, it is the responsibility of a father to take care of children until they have finished schooling. Even though looking at ages of College students of Saint Monica's most of them as full adults and cannot be considered as children per se, yet once they are in school, it is the responsibility of father assisted by mothers to cater for their needs. Some other times too, it would be observed that some fathers refuse to take responsibility for their children's upkeep because of divorce or separation, when it happens that way, the responsibility of taking care of children falls on mothers, hence, 34.0% of students responding that their mothers took care of their school needs. Whichever way the situation may be, the interest of the researcher is whether the educational needs of the students are provided as and when necessary relative to the educational background of parents.

The last item which was used to measure whether the educational background of parents could have impact on students' academic performance was visiting of wards in school. On this very issue, teachers were asked 'how often parents visited their wards in schools' and parent respondents on the other hand were asked 'how often they visited their wards at school'. The responses of teachers and parents are presented together in Table 7. It is observed from Table 7 that very often 20% visited their wards in school, 60% visited sometimes whilst all teachers and 20% of parent respondents revealed that some parents occasionally paid their children a visit in the school.

Table 7: Teachers and Parents' Responses on how Often Parents Visited Their Wards at School

Teacher responses	Parents responses	
Responses	N (%)	N (%)
Very often	-	2 (20)
Sometimes	-	6 (60)
Occasionally	12 (100)	2 (20)
Total	12 (100)	10 (100)

In sum, table 7 shows that no teacher or parent respondent indicated that parents did not visit their wards at all in school and that is expected to be the norm. This does mean, all parents visited their wards all the time. On the whole, parents visited their wards as per the stipulated visiting hours because in a boarding school, a parent or guardian cannot choose to visit the ward at will unless there is a special invitation from the head or an issue to be dealt with.

Research Question Two: How can parental income influence the academic performance of students of Saint Monica's College of Education?

This research question was to determine the extent to which parental income and occupation, and their influence the academic performance of students. All the responses on the parental income would be presented then afterwards, those of the occupation would be presented, taking into account any significant findings in consonance with existing literature.

Parental Income and its Influence on Students' Academic Performance

As has been the trend, teachers, parents and students answered separate but somehow related questions. In this subsection, students' responses are

presented first. Students were asked how their parents earned their income. The responses they gave to this question are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Responses on how Students’ Parents earned their Income

Income source parents	Frequency	Percentage
Farming	30	30.0
Trading	54	54.0
Hawking/Selling	16	16.0
Total	100	100.0

It must be emphasised that the term ‘trading’ as had been used in this discussion means engaged in big business endeavour like import and export ventures. On the other hand, a person engaged in hawking or selling is petty trader who hardly has a store or even stall at the market to ply the trading business – basically that type of business is carrying a few things on the head to sell.

From Table 8, it is observed that parents of respondents earned their income from three main sources. Majority (54.0%) of the respondents were seen to earn income from trading activities. Also, the figure shows that 30.0% parents of student respondents had their income from farming, whilst 16.0% of parents earned income from hawking and selling activities.

Similarly, student respondents gave information on the timelines their parents earned their income. The responses to this issue are depicted by Table 9.

Table 9: Time lines Students' Parents earned their Income

Time lines	Frequency	Percentage
Monthly	34	34.0
Weekly	34	34.0
Daily	18	18.0
Yearly	14	14.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 9 shows that 34.0% each of student respondents indicated that their parents earned their income on monthly or weekly basis. It is a possibility that parents who work were traders or farmers could earn an income on monthly or weekly basis. It is also not out of place for some parents to earn income on daily or better still yearly basis. The norm has been that some type of work like farming and to some extent one's income can be earned on yearly basis if it is a cocoa farm. What is important is the sufficiency of the income to support the family and for that reason, a farmer's ward in College would encounter challenges getting the needed financial assistance to survive in school and complete the studies on time without any hitch.

After students have given the income sources and regularity of income, they were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with two proposed statements. The first one had to do with students' views on whether parental income was essential if high academic performance was to be achieved by wards and the second was whether students from low income families can afford to maintain good academic performance. Responses to these two issues are presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Students' Responses on Whether Parental Income as Influence on Ward's Academic Performance

Statements	Responses		
	Agree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Total N (%)
Parental income is important if high academic performance is to be achieved	89 (89.0)	11(11.0)	100 (100.0)
Students from low income families attain less education than students from high income families	83 (83.0)	17 (11.0)	100 (100.0)

Table 10 shows that 89(89.0%) of student respondents agreed that parental income was essential for high academic performance of wards. This can be explained within the context that when parents stable income they would be able to do well academically. Akanle (2007) gives credence to the views expressed by the majority on this. He (Akanle, 2007) identified parental income in his work to be a cogent factor upon which the academic/vocational success of secondary school students lies.

On the second issue, Table 10 indicates that 83.0% of student respondents agreed that students from low income families are not likely to do well academically. On this issue, 17.0% of the students disagreed. Strictly speaking, parental income alone cannot be used to predict the academic success of wards but it still a good socioeconomic factor in determining academic success of children. As study by Rouse and Barrow (2006) found that students from low-income families attained less education than children from more advantageous families.

The responses elicited from teachers and parents on parental income and the influence it has on the academic performance of wards are presented in Tables 11 and 12. Even though, both teacher and parent respondents were asked three separate questions, two of them bore some semblance and the answers to them are presented as such. Answers to the remaining items on this issue that are slightly different are presented in prose. Table 11 presents responses on whether parents paid their wards' school fees as expected.

