Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

Parental Involvement, Decision Making and Academic Performance among Students

Ayesha Irshad (Corresponding Author)
MPhil scholar, Department of Psychology, Riphah international university, Faisalabad campus. Email: ayeshairshad635@gmail.com

Dr. Aafia Rasool
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus. Email: dr.aafia@riphahfsd.edu.pk

Moazzam Shehzad
PhD Scholar, Department of Psychology, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus. Email: Moazam456@gmail.com

Abstract
The study investigated how parental involvement affected the academic performance and decision-making skills of the students. The study used a sample of 300 students to investigate the relationship between academic performance (CGPA) and decision-making and different aspects of parental involvement. Pearson correlation, regression analysis, and independent sample t-tests were used to analyze quantitative data. The results showed that there was a complicated link between the dependent variables and parental involvement. Academic achievement was negatively correlated with overall parental involvement, although it was a significant predictor of decision-making dimensions. While encouraging parental actions might help children make better decisions, over-involvement can have a detrimental impact on academic success and independence. These results highlight how crucial balanced parental involvement is for encouraging adolescents' independence and academic achievement.

Keywords: academic performance, decision making, parental involvement

Introduction

Students' academic performance and decision-making skills are greatly influenced by parental involvement, particularly as they go from youth to adulthood. Across all educational levels, parental involvement has long been seen as a critical component in fostering academic performance.

The participation of parents in their children's educational processes and activities, including communication with teachers, participation in school events, and support at home, is known as parental involvement. According to Epstein (1995),Parenting, communication, volunteering, at-home learning, decision-making and community collaboration are the six overlapping categories of parental involvement. Different approaches to parental involvement in their children's education are reflected in each of these areas.

Parental involvement at school includes parents who attend as visitors or members of the audience to support and promote school activities, as well as volunteers who can be categorized as mentors or tutors to students and helpers who support

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

instructors in the classroom and during school-related activities. Parents' involvement in advocacy and governance to support school administrators is another more recent and expanding type of parental involvement in schools (Epstein, 1988).
Furthermore, research has indicated that there appears to be a beneficial correlation between academic performance and parental involvement. Research has indicated that parental involvement in their children's education benefits their parents, kids and schools(Aremu et al., 2006).Rasinski and Fredericks (1988)determined that parents are crucial in setting the groundwork for their kids' education;also made the similar observation that "a foundation for literacy is built with ease when children are surrounded by caring, capable parents and are able to enjoy nurturing and moderate competitive kinship". Parental involvement not only affects academic performance but also develops students' critical decision-making skills, which impact choices in the future. According to Vaidya and Acharya (2023), decision making (DM) is the process of selecting one option from a range of possibilities in order to achieve a desired outcome. According to Byrnes (2002), decisions on what technology to use, what to study for a living, the color scheme of our rooms and the type of spouse and number of children we choose to have an impact on practically every aspect of our lives. Choosing a decision is essentially about choosing a choice, according to (Drummond, 2002).
Students experience a lot of anxiety and uncertainty when choosing a major (Galotti, 1999). Numerous things impact them, including their aptitudes and interests and the subject's employment prospects (Malgwi et al., 2005). Decision-making is more complicated than it seems, according to Othman et al. (2019), since people's choices can determine whether they succeed or fail in life. Students might not know enough about the variety of subjects they can choose from(Chaturapruek et al., 2021).
The term "helicopter parenting" is a parenting approach where parents overly interfere in their kids' lives, especially when it comes to making decisions, which limits their chances for self-reliance. Helicopter parenting is a unique type of control that is distinct from other parenting philosophies such as authoritative or authoritarian parenting, according to research by Padilla-Walker and Nelson (2012). According to the study, students' capacity for independent decision-making may be hampered by their parents' overbearing engagement throughout the emerging adult stage, which is usually while they are in college or university. This type of parenting frequently causes pupils to become unduly dependent on their parents for direction and approval, which lowers their confidence in making decisions. Students' confidence in their ability to make decisions can be greatly increased by positive parental involvement that is defined by instrumental, emotional and informational support. Children may make decisions, grow from their experiences and learn from their mistakes in a safe setting when their parents are encouraging but not controlling. Ratelle et al. (2005)investigated the connection between college students' academic perseverance and their perceptions of parental support, especially in rigorous subjects like science.
According to research, children who have parents who are involved in their education tend to do better academically. This engagement can take many different forms, including giving direction, creating a supportive learning atmosphere, and continuously encouraging others. The degree of accomplishment or success that students exhibit in their academic subjects is referred to as academic performance.

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

Numerous metrics, including grades, test scores, prizes and advancement, can be used to gauge academic performance (Rohana Ahmad Shimi, 2024). Academic performance is the sum of a student's achievements and success in their academic endeavors. It is typically assessed using test results, grades and a student's overall academic performance. An important measure of a student's dedication to their studies, subject-matter expertise and application abilities is their academic performance(Keerthana, 2024).

Children's academic performance has been proven to be impacted by parental involvement practices at home, at school and at college (Hill & Craft, 2003). Parents are actively involved in improving their kids' academic performance. To guarantee their children's improved academic success, they offer them financial, emotional and motivational support as well as resources (such as books, newspapers, and educational toys, among others). The operational word for parental engagement has not been used consistently throughout research papers, despite the fact that it is crucial to students' education. Any engagement between parents and kids at home or at school to make sure the kids' academic performance is going well is referred to as parental involvement.

