



THE IMPACT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS ON THE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF GRADE 5 LEARNERS

HAZEL GRACE B. BUNAO

Institute of Graduate and Professional Studies
Lyceum-Northwestern University
Dagupan City

Abstract: This study, titled Vocabulary Skills as Predictors of Academic Achievement in English: A Case Study of Grade 6 Learners, aimed to examine the relationship between receptive and productive vocabulary skills and academic performance in English among Grade 6 learners. Conducted in the West B District of Tarlac City Schools Division during the school year 2024-2025, the research employed a quantitative approach. A total of 120 learners participated, with data collected through the 2,000 and 3,000 receptive and productive vocabulary levels tests and an assessment of their academic performance. The findings revealed that the learners demonstrated **average receptive vocabulary skills** but **low productive vocabulary skills**, indicating difficulties in applying their vocabulary knowledge in expressive tasks such as writing and speaking. The learners' academic performance in English was categorized as **satisfactory**, with a mean grade of 84.70. Statistical analysis established a **moderate correlation** between receptive and productive vocabulary skills and a similar correlation between vocabulary skills and academic performance, highlighting the predictive role of vocabulary in academic success. Furthermore, significant differences were identified in vocabulary skills based on sex and section, with female learners and those in higher-performing sections outperforming their peers. The results underscore the importance of vocabulary skills as key predictors of academic achievement. The study recommends the implementation of a structured instructional plan that emphasizes direct and incidental vocabulary learning, contextualized teaching strategies, and equitable classroom practices. Such measures are crucial in bridging the gap between receptive and productive vocabulary skills and enhancing the learners' overall proficiency and academic outcomes.

Index Terms: vocabulary skills, academic performance, Grade 6 learners

I. INTRODUCTION

A person's life chances, income, and prosperity are closely correlated with their level of education (Battle and Lewis 2002). The world is always changing, and getting an education has a big impact on where, what, and how people find their careers. It also works the other way around. Additionally, social and economic status play a big role in education or the learning framework. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that socioeconomic status is a reliable and accurate predictor of a wide range of outcomes throughout life, including psychological and physical health. For this reason, socioeconomic status matters in behavioral and social science research, practice, advocacy, and education.

According to several studies, socioeconomic status (SES) has a big impact on academic achievement. Students from higher SES households usually do better academically because they have access to more resources, improved learning environments, and more supportive parents. Research keeps showing that neighborhood quality, parental education, and family income all have a significant impact on students' academic performance. However, what remains less understood is the extent to which specific interventions, such as targeted mentorship programs or school funding reforms, can mitigate these disparities.

Socioeconomic status (SES) can include factors that affect one's quality of life as well as the opportunities and privileges that members of the community are granted. Poverty is not just one problem; rather, it is defined by various psychological and physical pressures. Social financial position is also a significant factor affecting pupils' academic performance. First things first: it needs to be defined to understand why socioeconomic status affects student achievement. Several studies addressed the economic

situation from various angles. According to Cary (2011), there are two main reasons a student's financial situation affects their academic performance. This considers socio social as well as instructional factors.

Socioeconomic status (SES) is one of the most widely studied constructs in the social sciences. Several ways of measuring SES have been proposed, but most include some quantification of family income, parental education, and occupational status. Research shows that SES is associated with a wide array of health, cognitive, and socioemotional outcomes in children, with effects beginning before birth and continuing into adulthood. A variety of mechanisms linking SES to child well-being have been proposed, with most involving differences in access to material and social resources or reactions to stress-inducing conditions by both the children themselves and their parents. For children, SES impacts well-being at multiple levels, including both family and neighborhood. Its effects are moderated by children's characteristics, family characteristics, and external support systems.

Socioeconomic status (SES) is a multidimensional measure that encompasses factors such as family income, parental education, and occupational status, significantly impacting students' academic performance. Sirin (2005), in a comprehensive meta-analytic review, synthesizes findings from 58 studies conducted in the United States and demonstrates that SES is a moderate to strong predictor of academic success. The study highlights that students from higher SES backgrounds tend to have better educational outcomes due to greater access to resources, more supportive learning environments, and higher parental expectations. Sirin's analysis underscores the universal influence of SES on educational attainment and emphasizes the need to address SES-related disparities to promote equity in academic achievement.