Table 11: Teacher and Parent's Responses on Whether Parents Paid Their Wards Fees Promptly

Responses	Teachers N (%)	Parents N (%)
Always	2 (16.7)	9 (90.0)
Sometimes	10 (83.3)	1 (10.0)
Total	12 (100.0)	10 (100.0)

Table 11 shows that teachers contended that few parents paid their wards' fees always. On the contrary, the majority of respondents who were parent however indicated that they paid their wards' school fees on time all the time. There is a contention here in the sense that teachers who handle issues relating to fees observed that payment of fees by parents was not done as urgently as the case should be but the few parents captured in this study held a contrary view.

Table 12 presents teacher and parent respondents' responses on the issue that parental income has positive correlation with good academic performance of children. In the specific case of teachers, the proposition was that parents who earn higher income participate more in their wards' education

than those with low income levels. On the part of parents, the proposition was that parental income has as significant effect on students' academic performance. In both case, respondents were required to show their degree of agreement or disagreement with the propositions.

Table 12: Teachers and Parents' Views on Whether Parental Income has Positive Impact on Students' Academic Performance

	Teachers	Parents
Responses	N (%)	N (%)
Agree	11 (91.7)	10 (100.0)
Disagree	1 (8.3)	-
Total	12 (100.0)	10 (100.0)

Table 12 shows that that 91.7% of teachers and 90.0% of parent respondents agreed that parents with higher and reliable income are able to participate fully in the education of their wards. These days the schooling has become expensive and if parents are to leave their places of residence to come and visit their wards in school, it would depend on their income. If the income is small, it would always be difficult for them to pay for the all the levies promptly. This finding is confirmed by a recent study conducted in the United States by Reardon (2011) on the income levels of parents and the impact they have on the performance of children. He found a positive correlation between income and academic performance of students and the reasons given above suffice.

Parents were also asked if they gave their wards pocket money after payment of fees. The responses showed that 10.0% indicated always and 90.0% answered that they did that sometimes. It must be emphasised that these factor into the peace of mind the student is supposed to get to concentrate. As

students in the boarding house or even day students they need some pocket money for their use and if they do not have it would have negative impact on them and would affect them to some extent. On this same issue, teachers answered to the question if parents would be prepared to pay for extra tuition if need be. Teacher responses to this question were that 66.7% answered in the affirmative and the remaining (33.3%) responded in the negative. The responses on the income levels of parents point to one direction, that is, if the parents' income is low, they are not likely to participate fully in the education of their wards and this would have negative effect on the wards' academic performance.

In support of what had been discussed under the income levels of parents, Onzima (2011) found in a study that parents income level affects pupils performance more than education level and occupation of parents. Where parents' income is not sufficient to sustain the academic and personal social life of the pupil, the child's psychological balance in the class room is affected leading due to low concentration.

The first part of this section was mainly concerned with income levels of parents. The second part discusses parental occupation and its relationship with the academic performance of students. To start with, teacher respondents were asked to indicate from the information available to them, the common occupation of students' parents. This confirms what students were asked to indicate earlier in respect of their parents' income levels. The responses of teachers on the common type of occupation of parents are presented in Table 13.

Table 13: Teachers' Responses on the Common Occupation of Parents

Type of occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Teaching	3	25.0
Farming	3	25.0
Trading	6	50.0
Total	12	100.0

The information displayed in Table 13 largely confirms the responses given by students earlier. In this table, it is seen 50.0% of parents of students are into trading activities. Trading itself is not a bad occupation but it depends on the type of trading. If for instance the parents is big business person, that would reflect in substantial income that may accrue periodically so that parents would be able to support their wards in their academic endeavour.

Table 13 also shows that 25.0% of teachers stated that the parents of students are into teaching. Apart from the fact that teachers earn regular income to be able to support their wards financially, they are understand what education is about and can give moral support as well. The remaining 25.0% of parents according to teachers were farmers. This scenario is similar to the trading activities whereby a parent could be big time farmer whose income would be substantial to contribute meaningfully in terms of the needed financial support for students.

In relation to the above presentation, teachers were asked the extent parents' occupation influenced students' academic performance. From the responses teachers gave, 66.7% indicated to a large extent and the remaining 33.3% said very largely. The implication of these responses is that parental occupation is key variable in determining good academic performance of

students. As has been stated earlier, if a parent's occupation is not viable economically, such a parent would not be able to fend very well for the ward and that could affect the students academic pursuit. Most often students who are unable to pay their fees on time, do not have the peace of mind to concentrate on their studies, hence they fail their examinations and even dropout as a result. One's ability to provide basic school amenities depends on the availability to have access to regular financial support.

In support of the fact that a parent's occupation is good predictor of better academic performance, Akanle (2007) and Alissa and Gregg (2010) found in separate studies that parents with higher occupational prestige often have more success in preparing their wards for school because they have access to a wide range of resources to promote and support their children's academic pursuits. Such well place parents are able to provide their wards with high-quality care, books, and other educational needs to encourage the students in various learning activities at home and in school.

In line with the above, student respondents were asked the extent they agreed or disagreed that parental occupation affects students' academic performance. Students' responses to this issue showed that 74.0% agreed that parent's occupation indeed impact positively on the academic performance of students but 26.0% disagreed. It is evident that parent's occupation can greatly influence the academic performance of students as found by Akanle (2007) in his study in Nigeria.

The views of parent respondents were also sought on the issue being discussed. On this issue, parents were given two propositions to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement as they deem appropriate. The responses

parents gave indicated that the majority (i.e., 80.0%) agreed that parental occupation is important and it as well influences their wards academic performance. Also, 20.0% of the parent respondents disagreed that parental occupation could influence their wards academic performance and it was unimportant if high academic standard of students is to be achieved. Certainly, the views of the majority received support from existing research in the area. In this sense, Marjoribanks (1996) maintains on the whole it has been found in many researches that parental level of socio-economic status and occupation affect the academic achievement of students positively.