It has been demonstrated that parental involvement in schooling improves students' academic performance. According to a study by Yang and Chen (2023), one of the most important components of social support for adolescents' academic success and participation in school is parental involvement. One of the most important indicators of academic performance or achievement is school engagement, which is defined as the degree to which students are engaged and dedicated to their education and school-related activities.

When parents offer encouraging direction without compromising their children's sense of independence, the relationship between parental decision-making and academic performance is particularly clear. According to Grolnick and Slowiaczek (1994), students feel more capable and driven to succeed in their academics when they have parental support and encouragement to make decisions.

Research objectives

1. To evaluate the relationship between parental involvement, decision making and academic performance of students.
2. To examine the role of parental involvement in predicting decision making among students.
3. To examine the role of parental involvement in predicting academic performance among students.
4. To see the group differences of parental involvement, decision making and academic performance among students in terms of gender.

Research Hypotheses

1. There would be a significant relationship between parental involvement, decision making and academic performance among students.
2. Parental involvement will significantly predict decision making among students.
3. Parental involvement will significantly predict academic performance among students.

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

4. There will be significant group differences in parental involvement, decision making and academic performance in terms of gender.

Literature Review

It has long been recognized that a student's academic progress is significantly influenced by the involvement of their parents in their education. The majority of research indicates that parental involvement has a favorable impact on students' motivation and academic performance.

According to Henderson and Berla (1994), a student's family's ability to become involved, show interest, foster a learning environment at home, and become involved in their child's education at school and in the community is a more accurate indicator of their success than their financial or social standing.

Parental views regarding gender disparities are frequently shaped in Asian culture and parents have different traditional expectations for their sons and daughters (Shek et al., 2019). Additionally, it is noted that men and women select occupations that align with their gender roles, and that boys and girls perform differently in a variety of topics(Rudasill & Callahan, 2014). However, during the past few decades, women have begun to show interest in jobs that are not influenced by gender and the favored career possibilities have altered (Abbasi &Sarwat, 2014).

Children's academic performance is significantly impacted by the degree of parental involvement. According to social cognitive theory, children watch and converse with significant others in their life to learn about acceptable behavior and socially acceptable objectives (Bandura, 1977a). On the basis of this presumption, parents can set an example for their children by modeling good attitudes and behaviors toward the school.

Three overlapping domains of influence family, school, and community were used by Epstein et al. (2018) to evaluate how children learn and develop. He asserts that in order to effectively serve the child's needs, all three domains must collaborate. Epstein et al. (2018) once more distinguished six categories of involvement according to the connections among the community, school and families. These include decision-making, communication, volunteering, at-home learning, parenting (skills) and community collaboration. In order to create successful relationships (between the home and the school), he made it very clear that these six forms of involvement must be included. (Epstein, 2010).

According to Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory, human growth takes place within a number of interconnected systems. While other systems (mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystemand chronosystem) indirectly influence developmental outcomes through interactions with the microsystem, the microsystem which includes the family and school has a direct impact on a child's growth(Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

According to the social learning theory, kids pick up knowledge by watching and copying others, particularly important people like parents. The idea emphasizes how children's conduct and motivation can be influenced by observational learning and role modeling (Bandura, 1977b).

When parents exhibit responsible decision-making and positive attitudes toward education, their children are more likely to follow suit, which promotes academic success (Harris & Goodall, 2008).

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

Expectancy-Value Theory, originally developed by Eccles and her colleagues, provides a robust framework for understanding motivation in educational settings. According to EVT, individuals' motivation to engage in a task is influenced by two main factors: their expectations of success in that task and the value they place on its outcomes. The concept of expectancy relates to both parents' and students' beliefs about the likelihood of success in academic tasks. Parents who believe in their child's ability to succeed academically are more likely to set high expectations and provide support that reinforces these expectations (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).

Hill and Tyson (2009) conducted a thorough meta-analysis to examine the impact of various forms of parental involvement on the academic performance of middle school pupils. Direct homework help was shown to be less beneficial than involvement through academic socialization (e.g., defining educational goals, developing drive). According to the study, parental support, encouragement and communication of high expectations for educational goals cultivate a sense of independence and drive that has a direct positive impact on academic performance.

Parental involvement was studied from a developmental-ecological perspective by Seginer (2006) as a dynamic interplay between community, school and family influences. Her study demonstrated how parental involvement affects academic performance by fostering a disciplined, encouraging learning environment. According to her research, students feel more a part of the school and perform better academically when parents participate in cooperative school activities. The preventive function of family participation during children' transition to high school was investigated(Chen & Gregory, 2009).

Parental involvement from preschool through grade school was studied by Miedel and Reynolds (1999) in a longitudinal study of children in the Chicago Longitudinal Study. Results indicated that greater high school reading and math scores were associated with early parental involvement in education, which included regular communication with instructors and participation in school events. This study emphasizes how early parental involvement affects academic success over the long run.

Research Methodology

Research design

For this study, a quantitative research design was selected, which entails gathering and analyzing numerical data in order to investigate and determine correlations between variables.