Research Question Three: How can family size influence students' academic performance?

Another focus of this study was investigation the influence of family size on the academic performance of students. As usual, teachers, parents and students were made to give answers to series of question on the family issue. The responses of students are presented first then those of teachers and parents would follow.

Firstly, students were made to indicate the number of their siblings. This information is presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Number of Siblings Student Respondents Have

Number of siblings	Frequency	Percentage
Five	39	39.0
Four	20	20.0
Three	29	29.0
Two	12	12.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 14 shows that out of 100 respondents, 39 representing (39.0 %) have five siblings whilst 29.0% of respondents have three siblings. Again, the figure shows that 20.0% and 12.0% of student respondents respectively have four and two siblings. From Table 16, it can be concluded that majority of the students representing 59.0% have the largest number of siblings and this can affect their academic performance. This assertion is being made because several empirical studies have found a negative relationship between the number of siblings, and future economic and educational achievements (Blake (1981), Hanushek (1992)). Blake (1981) used different survey data set from the United States and finds that the number of siblings correlates negatively with educational attainment. Hanushek (1992) estimated the effect of the number of students on achievements in school, whereby achievements are defined as test scores from the Iowa Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary test. The main finding in that paper was that family size had a significant negative relation with school achievement of students.

The second batch of student respondents on the family size issue is presented in Table 15. Students were given four statements to indicate their agreement or disagreement with each of them.

Table 15: Students' Views Whether Family Size influences Academic Performance of Students

Statements	Agree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Total N (%)
Smaller family size has been linked with higher academic achievement.	76 (76)	24 (24)	100 (100)
Students with fewer siblings are likely to receive more parental attention and have more access to resources than students from large families.	88 (88)	12 (12)	100 (100)
Students with large families attain less school on the average than students with fewer brothers and sisters.	82 (82)	18 (18)	100 (100)
Students from small family size at all social levels tend to perform better in intelligence test and at school.	75 (75)	25 (25)	100 (100)

Table 15 shows that on the average 80.0% of student respondents agreed with the propositions put forward for their consideration. Some, averaging 20.0% disagreed. Those who disagreed may not have had the advantage of comparing empirical sources, hence their views. However, the views of the minority of students had some sort of support from the study of Tenibiaje (2009) whose analysis of the data showed that family size and birth order have no influence on academic performance of pre-degree students of the University of Edo-Ekiti, Nigeria which formed the majority representing (46.0%) agree that students with fewer families are likely to receive more parental attention and have more access to resources than students from large families.

The majority of respondents insisted that family size has effect on the academic performance of students. Studies conducted on educational attainment of students and the size of the family indicated that students from large families attain less schooling on the average than those students with few brothers and sisters. This negative effect of family size on educational attainment persist after the socioeconomic characteristics of the families are statistically controlled (Blake, 1989). These studies assumed that large families spread their resources: economic, cultural and effectiveness more thinly than do families with fewer children. This suggest that parents who have many children invest less money, time, emotional and psychic energy and attention on each child (Blake, 1989). In the same vane, Hensley, Ramsey and Algozzine (1996) found that in each analysis in which family size was significant, the small family was positively related to the academic achievement of children.

The next set of responses is those elicited from parent respondents. They responded to three items, two of which were statements they were made to react

to in term of agreement or disagreement. On the first statement, which indicated parents of many children cannot afford to divide quality time with their children. The second statement stated that: parents with two or three children can afford the time to develop their children's academic capabilities. Data collected for first statement showed that 90.0% of parent respondents agreed that parents of many children cannot afford to divide quality time with the children. Students at the College level are not children in that sense of the word, however, they need the moral and financial support of their parents, especially during time of visits.

Additionally, all respondents agreed that parents with few children, like two or three are in a better position to give their wards in school more attention than those with many children. Apart from the emotional support that students expect from their parents, they also would need the badly needed resources to be able to prosecute their academic pursuits without any hitch. It turns out the children are many and the resources are inadequate, parents would have to prioritise, which they are likely to do in favour of the younger ones to the detriment of those in Colleges, where students are given allowances.

The views of teachers on the family size issue were sought in three items. The first item asked whether teacher thought the number of siblings influenced the academic performance of students. Responses teachers gave showed that 75.0% of them thought along that line and 25.0% disagreed. The views teachers expressed on the number of siblings and family size showed that 80.0% respectively agreed that number of siblings and family size negatively affects students' academic performance. On the same issue, 20.0% of teacher respondents disagreed that was case. In respect of those who disagreed that the

number of siblings and family size has negative effects on academic performance of students are justified in the sense that it is not only family size and number of sibling that influence academic performance of learners.

There are other intervening variables such the income levels of parents, type of occupation and the willingness to even give the children the needed attention. Besides, it has been found in another study that family size and birth order do not have any influence on learners' academic performance (Tenibiaje, 2009).

A couple studies support the views of the majority of teachers that family size and the number of siblings can affect learners' academic performance negatively. For instance, Atkinson (2000) and Tenibiaje (2009) in a study found that family size of students was closely related with the overall academic results. It was explained in both studies that children from families of controlled birth had larger chances of guidance from their parents, which eventually yields good academic results. On the contrary, children relatively larger families obtained poor academic results.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter of the study deals with the summary and the main findings. It also takes care of the conclusions made to the findings, recommendations made based on the findings and suggested areas for further research.

Summary of the Study

This study investigated the socioeconomic factors that influence the academic performance of students of Saint Monica's College of Education at Mampong Ashanti in particular and students in general. The study was guided by three main research questions. The literature review for the study detailed different aspects of the socioeconomic factors that scholars believed influenced how students performed academically.

As the methodology for the study, it catered for the research design, population, sample and sampling procedures used for the selection of respondents. The instruments for data collection were described. Also, data collection and analysis procedures were discussed to show how data was collected and analysed taking into consideration the research questions for the study. The study was a descriptive survey because only a section of the students, parents and teachers of Saint Monica's College of Education was taken for the study.

Presentation of results was done using descriptive statistics in the form of frequency tables, percentages, charts and other were also presented in prose.

The results were presented under suitable heading that largely reflected the objectives of the study.

Summary of Findings

The main finding of this study is that parental educational and occupational background and income level have influence on students' academic performance. Specifically it was found that:

- i. When parents promptly provide their wards school needs, their academic performance improved,
- ii. Parents provided the educational needs of their wards because they knew the importance of that to the success of their wards' education,
- iii. Parents were engaged in various kinds of occupation that earned them regular income enough to support their wards' educational needs for good academic performance,
- vi. Family size had influence of the academic performance of students. Thus, students from smaller families tend to perform better than those from larger families. In the same way, students from high income homes had better parental support than those from lower income homes.

Conclusions

The results of the study showed that parental educational level, occupation as well as income levels had impact on the academic performance of students. Moreover, family sizes had positive impact on the academic performance of students. This means that results of this study had confirmed what the existing literature had documented about the socio-economic factors that influence the academic performance of students.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings:

1. Firstly, it is recommended that since the education of parents are important in the academic success of their wards, the few non-literate parents should be given non-formal education to understand that their wards education should be a priority for them.
2. Since the income of parents is equally relevant to the education of children, governmental agencies should ensure that parents with irregular income are supported to be gainfully employed. Besides, children of relatively poor parents should be helped in the award of government scholarships.
3. Also, it is recommended that students from low socioeconomic background should try and persevere in the light of financial hardships and remain in school since there is light at the end of the tunnel.
4. School authorities should strive to identify students from larger families and those who have higher number of siblings and are disadvantaged and assist them in whatever ways they can so that all students can go through the educational pursuits without any hitch.

Suggested Areas for Further Research

The following suggested areas must be considered for further research. This topic must be replicated in other Colleges of Education in Ghana. Also, a comparative study should be conducted between the academic success of children from large extended families and those from nuclear families in the

Mampong Ashanti Municipal Educational Area. Lastly, the effects of single parenting on the academic performance of wards.

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, D., & Pischke, S. (2001). Changes in the wage structure, family income, and children's education. *European Economic Review*, 45, 890-904.
- Ainley, J., Graetz, B., Long, M., & Batten, M. (1995). *Socio-economic status and school education*. DEET/ACER, Canberra.
- Akanle, O. B. (2007). *Socio-economic factors influencing student's academic performance in Nigeria. Some explanation from a local survey*. Retrieved September 22, 2011 from www.medwelljournals.com/abstract/?doi=pjssci.2008.319
- Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Bedinger, S. D. (1994). When expectations work: Race and socioeconomic differences in school performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57, 283–299.
- Alisa, G., & Gregg, P. (2010). *Poorer children's educational attainment: How important are attitudes and behaviour?* Retrieved September 22, 2011, from www.jrf.org.uk/system/files/
- Amato, P. (1987). *Children in Australian families: The growth of competence*. Sydney: Prentice Hall.
- Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Angelides, P., Theophanous, L., & Leigh, J. (2006). Understanding teacher-parent relationships for improving pre-primary schools in Cyprus. *Educational Review*, 58 (3), 303-316.
- Angrist, J., & Evans, W. (1998). Children and their parents' labor supply: Evidence from exogenous variation in family size. *The American*

- Economic Review*, 88 (3), 450–477.
- Angrist, J. D., Lavy, V., & Schlosser, A. (2005). *New evidence on the causal link between the quantity and quality of children*, mimeo, Hebrew University Department of Economics.
- Atkinson, E. (2000). An investigation into the relationship between teacher motivation and pupil motivation. *Educational Psychology*, 20 (1), 45 – 57.
- Baharudin, R., & Luster, T. (1998). Factors related to the quality of the home environment and children's achievement. *Journal of Family Issues*, 19, 375–403.
- Baker, D. P., & Stevenson, D. L. (1986). Mothers' strategies for children's school achievement: Managing the transition to high school. *Sociology of education*, 59 (7), 156-166.
- Becker, G., & Tomes, N. (1986). Human capital and the rise and fall of families. *Journal of Labour Economics*, 4 (3), 1–39.
- Becker, B. S. (1981). *A treatise on the family*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Becker, B. S., & Lewis, H. G. (1973). On the Interaction between the quantity and quality of children. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81 (2), 279 – 288.
- Beder, H. (1999). *The outcomes and impacts of adult literacy education in the United States* (Vol. 6). Cambridge, MA: National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy.
- Behrman, J. (1997). *Mother's schooling and child education: A survey*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania.