Participants

The target demographic for this study consisted of university-level students from various academic institutions. The participants in this review were selected using a straightforward sampling technique. Three hundred bachelor's degree students from various Faisalabad institutions participated. The study's sample was split into two groups: 145 males and 155 females. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 25.

Sampling technique

Convenience sampling was employed in this study to collect a sample for additional examination. Participants in this study were readily available on the campuses of the

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

Faisalabad colleges and universities that were the subject of the study.

Inclusion /Exclusion criteria
Inclusion criteria

- Students currently enrolled in a university.
- Students who consent to provide information on personal and family-related factors.
- Students having language proficiency to understand and respond to the questionnaires.
- Participants must have a consistent relationship with at least one parent or parental figure.

Exclusion criteria

- Students not currently enrolled in an educational institution.
- Students who live entirely independently from parental or familial support.
- Individuals unwilling or unable to accurately self-report.
- Students who lack contact with any parental figure.

Research Instruments
The questionnaire consists of three sections, and thereby, respondents will be required to spend approximately 15 minutes completing the questionnaire. The three portions included Part 1 (demographic data), Part 2 (Parental involvement rating scale) and Part 3 (Decision making questionnaire)

Demographic sheet
Age, gender, education, CGPA, number of siblings, birth order, family structure and socioeconomic status were included in a demographic sheet that was collected from participants.

Parental involvement rating scale
PIRS is intended to measure the involvement of parents in their children's education and it is developed by(Gafoor & Naseema, 2001). It is 76 items scale. The questions on the PIRS were scored on a three-point Likert scale ranging from 2 ("Always true") to 0 ("Never true"). It consisted of nine subscale components; Parental Acceptance, Parental Aspiration, Parental Attention, Parental Encouragement, Parental Guidance, Parental Influence, Parental Decision-making, Parental Provision of Physical Facilities and Parental Care to the Physical Fitness of Child.

Decision making questionnaire
Decision making questionnaire was developed by (French et al., 1993). Responses to 21 items of the DMQ formed seven independent and internally coherent dimensions according to a principal components (PC) analysis. These were labeled: control, thoroughness, instinctiveness, social resistance, hesitancy, perfectionism and idealism. DMQ items were phrased as questions asking about frequency of a given type of behavior and subjects were instructed to tick one of six boxes that indicated that they behaved in this way: never or very infrequently, infrequently, quite infrequently, quite frequently, frequently, very frequently or always.

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

Academic performance
The academic performance was assessed by using demographic sheet. The students were asked regarding their previous CGPA.

Research Procedure
After the approval of synopsis from the board of study meeting, the next step that was taken was the permission of data collection from the department of Psychology Institute of Riphah international University Faisalabad and from where the data had to be collected. The purpose of the research was explained to every participant in research. Only those participants were included that fulfilled the inclusion criteria and showed willingness for the participation of the research. They were insured about the confidentiality of their responses and the right to withdraw from the research at any time without any penalty. After that questionnaire was provided to the participant, all the assessment measures were filled by the participants themselves.

Data Analysis
Following data collection, each survey was graded using statistical standards. Analysis was done using the statistical software for social sciences (SPSS). Initially, the demographic features of research participants were measured using computed descriptive statistics. For measuring variables, descriptive statistics are also employed. Scale Reliability of scale was measured using reliability analysis. Pearson correlation was calculated to examine the relationship between the variables. The independent sample t-test was calculated to assess the significance of the differences between the variables. Multiple regression analysis was performed in order to quantify the predicted connection between the variables.

Ethical Consideration
Prior approval, informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality were provided to the quantitative study participants in accordance with the American Psychological Association's recommended ethical standards. Before the study could be conducted, its methods and materials were approved by the University of Riphah Faisalabad's board of advanced study. Participants were given a comprehensive explanation, and the study was carried out honestly. In addition to providing written agreement, the participants were informed that they might withdraw from the study at any moment without facing any repercussions.

Results
In order to assess the frequency and percentage of participants present in study, demographic characteristic analysis was done.

Table 1: *Frequency and percentage of Demographic variables of the participants (N=300)*

Characteristics	Frequency	%
Gender		

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

Female	155	51.7
Male	145	48.3
Age		
18-21	217	72.3
22-25	83	27.7
Education		
Bachelors	300	100
Family system		
Joint	113	37.7
Nuclear	187	62.3
Economic system		
Lower class	9	3.0
Middle class	265	88.3
Upper class	26	8.7
Head of family		
Mother	14	4.7
Father	278	92.7
Brother	8	2.7
CGPA		
CGPA below 2.5	1	.3
CGPA between 2.5-2.9	19	6.3
CGPA between 3.0-3.49	100	33.3
CGPA 3.5 or above	180	60.0
Subject		
Natural science	41	13.7
Social science	38	12.7
Formal science	51	17.0
Humanities	56	18.7
Applied sciences	73	24.3
Arts	4	1.3
Business and management	27	9.0
Law	10	3.3

Table 1 displays the demographic information of the three hundred (n=300) research participants.