- Behrman, J. R., & Taubman, P. (1986). Birth Order, Schooling and Earnings. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 4 (3), 121 – 145.
- Bekman, S. (1999). *A fair chance: an evaluation of the mother-child program*. Istanbul: Mother Child Foundation.
- Beller, E. (2008). *Bringing intergenerational social mobility research into the 21st Century: Why mothers matter*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Benner, A., & Mistry, R. (2007). Congruence of mother and teacher educational expectations and low-income youth's academic competence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99 (1), 140-153.
- Bjorkman, M. (2005). *Income shocks and gender gaps in education: Evidence from Uganda*. Retrieved September 22, 2011, from www.cgdev.org/.../Job%20market%20paper%20M%20Bjorkman.pdf
- Black, S. E., Devereux, P. J., & Salvanes, K. G. (2005). The more the merrier? The effect of family size and birth order on children's education. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120 (2), 669 – 700.
- Blake, J. (1989). *Family size and achievement*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Blake, J. (1981). Family size and the quality of children. *Demography*, 18, 421–42.
- Bobetsky, V. V. (2003). Turn parents into partners. *Teaching music*, 11(1), 38.
- Buckingham, J. (1999). *The puzzle of boys' educational decline: A review of the evidence*. Issue Analysis, No.9. Sydney: Centre for Independent Studies.
- Buckner, J. C., Bassuk, E. L., & Weinreb, L. F. (2001). Predictors of Academic achievement among homeless and low-income housed children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 39 (1), 45-69.

- Burchfield, S. (1996). *An evaluation of the impact of literacy on women's empowerment in Nepal*. Report for USAID ABEL project. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Institute of International Development.
- Burchfield, S., Hua, H., Iturry, T., & Rocha, V. (2002). *A longitudinal study of the effect of integrated literacy and basic education programs on the participation of women in social and economic development in Bolivia*. USAID/World Education Inc.
- Calvert, G. (2000). Valuing children, young people and families. *Family Matters*, 56, 28-33.
- Carneiro, P., Meghir, C., & Parey, M. (2007). *Maternal education, home environments and the development of children and adolescents*. University College London and Institute for Fiscal Studies. Retrieved September 22, 2011, from <http://www.cepr.org/pubs/new-dps/dplist.asp?dpno=6505.asp>
- Carr-Hill, R., Okech, A., Katahoire, A., Kakooza, T., Ndidde, A., & Oxenham, J. (2001). *Adult literacy programs in Uganda*. Washington D.C.: Human Development Africa Region, the World Bank.
- Catsambis, S. (2001). Expanding knowledge of parental involvement in children's parent-teacher communication secondary education: Connections with high school seniors' academic success. *Social Psychology of Education*, 5, 149-177.
- Cawthera, A. (1997). *Let's teach ourselves: The operation and effectiveness of a people's literacy movement*, available on www.eldis.org

- Checchi, D., & Salvi, A. (2010). *Does education represent a social protection for lifetime in Sub-Saharan Africa?*, Education report on development, Brussels: European University Institute Europe.
- Christenson, S. (2004). The family-school partnership: An opportunity to promote the learning competence of all students. *School Psychology Review*, 33, 83-104.
- Clark, R. M. (1983). *Family life and school achievement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cole, B., & Hoffer, T. B. (1987). *The way of life of the Catholics*. London. Rinehart and Winston.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95 – 120.
- Coleman, J. S. (1991). *Parental involvement in education*. In: *policy perspective office of educational research and improvement*, Washington DC: US Department of Education.
- Coleman, J. S. (2006). The adolescent society. *Education Next*, 6 (1), 40 - 43.
- Comings, J., Shrestha, C. K., & Smith, C. (1992). A secondary analysis of a Nepalese national literacy program. *Comparative Education Review*, 36: 212–226.
- Conger, R. D., Ebert-Wallace, L., Sun, Y., Simons, R. L., McLoyd, V. C., & Brody, G. H. (2002). Economic pressure in African American families: A replication and extension of the family stress model. *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 179 –193.

- Corwyn, R. F., & Bradley, R. F. (2002). *Family process mediators of the relation between SES and child outcomes*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Arkansas at Little Rock.
- Currie, J. (1995). *Welfare and the well-being of children, fundamentals of pure and applied economics No.59*. Zurich: Harwood Academic Publishers, Switzerland.
- Datcher-Loury, L. (1989). Family background and school achievement among low income blacks. *Journal of Human Resources*, 24, 528-544.
- Dalton, C., & Glauber, R. (2005). *Parental educational investment and children's academic risk: Estimates of the Impact of sibship size and birth order from exogenous variation in fertility*. National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), working paper 11302.
- Desmond, S. (2004). Family literacy project. *Adult Education and Development*, 61, 35-40.
- Domina, T. (2005). Leveling the home advantage: Assessing the effectiveness of parental involvement in elementary school. *Sociology of Education*, 78, 233–249.
- Downey, D. B. (1995). When bigger is not better: Family size, parental resources, and children's educational performance." *American Sociological Review*, 60 (5), 746-761.
- Eamon, M. K. (2005). Social-demographic, school, neighborhood, and parenting influences on academic achievement of Latino young adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 34 (2), 163-175.
- Eccles, J. S. (1993). School and family effects on the ontogeny of children's interests, self-perceptions, and activity choice. In J. Jacobs (Ed.),

- Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol. 40. *Developmental perspectives on motivation* (pp. 145–208): Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Egbo, B. (2000). *Gender, literacy and life chances in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Engin-Demir, C. (2009). Factors affecting the academic achievement of Turkish urban poor. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29 (1), 17 – 29.
- Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 701- 712.
- Farmer, A. D. (2006). Inner City African American parental involvement in elementary schools: Getting beyond urban legends of apathy. *Educational Review*, 21, 1-12.
- Fantuzzo, J., McWayne, C., Perry, M. A., & Childs, S. (2004). Multiple dimensions of family involvement and their relations to behavioral and learning competencies for urban, Low-income children. *School Psychology Review*, 33 (4), 467-480.
- Ferguson, R. (1991). Paying for public education: New evidence of how and why money matters. *Harvard Journal on Legislation*, 28, 465-98.
- Fiedrich, M., & Jellema, A. (2003). *Literacy, gender and social agency: Adventures in empowerment*. DfID Research Report 53.
- Fuligni, A. J. (1997). The academic achievement of adolescents from immigrant families: The roles of family background, attitudes, and behavior. *Child Development*, 68, 351-363.