Table 2: *Reliability analysis and Descriptive Statistics of parental involvement, decision making and academic performance (N=300)*

Variables	M	S. D	Range		α
			Actual	Potential	
Parental-involvement rating scale	84.47	18.34	38-152	0-152	.87
Decision making questionnaire	97.44	16.22	54-126	0-126	.88

Note.M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, α=Cronbach alpha value

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics and reliability analysis for the Parental Involvement Rating Scale and Decision-Making Questionnaire.The Parental Involvement Rating Scale shows good reliability (α = .87) with scores ranging from 38–152 (M = 84.47, SD = 18.34). The Decision-Making Questionnaire also shows high reliability (α = .88) with scores ranging from 54–126 (M = 97.44, SD = 16.22). Both scales demonstrate strong overall reliability.

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

Table 3: *Pearson product moment Correlation among Study Variables (N=300)*

	CGPA	PA	AS	AT	PE	PG	PI	PDM	PPPF	PCP	TH	CO	H	SR	OP	P	IN
CGPA	---																
PA	-.059	---															
AS	-.029	.201**	---														
AT	-.180**	.221**	.179**	---													
PE	-.125*	.302**	.416**	.521**	---												
PG	-.082	.191**	.470**	.547**	.648**	---											
PI	-.151**	.232**	.373**	.450**	.545**	.554**	---										
PDM	-.118*	.282**	.174**	.593**	.446**	.449**	.390**	---									
PPPF	-.155**	.278**	.380**	.561**	.602**-	.619**	.463**	.524**	---								
PCP	.181**	.021	.111	-.270**	-.132**	-.131**	-.057	-.284**	-.171**	---							

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

TH	.019	-.087	-.036	-.301**	-.283**	-.335**	-.188**	-.275**	-.253**	.312**	---							
CO	.031	-.041	.011	-.228**	-.234**	-.247**	-.181**	-.177**	-.249**	.306**	.601**	---						
H	.040	.029	-.009	-.160**	-.179**	-198**	-.146**	-.163**	-.179**	.276**	.551**	.648**	---					
SR	.106	.049	-.003	-.237**	-.235**	-.230**	-.106	-.174**	-.224**	.295**	.567**	.621**	.475**	---				
OP	.071	.007	.000	-.229**	-.195**	-.297**	-.138**	-.205**	-.193**	.324**	.535**	.508**	.466**	.557**	---			
P	.101	.101	-.068	-.170**	-.254**	-.209**	-.112	-.096	-.227**	.207**	.521**	.527**	.486**	.495**	.449**	---		
IN	.013	-.055	.029	-.211**	-.297**	-.247**	-.107	-.168**	-.202**	.246**	.414**	.487**	.355**	.453**	.434**	.433**	---	

Note.PA = Parental Acceptance, AS = Parental Aspiration, AT = Parental Attention, PE = Parental Encouragement, PG = Parental Guidance, PI = Parental Influence, PDM = Parental Decision-Making, PPPF = Parental Provision of Physical Facilities, PCP = Parental Care to Physical Fitness of Child, DMQ = Decision-Making Questionnaire, DMQ_TH = Thoroughness, DMQ_CO = Control, DMQ_H = Hesitancy, DMQ_SR = Social Resistance, DMQ_OP = Optimizing, DMQ_P = Principled, DMQ_IN = Instinctiveness. $p < .05$. $p < .01$.
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

The table 3 shows significant correlations between CGPA and other study variables. CGPA is negatively correlated with Parental Attention (-0.180, $p < .01$), Parental Encouragement (-0.125, $p < .05$), Parental Influence (-0.151, $p < .01$), Parental Decision-Making (-0.118, $p < .05$), and Parental Provision of Physical Facilities (-0.155, $p < .01$), suggesting that higher levels of these parental behaviors are associated with slightly lower CGPA scores. CGPA is positively correlated with Parental Care for Physical Fitness (0.181, $p < .01$), indicating that better physical care from parents is linked to higher academic performance. Among the decision-making styles, CGPA has significant positive correlations with Social Resistance (0.106, $p < .01$) but does not show strong relationships with other decision-making dimensions.

Parental Acceptance correlates positively with Parental Aspiration (0.201, $p < .01$), Attention (0.221, $p < .01$), Encouragement (0.302, $p < .01$), Guidance (0.191, $p < .01$), Influence (0.232, $p < .01$), Decision-Making (0.282, $p < .01$), and Provision of Physical Facilities (0.278, $p < .01$). Stronger relationships are observed among parental encouragement, guidance, and attention, with correlations exceeding 0.5, reflecting their interconnected nature in parenting practices.

Parental Care for Physical Fitness positively correlates with decision-making styles like Thoroughness (0.312, $p < .01$) and Control (0.306, $p < .01$). These findings highlight the nuanced relationships between parental involvement, decision-making styles, and academic performance.

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

Table 4: *Parental involvement as predictor of decision making(N=300)*

	TH		CO		H		SR		OP		P		IN	
Variables	β	S.E	β	S.E	B	S.E	B	S.E	B	S.E	B	S.E	β	S.E
TOTAL_PIRS	-.32**	.011	-.24**	.014	-.18**	.01	-.22**	.01	-.23**	.01	-.22**	.01	-.24**	.01
R^2	.100		.058		.032		.048		.054		.048		.057	
ΔR^2	.097		.055		.029		.044		.050		.045		.054	

Note. N=300, *p < .05, **p<.01, ΔR^2 = adjusted R^2, TOTAL_PIRS = parental involvement rating scale, TH = Thoroughness, CO = Control, H = Hesitancy, SR = Social Resistance, OP = Optimizing, P = Principled, IN = Instinctiveness.