- Gay, L. R. (1981). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (2nd ed.). Columbus: Merrill publishing Company.
- Giang, V., & Nisen, M. (2012). *What extremely successful people were doing at age 25*. Retrieved 12th September, 2012 from www.businessinsider.com
- Gough, T. (1946). Family size and educational attainment in the United States. *Population and Development Review*, 10 (4), 647-660.
- Gregg, P., & Machin, S. (1999). Childhood disadvantage and success or failure in labour market. In Blanch flower, D., Freeman, R. (Eds.), *Youth employment and joblessness in advanced countries*. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Halle, T., Kurtz-Costes, B., & Mahoney, J. (1997). Family influences on school achievement in low-income, African American children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 527–537.
- Hanushek, E. A. (1992). The trade-off between child quantity and quality. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100 (1), 84 – 117.
- Hanushek, E. A. (2005). The economics of school quality. *German Economic Review*, 6, 269-286.
- Hauser, R. M., & Sewel, W. H. (1985). Birth order and educational attainment in full sibships. *American Educational Research Journal*, 22 (1), 1 – 23.
- Haveman, R., & Wolfe, B. (1995). The determinants of children's attainments: A review of methods and findings. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33(4), 1829–78.
- Henrich, C. C., Schwab-Stone, M., Fanti, K., Jones, S. M., & Ruchkin, V. (2004). The association of violence exposure with academic achievement and feeling safe at school: Is it moderated by parent

- support? A prospective study. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25 (3), 327-348.
- Hensley, M., Ramsey, R. S., & Algozzine, R. (1996). *Characteristics of and strategies for teaching students with mild disabilities*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2002). Examining the effects of parental absence on the academic achievement of adolescents: The challenge of controlling for family income. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 23 (2), 76-77.
- Jimerson, S., Egeland, B., & Teo, A. (1999). A longitudinal study of achievement trajectories factors associated with change. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 116 –126.
- Johnston, A., Ganzeboom, H., & Treiman, D. (2005). *Mothers' and 'Fathers' influences on educational attainment*. A paper presented at RC28 Conference, Oslo, Norway.
- Kasente, D. (2003). *Gender and education in Uganda; a case study for EFA monitoring report*, Makerere University. Retrieved September 22, 2011, from <http://portal.unesco.org/education/>
- Kakuru, D. M. (2003). *Gender sensitive educational policy and practice*. Retrieved September 22, 2011, from <http://Portal.Unesco.Org>
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). *Foundations of behavioral research* (2nd ed.). New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Klebanov, P. K., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Duncan, G. J. (1994). Does neighborhood and family poverty affect mothers' parenting, mental health, and social support? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 441–455.

- Leibowitz, A. (1974). Home investments in children. *Journal of Political Economy*, 82 (2), 111–131.
- Linver, M. R., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Kohen, D. E. (2002). Family processes as pathways from income to young children's development. *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 719 –734
- Lonoff, S. (1971). Using videotape to talk about teaching. *Association of Departments of English Bulletin*, 118, 10-14.
- Luster, T., Rhoades, K., & Haas, B. (1989). The relation between parental values and parenting behavior: A test of the Kohn Hypothesis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 139 –147.
- Majoribanks, K. (1996). Family learning environments and students outcomes: A review. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 27(2), 373-394.
- Matuszek, P. (1977). Using tests in nondiscriminatory assessment. In T. Oakland (Ed.), *Psychological and educational assessment of minority children* (pp. 52-69). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Matuszek, P., & Oakland, T. (1979). Factors influencing teachers' and psychologists' recommendations regarding special education placement. *Journal of School Psychology*, 14 (2), 116-125.
- McDonald, R. P., & Ho, M. R. (2002). Principles and practice in reporting structural equation analyses. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 64 – 82.
- McNeal, R. B. (1999). Parental involvement as social capital: Deferential effectiveness on science, achievement, truancy and dropping-out. *Social Forces*, 78, 117 – 144.

- Mistry, R. S., Vandewater, E. A., Houston, A. C., & McLoyd, V. C. (2002). Economic well-being and children's social adjustment: The role of family process in an ethnically diverse low income sample. *Child Development, 73*, 935–951.
- Mukherjee, D. (1995). *The relationship between socio-economic background and participation in education*. ACEE Research Monograph No.1, Darlinghurst.
- Nannyonjo, H. (2007). *Education inputs in Uganda: An analysis of factors influencing learning achievement in grade six*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Nwana, O. C. (1982). *Introduction to education research*. Ibadan: Heinemann.
- Nye, B., & Hedges, L.V. (2002). The effects of small classes on achievement: The results of the Tennessee class size experiment. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*, 123-151.
- Okumu, I. M., Nakajjo, A., & Isoke, D. (2008). *Socioeconomic determinants of primary school dropout: The logistic model analysis*. Retrieved June 20, 2010 from <http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/7851>.
- Onzima, R. (2011). *Parent's socio-economic status and pupils' educational attainment: Case of Saint Jude Primary School Malabatown Council Uganda*. Retrieved June 20, 2010 from <http://www.academia.edu/>
- Parcel, T. L., & Menaghan, E. G. (1994). Early parental work, family social capital, and early childhood outcomes. *American Journal of Sociology, 99* (4), 972-1009.
- Patrikakou, E. N. (2004). *Adolescence: Are parents relevant to students' high school achievement and post-secondary achievement?* Harvard Family

Research Project. Retrieved on May 18, 2011, from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/fine/resources/>