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

The table 4 presents the results of regression analyses examining the predictive role of parental involvement

Parental involvement negatively predicts all decision-making dimensions, with values (β =**-0.18,** p<.01)Hesitancy,(β = **-0.32,** p<.01) Thoroughness. These negative coefficients suggest that higher parental involvement is associated with lower levels of these decision-making traits. Similarly, parental involvement negatively predicts Control (β = -0.24, p<.01), Hesitancy (β = -0.18, p<.01), Social Resistance (β = -0.22, p<.01), Optimizing (β = -0.23, p<.01), Principled (β = -0.22, p<.01), and Instinctiveness (β = -0.24, p<.01).

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

Table 5: *Subscales ofparental involvement as predictor of decision making subscales (N=300)*

	TH		CO		H		SR		OP		P		IN	
Variables	B	S.E	B	S.E	B	S.E	B	S.E	B	S.E	B	S.E	β	S.E
ALL_PA	-.02	.13	.01	.03	.08	.10	.12*	.11	.05	.08	.01	.08	.001	.08
ALL_AS	.11	.10	.15*	.27	.08	.08	.09	.08	.11	.06	.04	.06	.18**	.06
ALL_AT	-.05	.08	-.002	-.002	.05	.06	-.06	.06	-.01	.05	-.01	.05	.003	.05
ALL_PE	-.09	.07	-.09	-.09	-.07	.05	-.16*	.06	-.02	.04	-.20	.04*	-.29**	.04
ALL_PG	-.26**	.05	-.14	-.11	-.12	.04	-.11	.04	-.31**	.03	-.07	.03	-.17*	.03
ALL_PI	.02	.11	-.06	-.12	-.06	.09	.06	.09	.01	.07	.05	.07	.08	.07
ALL_PDM	-.05	.14	.06	.14	-.02	.11	.03	.11	-.02	.08	.12	.09	.03	.09
ALL_PPPF	.01	.10	-.13	-.19	-.06	.08	-.09	.08	.01	.06	-.13	.06	-.02	.06
ALL_PCP	.23**	.16	.25**	.85	.23**	.13	.23**	.14	.26**	.097	.18	.10**	.18**	.10
R^2	.21		.17		.12		.16		.18		.11		.17	
ΔR^2	.18		.14		.09		.13		.16		.09		.14	

Note. N=300, *$p < .05$, **$p<.01$, ΔR^2 = adjusted R^2 ,PA = Parental Acceptance, AS = Parental Aspiration, AT = Parental Attention, PE = Parental Encouragement, PG = Parental Guidance, PI = Parental Influence, PDM = Parental Decision-Making, PPPF = Parental Provision of Physical Facilities, PCP = Parental Care to Physical Fitness of Child, TH = Thoroughness, CO = Control, H = Hesitancy, SR = Social Resistance, OP = Optimizing, P = Principled, IN = Instinctiveness.

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

The table 5 demonstrates the predictive role of various subscales of parental involvement on decision-making subscales, using beta (β) coefficients and their significance levels. Parental Guidance negatively predicts Thoroughness (β = -0.26, p < .01) and Optimizing (β = -0.31, p < .01) and also shows a weaker negative prediction of Instinctiveness (β = -0.17, p < .05). Parental Care for Physical Fitness positively predicts Thoroughness (β = 0.23, p < .01), Control (β = 0.25, p < .01), Hesitancy (β = 0.23, p < .01), Social Resistance (β = 0.23, p < .01), Optimizing (β = 0.26, p < .01), Principled (β = 0.18, p < .01), and Instinctiveness (β = 0.18, p < .01). Parental Encouragement negatively predicts Social Resistance (β = -0.16, p < .05), Principled (β = -0.20, p < .05), and Instinctiveness (β = -0.29, p < .01). Parental Aspiration positively predicts Control (β = 0.15, p < .05) and Instinctiveness (β = 0.18, p < .01). Parental Acceptance positively predicts Social Resistance (β = 0.12, p < .05), while other relationships for this variable are not significant. Remaining subscales, including Parental Attention, Parental Influence, Parental Decision-Making, and Parental Provision of Physical Facilities, do not show significant predictive effects on decision-making subscales. These results indicate that parental guidance, encouragement, aspirations, and care for physical fitness are the most influential subscales in shaping decision-making styles.

Table 6: *Parental involvement as predictor of academic performance (N=300)*

Variable		*B*	*SE*
TOTAL_PIRS		-.005**	.002
R^2	0.21		
ΔR^2	.017		

Note. N=300, *p < .05, **p<.01, ΔR^2 = adjusted R^2

The regression analysis shows that parental involvement, as measured by the TOTAL_PIRS score, is a significant predictor of academic performance, with a negative relationship. The unstandardized coefficient (B= -0.005, p = .013) indicates that for every one-unit increase in the parental involvement score, academic performance decreases by 0.005 units. The standardized beta coefficient (β = -0.144) reflects a small but significant negative effect of parental involvement on academic performance.