- Peng, S. S., & Wright, D. (1994). Explanation of academic achievement of Asian-American students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 87 (6), 346-352.
- Phillips, M. (1998). *Family background, parenting practices, and the black-white test score gap. The black-white test score gap*. Washington, D.C.: Brooking Institution Press.
- Ramey, S. L., & Ramey, C. T. (1994). The transition to school: Why the first few years matter for a lifetime. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76 (30), 194-198.
- Rath, J. M., Gielen, A. C., Haynie, D. L., Solomon, B. S., Cheng, T. L., & Simons-Morton, B. G. (2008). Factors associated with perceived parental academic monitoring in a population of low-income, African American young adolescents. *Research in Middle Level Education Online*, 31 (8), 81- 82.
- Reardon, S. F. (2011). *The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
- Rich, A. (2000). *Beyond the classroom: How parents influence their children's education*, CIS Policy Monograph 48, Centre for Independent Studies, Sydney.
- Robinson, E. (1993). The effect of family background on pupils' academic achievement in Mozambique. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 13 (3), 289 – 294.

- Rollins, B. C., & Thomas, D. L. (1979). Parental support, power, and control techniques in the socialization of children. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), *Contemporary theories about the family*, Vol. L (pp. 317-364). New York: The Free Press, Macmillan.
- Rouse, C. E., & Barrow, L. (2006). U.S. elementary and secondary schools: Equalizing opportunity or replacing the status Quo?. *The Future of Children*, 16 (2), 99-123.
- Schiller, K. S., Khmelkov, V. T., & Wang, X. Q. (2002). Economic development and the effect of family characteristics on mathematics achievement. *Journal of Marriage and family*, 64, 730–742.
- Schultz, T. P. (1993). Returns to women's schooling. In Elizabeth King and M. Anne Hill, (Eds.), *Women's education in developing countries: Barriers, benefits, and policy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sewell, W. H., & Shah, V. P. (1968). Social class, parental encouragement and educational aspirations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 73, 559-572.
- Simmons, J., & Alexander, L. (1978). The determinants of school achievement in developing countries: A review of the research. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 26, 545 – 560.
- Sizemore, B. A., Brossard, C. A., & Harrigan, B. (1983). *An abashing anomaly: The high achieving predominantly black elementary school-executive summary*. Pittsburgh, PA: Pittsburgh University, Department of Black Community Education.
- Smith, J. R., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Klebanov, P. K. (1997). Consequences of living in poverty for young children's cognitive and verbal ability and

- early school achievement. In Duncan, Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Consequences of growing up poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sparkes, J. (1999). *Schools, education and social exclusion*, CASE Paper 29, Centre for analysis of social exclusion. London: London School of Economics.
- Sukon, K. S., Jawahir, R. (2005). Influence of home related factors in numeracy performance of fourth – grade children in Mauritius. *International Journal of Education and Development*, 25 (5), 247-556.
- Sutton, A., & Soderstrom, I. (2001). Predicting elementary and secondary school achievement with school-related and demographic factors. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92 (6), 330-338.
- Teachman, J. D., Paasch, K. M., Day, R. D., & Carver, K. P. (1996). Poverty during adolescence and subsequent educational attainment. In Duncan, Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Consequences of growing up poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tenibiaje, D. J. (2009). Influence of family size and family birth order on academic performance of adolescents in higher institution. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 6 (3), 110-114.
- Thomas, D., Beegle, K., Frankenberg, E., Sikoki, B., Strauss, J., & Teruel, G. (2003). Education in a crisis. *Journal of Development Economics*, 74, 53–85.
- Thompson, G. L. (2002). *African American teens discuss their schooling experiences*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Thompson, G. L. (2007). *Up where we belong: Helping African American and Latino students rise in school and in life*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Van Laar, C., & Sidanius, J. (2001). Social status and the academic achievement gap: A social dominance perspective. *Social Psychology of Education*, 4, 235-258.
- Van Velsor, P., & Orozco, G.L. (2007). Involving low-income parents in the schools: Community centric strategies for school counsellors. *Professional School Counselling: American School Counsellor Association*, 11 (1), 17-24.
- White, K. R. (1982). The relation between socioeconomic status and academic achievement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91 (3), 461-481.
- White, S. B., Reynolds, P. D., Thomas, M. M., & Gitzlaff, N. J. (1993). Socioeconomic status and achievement revisited. *Urban Education*, 28, 328-343.
- Williams, N., Penelope, R. W., Connell, W., & White, V. M. (1991). Australian research on poverty and education, 1979-1987, in R.W. Connell, V.M. White and K. M. Johnston, eds, *Running twice as hard: The disadvantaged schools program in Australia*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.
- Yeung, W. J., Linver, M. R., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2002). How money matters for young children's development: Parental investment and family processes. *Child Development*, 73, 1861– 1879.
- Zill, N., Collins, M., West, J., & Hausken, E. (1995). Approaching kindergarten: A look at preschoolers in the United States. *Young Children*, 51, 35-38.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Dear Respondent,

This is a component part of a research work that seeks to identify the effect of socioeconomic factors on students' academic performance, a case study of St. Monica's College of Education. Your response shall be treated as purely confidential.

Please tick (✓) the appropriate box and write where applicable.