Table 7: *Parental involvement (subscales) as predictor of academic performance (N=300)*

Variable	*B*	*SE*
ALL_PA	-.006	.023
ALL_AS	.001	.018
ALL_AT	-.019	.014
ALL_PE	-.002	.012
ALL_PG	.012	.010
ALL_PI	-.032	.020
ALL_PDM	.015	.024
ALL_PPPF	-.020	.018

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

ALL_PCP	.074**	.029	
R^2	.068		
ΔR^2	.039		

Note. N=300, *p < .05, **p<.01, ΔR^2 = adjusted R^2,PA = Parental Acceptance, AS = Parental Aspiration, AT = Parental Attention, PE = Parental Encouragement, PG = Parental Guidance, PI = Parental Influence, PDM = Parental Decision-Making, PPPF = Parental Provision of Physical Facilities, PCP = Parental Care to Physical Fitness of Child

The regression analysis examines the predictive role of parental involvement subscales on academic performance. Among the subscales, only Parental Care for Physical Fitness (ALL_PCP) is a significant positive predictor (B=0.074, p=.012), indicating that for every one-unit increase in this subscale, academic performance increases by 0.074 units.. The standardized beta coefficient (β = 0.154) reflects a small positive effect. The remaining subscales, including Parental Acceptance, Aspiration, Attention, Encouragement, Guidance, Influence, Decision-Making, and Provision of Physical Facilities, do not significantly predict academic performance, as their p-values are above the conventional significance threshold (p > .05).

Table 8: *Independent sample t test to assess gender differences on parental involvement, decision making and academic performance (N=300)*

	Female N=155		Male N=145				*95%*		
Variables	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*T*	*P*	*LL*	*UL*	Cohen's d
TOTAL_PIRS	76.06	13.45	93.46	18.63	-9.31	.000	-21.08	-13.72	-1.07
ALL_PA	7.75	1.49	8.20	1.77	-2.35	.019	-.817	-.073	-0.27
ALL_AS	9.35	2.39	10.71	2.25	-5.06	.000	-1.89	-.833	-0.58
ALL_AT	6.90	3.26	9.30	3.67	-5.98	.000	-3.18	-1.61	-0.69
ALL_PE	13.04	3.32	16.55	4.69	-7.50	.000	-3.50	.467	-0.86
ALL_PG	17.30	5.16	22.13	5.24	-8.04	.000	.601	-6.01	-0.92
ALL_PI	7.52	1.88	9.00	2.43	-5.86	.000	-1.96	-.97	-0.68
ALL_PDM	2.82	1.81	4.22	1.85	-6.59	.000	-1.81	-.97	-0.76

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

ALL_PPPF	6.46	2.40	8.97	2.93	-8.13	.000	-3.12	-1.90	-0.94
ALL_PCP	4.88	1.32	4.35	1.25	3.51	.001	.231	.818	0.41
DMQ_TH	20.03	3.48	18.02	3.89	4.70	.000	1.16	2.84	0.54
DMQ_CO	24.35	4.53	22.75	4.23	3.14	.002	.597	2.59	0.36
DMQ_H	14.59	2.94	13.94	2.70	1.98	.048	.004	1.29	0.22
DMQ_SR	14.56	2.98	13.08	2.96	4.30	.000	.801	2.15	0.49
DMQ_OP	9.50	2.08	8.70	2.30	3.18	.002	.307	1.30	0.36
DMQ_P	8.99	2.39	8.02	2.03	3.75	.000	.459	1.47	0.43
DMQ_IN	9.47	2.29	8.51	2.33	3.59	.000	.434	1.48	0.41
CGPA	3.63	0.55	3.41	0.68	3.13	.002	.083	.366	0.35

Note. M=mean, SD=Standard deviation, t=t-test, P=Significant value, UL=Upper limit, LL=Lower limit,PIRS=Parental-involvement rating scale; DMQ= Decision making questionnaire

For the total parental involvement rating scale (PIRS), females scored significantly lower (M = 76.06, SD = 13.45) than males (M = 93.46, SD = 18.63), with a large effect size (Cohen's d = -1.07) and a confidence interval ranging from -21.08 to -13.72, indicating a meaningful difference favoring males. In terms of sub-dimensions, males scored significantly higher than females in Parental Acceptance, Parental Aspiration, Parental Attention, Parental Encouragement, Parental Guidance, Parental Influence, Parental Decision-Making, and Parental Provision of Physical Facilities, with effect sizes ranging from small (Cohen's d = -0.27 for Parental Acceptance) to large (Cohen's d = -0.94 for Parental Provision of Physical Facilities). Interestingly, in Parental Care for Physical Fitness, females scored significantly higher (M = 4.88, SD = 1.32) than males (M = 4.35, SD = 1.25), with a small but meaningful effect size (Cohen's d = 0.41). Sub-dimensions of decision-making such as Thoroughness, Control, Hesitancy, Social Resistance, Optimizing, Principled, and Instinctiveness also showed higher scores for females compared to males, with effect sizes ranging from small (Cohen's d = 0.22 for Hesitancy) to moderate (Cohen's d = 0.54 for Thoroughness).

Females had a significantly higher CGPA (M = 3.63, SD = 0.55) compared to males (M = 3.41, SD = 0.68), with a small effect size (Cohen's d = 0.35), suggesting better academic performance among female participants. These findings highlight significant gender differences across the variables, with males scoring higher in most dimensions of parental involvement and females excelling in decision-making and academic performance.

Discussion

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

This study looked at how Parental involvement affects adolescents' academic performance and decision-making, with an emphasis on how different aspects of parental involvement affect these results. Parental involvement, decision-making, and academic success are all interconnected, as demonstrated by the correlation analysis, which found significant correlations among all the research variables. These results provide credence to the idea that Parental involvement is crucial in influencing adolescents' thought processes and academic performance.

Significant results were obtained from the regression analysis evaluating the overall influence of Parental involvement on decision-making. All parental engagement dimensions as determined by the total parental involvement rating scale (TOTAL_PIRS) significantly predicted the subscales measuring decision-making. In line with other research that emphasized the beneficial function of parental guidance in fostering good decision-making, this implies that higher levels of Parental involvement are linked to more effective and less hesitating decision-making(Steinberg et al., 2016).

Results of an assessment of the relationship between Parental involvement and academic performance, which showed that parental involvement was a strong predictor of students' academic outcomes. In particular, there was a negative correlation found between parental involvement and academic accomplishment, and academic performance was significantly predicted by the total parental involvement rating scale (TOTAL_PIRS). This result is consistent with earlier studies that found that although Parental involvement is generally advantageous, over-involvement can occasionally result in stress and pressure that impairs adolescents' academic performance(Grolnick & Ryan, 1989). The results from this study contribute to the ongoing debate on the optimal level of parental involvement, indicating that too much involvement may not always be conducive to academic success.

Interesting subtleties were discovered through additional regression analysis of the various parental involvement aspects. Parental concern for the child's physical fitness (ALL_PCP) was found to be a substantial positive predictor of both academic performance and decision-making. This result is in line with studies that highlight the value of parental guidance in promoting both academic performance and general well-being (Gonzalez-DeHass et al., 2005). Other aspects of Parental involvement, on the other hand, like parental decision-making (ALL_PDM), parental attention (ALL_AT), and parental provision of physical facilities (ALL_PPPF), demonstrated lower or non-significant associations with academic performance and decision-making. This implies that although these facets of Parental involvement might aid in adolescents' growth, they are not as closely associated with the particular results of academic performance and decision-making as other types of involvement.

The findings showed that male and female students differed significantly in a number of parental engagement domains, with female students reporting greater levels of involvement in the majority of subscales. These results are in line with earlier research that found that parents tend to be more involved with their daughters than with their sons, indicating gender disparities in Parental

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

involvement(Spera, 2005). Moreover, female students demonstrated better academic performance (CGPA) compared to their male counterparts, which is in line with existing literature that shows females often outperform males academically (Buchmann et al., 2008).
This is further supported by Pomerantz et al. (2007), who noted that because of the relational dynamics frequently fostered between daughters and parents, female students are more prone to accept parental ideals, especially in academics.

Conclusion

The results shed important light on the ways that different types of parental involvement such as physical provision, emotional support, and guidance affect students' capacity for making decisions and their academic performance. Significant relationships between Parental involvement and decision-making subscales, including thoroughness, control, and optimizing, were found in the analysis, underscoring the beneficial effects of parental involvement in helping pupils develop more intelligent and deliberate decision-making abilities.
But the connection between academic performance and Parental involvement turned out to be more nuanced. The overall Parental involvement score had a negative correlation with CGPA, even though some components of it, including maintaining physical fitness, were positively connected with academic performance. This implies that although parental guidance might improve decision-making abilities, over-involvement or over-control may impair students' academic performance.
There were clear gender variations in academic performance and Parental involvement, with female students reporting higher levels of involvement and outperforming their male counterparts in terms of academic performance. The study highlights how crucial it is to create an atmosphere in which parental support promotes kids' freedom and autonomy, especially when it comes to their academic endeavors and decision-making.

Limitations

First off, there are only 300 participants in the study, which means that the sample may not be entirely typical of all students. As a result, the findings might not be applicable to other areas, socioeconomic groups, or educational frameworks.
Second, data is only collected once during the study's cross-sectional design. The capacity to evaluate the causal linkages between academic success and parental involvement is limited by this design. A longitudinal study might shed further light on how these connections change over time.
Third, self-reports, which are susceptible to social desirability bias, were probably used to gather information on parental involvement and decision-making.

Recommendations

Future studies could use a longitudinal approach to track changes in parental involvement and the influence of decision-making on academic performance over time, as cross-sectional designs have limitations. This would make it possible to

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

document how parental influence changes as pupils mature and encounter new academic obstacles. Future studies should include input from a variety of informants, including parents or teachers, to get around the drawback of depending just on student self-reports.

References

Abbasi, M. N., & Sarwat, N. (2014). Factors inducing career choice: Comparative study of five leading professions in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, *8*(3), 830-845.

Aremu, O. A., Tella, A., & Tella, A. (2006). Relationship among emotional intelligence, parental involvement and academic achievement of secondary school students in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Essays in Education*, *18*(1), 395-401.

Bandura, A. (1977a). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, *84*(2), 191.

Bandura, A. (1977b). Social learning theory. *Englewood Cliffs*.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. *Harvard University Press google schola*, *2*(7), 139-163.