A. Biographical Data

- 1) Age: () up to 20 () 21-25 () 26-30 () 31-35 () 36 upwards
- 2) Sex: () Female () Male
- 3) Marital Status : () Married () Single () Divorced () Widower
- 4) Level: () Year one () Year

B. Parental Educational Level

- 5) What is your mother's educational background?
 - a. No schooling ()
 - b. Primary education ()
 - c. Secondary education ()
 - d. Post-secondary education ()
- 6) Who provides your educational needs?
 - a. Mother ()
 - b. Father ()
 - c. Guardian ()
 - d. Others please state ()

- 7) Father's education is more important than mother's education.
 Strongly Agree Agree Partially Agree Disagree
- 8) Who made the choice of course for you at the SHS?
- a. Mother
 - b. Father
 - c. Brother
 - d. Guardian
 - e. Self

C. Parental Income

- 9) How do your parents earn their money?
- a. Farming
 - b. Trading
 - c. Hawking
 - d. Selling.
- 10) On which basis do your parents earn income?
- a. Monthly
 - b. Weekly
 - c. Day
 - d. Yearly
- 11) Parental income is essential if high academic performance is to be achieved by students
 Strongly Agree Agree Partially Agree Disagree
- 12) Students from low income families attain less education than students from more advantage families
 Strongly Agree Agree Partially Agree Disagree

Parental Occupation

13) What work does your parents engaged in?

- a. Farming
- b. Trading
- c. Civil Service
- d. House Wife

14) How often do your parents go to work?

- a. Everyday ()
- b. Sometime ()
- c. Occasionally()
- d. Weekends ()

15) Parental occupation affects academic performance.

() Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree

D. Family Size

16) How many siblings do you have?

- a. 5
- b. 4
- c. 3
- d. 2

17) Smaller family size has been linked with higher academic achievement.

() Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree

18) Students with fewer siblings are likely to receive more parental attention and have more access to resources than students from large families

() Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree

19) Students with large families attain less school on the average than students with fewer brothers and sisters

Strongly Agree Agree Partially Agree Disagree

20) Students from small family size at all social levels tend to perform better both in intelligence test and at school.

Strongly Agree Agree Partially Agree Disagree

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Dear Respondent,

This is a component part of a research work that seeks to identify the effect of socioeconomic factors on students' academic performance, a case study of St. Monica's College of Education. Your response shall be treated as purely confidential.

Please tick (✓) the appropriate box and write where applicable.

A. Biographical Data

1. Age: () 21-30 () 31-40 () 41-50 () 51 and above
2. Sex: () Female () Male
3. Marital Status: () Single () Married () Divorced () Widowed
4. Years of service: () 1-5 () 6-10 () 11-15 () 16-20 () 21- above
5. Grade/Rank:

B. Parental Educational Level

6. Do parents provide their wards with the necessary teaching and learning materials? Yes () No ()
7. If No to question 6, please explain
.....
8. How often do parents visit their wards at school?
 - a. Always
 - b. very Often
 - c. Occasionally
 - d. Not at all

9. Educated mothers are likely to send their wards to school.
() Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree

C. Parental Income

10. Do parents pay their wards school fees on time?
a. Always
b. Sometime
c. Every often
d. Occasionally
11. Are parents ready to pay for extra tuition for their wards?
Yes () No ()
12. Parents who earn higher income participate more in their wards' education than those with higher Low income
() Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree
13. Mother's education and family income are important predictors to academic success.
() Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree

Parental Occupation

14. What is the most common occupation of the students' parents?
a. Teaching
b. Farming
c. Trading
d. Nursing
15. Are the parents of the students self employed or into any business?
Yes () No ()
16. If No to the above, please explain.

17 How do parent's occupation influence student's academic performance?

- a. Very Largely
- b. Some Extent
- c. No Effect

Family Size

18 Do you think number of siblings influence students academic performance?

Yes () No ()

19 Number of siblings negatively affects student's academic performance.

() Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree

20 The size of families has some effect of academic performance of students

() Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree

APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS

Dear Respondent,

This is a component part of a research work that seeks to identify the effect of socioeconomic factors on students' academic performance, a case study of St. Monica's College of Education. Your response shall be treated as purely confidential.

Please tick (✓) the appropriate box and write where applicable.

A. Biographical Data

1. Age: () 21-30 () 31-40 () 41-50 () 51 and above
2. Sex: () Female () Male
3. Marital Status: () Married () Single () Divorced () Widow
4. Occupation (please state).....
5. Qualification: () None () Basic () Secondary () Tertiary

A. Parental Educational Level

6. How often do you visit your wards at school?
 - a. Very often
 - b. Sometimes
 - c. Most often
 - d. Not at all
7. How often do you provide teaching and learning materials for your wards education?
Yearly () Every Semester () When the need be ()
Seldom () Not at all ()

8. Apart from material resources, parental income, number of siblings, parents educational attainment, family level factors and birth order affects students academic performance.

Strongly Agree Agree Partially Agree Disagree

9. More educated mothers are more likely to invest in their wards schooling.

Strongly Agree Agree Partially Agree Disagree

B. Parental Income

10. Do you pay your wards school fees on time?

- a. Always
- b. Sometimes
- c. Most times
- d. Not at all

11. Do you give pocket money to your wards after paying their bills?

- a. Very often
- b. Always
- c. Sometimes
- d. Not at all

12. Parental income have a large effect on students academic performance.

Strongly Agree Agree Partially Agree Disagree

14. Suggest two ways by which low income can affect your wards academic Performance.

C. Parental Occupation

14. Parental occupation is very important if high academic standard of students is to be achieved.

Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree ()

15. Parental occupation influences their wards academic performance.

Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree ()

16. Does parental income and occupation influence learning?

Yes () No ()

17. No from question 16, please explain.

.....

Family Size

18. Parents of many children cannot afford to divide quality time with their children.

() Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree

19. Parents with two or three children can afford the time to develop their children academic capabilities.

() Strongly Agree () Agree () Partially Agree () Disagree

20. How would you estimate your family size?

() Small () Medium () Large