Buchmann, C., DiPrete, T. A., & McDaniel, A. (2008). Gender inequalities in education. *Annu. Rev. Sociol*, *34*(1), 319-337.

Byrnes, J. P. (2002). The development of decision-making. *Journal of adolescent health*, *31*(6), 208-215.

Chaturapruek, S., Dalberg, T., Thompson, M. E., Giebel, S., Harrison, M. H., Johari, R., Stevens, M. L., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2021). Studying undergraduate course consideration at scale. *AERA open*, *7*(1), 233-245.

Chen, W.-B., & Gregory, A. (2009). Parental involvement as a protective factor during the transition to high school. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *103*(1), 53-62.

Drummond, H. (2002). *The art of decision making: Mirrors of imagination, masks of fate*. John Wiley & Sons.

Epstein , Sanders, M. G., Sheldon, S. B., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., Van Voorhis, F. L., Martin, C. S., Thomas, B. G., & Greenfeld, M. D. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Corwin Press.

Epstein, J. L. (1988). How Do We Improve Programs for Parent Involvement? *Educational Horizons*, *66*(2), 58-59.

Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships. *Phi delta kappan*, *76*(9), 701-705.

Epstein, J. L. (2010). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi delta kappan*, *92*(3), 81-96.

French, D. J., West, R. J., Elander, J., & Wilding, J. M. (1993). Decision-making style, driving style, and self-reported involvement in road traffic accidents. *Ergonomics*, *36*(6), 627-644.

Gafoor, K., & Naseema, C. (2001). Parental Involvement Rating Scale (PIRS). *Malappuram: University of Calicut*.

Galotti, K. M. (1999). Making a" major" real-life decision: College students choosing an academic major. *Journal of educational psychology*, *91*(2), 379-387.

Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Parent styles associated with children's self-regulation and competence in school. *Journal of educational psychology*, *81*(2), 143-153.

Grolnick, W. S., & Slowiaczek, M. L. (1994). Parents' involvement in children's schooling: A multidimensional conceptualization and motivational model. *Child development*,

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

Vol. 3 No. 2 (February) (2025)

65(1), 237-252.
Harris, A., & Goodall, J. (2008). Do parents know they matter? Engaging all parents in learning. *Educational research*, *50*(3), 277-289.
Henderson, A. T., & Berla, N. (1994). *A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement*. ERIC.
Hill, N. E., & Craft, S. A. (2003). Parent-school involvement and school performance: Mediated pathways among socioeconomically comparable African American and Euro-American families. *Journal of educational psychology*, *95*(1), 74-83.
Jeynes, W. H. (2003). A meta-analysis: The effects of parental involvement on minority children's academic achievement. *Education and urban society*, *35*(2), 202-218.
Keerthana, D. M. N. (2024). Exploring the Relationship Between Hope, Academic Performance among College Students. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, *6*(4), 115-120.
Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Nelson, L. J. (2012). Black hawk down?: Establishing helicopter parenting as a distinct construct from other forms of parental control during emerging adulthood. *Journal of adolescence*, *35*(5), 1177-1190.
Pomerantz, E. M., Moorman, E. A., & Litwack, S. D. (2007). The how, whom, and why of parents' involvement in children's academic lives: more is not always better. *Review of educational research*, *77*(3), 373-410.
Rasinski, T. V., & Fredericks, A. D. (1988). Sharing literacy: Guiding principles and practices for parent involvement. *The reading teacher*, *41*(6), 508-512.
Ratelle, C. F., Larose, S., Guay, F., & Senécal, C. (2005). Perceptions of parental involvement and support as predictors of college students' persistence in a science curriculum. *Journal of family psychology*, *19*(2), 286–293.
Rohana Ahmad Shimi, N. B. M. A., Livyaa Darashinni A/P Ganesh, Divashini A/P Subramaniam, Yuvaatarsini Vignasveran, Parvisha Sree A/P Moganaselvan , Viraj A/L Rajamogan. (2024). The Impact of Parental Involvement in Student's Academic Performance. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *4*(1), 2051–2058.
Rudasill, K., & Callahan, C. (2014). Gender stereotypes and parenting. *Recuperado de http://www. education. com*, *13*(11), 201-210.
Seginer, R. (2006). Parents' educational involvement: A developmental ecology perspective. *Parenting: Science and practice*, *6*(1), 1-48.
Shek, D. T., Lam, C. M., & Zhu, X. (2019). Parental expectations amongst Chinese parents in Hong Kong: Profiles and demographic correlates. *International journal of child and adolescent health*, *12*(4), 345-356.
Spera, C. (2005). A review of the relationship among parenting practices, parenting styles, and adolescent school achievement. *Educational psychology review*, *17*, 125-146.
Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S. M., & Brown, B. B. (2016). Ethnic differences in adolescent achievement: An ecological perspective. In *Cognitive and Moral Development, Academic Achievement in Adolescence* (pp. 165-171).
Vaidya, P. R., & Acharya, K. (2023). Students' Decision-Making at the University Level: A Phenomenological Study. *Journal of Business and Management Research*, *5*(1-2), 20-34.
Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy–value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary educational psychology*, *25*(1), 68-81.
Yang, H., & Chen, Y. (2023). The impact of parental involvement on student writing ability: a meta-analysis. *Education Sciences*, *13*(7), 718.