Based on the findings of Considine, G., & Zappalà, G. (2002), even within a group with considerable financial disadvantage, socioeconomic status, as reflected by the level of parental education, was a key predictor of student academic achievement raises several policy implications. In brief, it supports the notion that the 'social' and the 'economic' components of the socioeconomic status equation may have distinct and separate influences on educational outcomes. While financial assistance to schools and families in need is important, policies and programs that also assist low-income parents in providing appropriate psychological and educational support for their children should also be promoted. Low income is not the only factor that harms effective parenting and children's development and educational achievement.

The poor have marginal access to basic education and allocate a minimal portion of their insufficient income to education. In fact, this small portion has also declined through the years, with an increasing share of expenditure devoted to food. The connection between poverty and education has gender issues intertwined, with boys less likely to stay in school than girls, especially among poor families. (Maligalig & Albert 2008)

According to the 2023 Annual Poverty Indicator Survey (APIS), 40.8 percent of Filipino children aged 5 to 24 were enrolled in school and were male, while 40.5 percent were female. Students between the ages of 6 and 9 had the highest percentage of students actively enrolled in school, accounting for 26.8% of all children between the ages of 5 and 24. Students between the ages of 10 and 12, and 17 and 19 came next, accounting for 18.4% and 15.1% of the population between the ages of 5 and 24 who were enrolled in school, respectively. About 18.6 percent of children aged 5 to 24 years were not attending school. Of those who were not attending school, the top reasons were the following: finished schooling or finished post-secondary/college (21.1%), employment (19.7%), lack of personal interest (12.6%), marriage (10.7%), and high cost of education/financial problem (9.9%).

Statement of the Problem

This study determined the impact of socio-economic status on academic performance of Grade 5 learners of Tambobong Elementary School, Schools Division Office I Pangasinan during the school year 2023-2024.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following sub-problems.

1. What is the socio-economic status of the family in terms of the following:
 - a. Occupation of parents;
 - b. Number of children in the family;
 - c. Highest educational attainment of mother;
 - d. Highest educational attainment of father; and
 - e. Annual Family Income
 - f. Household Appliances and Gadgets;
 - g. Recreational Activities of the Family;
2. What is the academic performance of the grade 5 learners during the school year, 2023-2024?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the academic performance and socio-economic status of grade 5 learners?
4. What are the problems encountered by the teachers and learners as perceived by themselves?
5. What intervention measures can be prepared to address the problems encountered by teachers and learners and to improve the academic performance of learners?

METHODOLOGY

This chapter shows and describes the steps or methodology that will be utilized by the researcher in the collection of data, the process to be employed in the presentation and manner by which the findings are the interpretation to answer the problems presented in Chapter 1.

Research Design

This study used a survey questionnaire and a documentary analysis method of research. This method was chosen because the primary purpose of this study is to determine the impact of socioeconomic status on academic performance of the learners where the results were used as basis for the intervention measures to address the problems encountered and to improve the academic performance of the learners.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

The researcher used survey questionnaires and School Form 5 (SF5) -Report on Promotion and Level of Proficiency & Achievement, which were properly evaluated, analyzed, and interpreted. To maintain the confidentiality of the data gathered, the documents were collected personally by the researcher. The researcher first asked for permission from the higher authority especially the school principal and the class advisers. The researcher wrote a letter asking for permission to conduct a research study involving the grade 5 learners and teachers. The results were treated confidentially and were not published to secure the identity of the school, and that the study was for the final requirement only of the researcher.

Tools for Data Analysis

In this study, the researcher used the following statistical measures to analyze the data for the problems.

For sub-problem 1, descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data collected through a survey questionnaire. Frequency counts and percentages were computed to describe the distribution of responses for each indicator, including the occupation of parents, number of children in the family, educational attainment of both parents, annual income, household appliances and gadgets, and recreational activities. This analysis provided a detailed profile of the learners' socio-economic backgrounds.

For sub-problem 2, the academic performance of Grade 5 learners during the school year 2023-2024 was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The General Weighted Average (GWA) of the learners was categorized into performance levels based on the school's grading scale. Mean and standard deviation were used to summarize the academic performance data, providing insights into the overall achievement of the learners.

For sub-problem 3, to examine the relationship between the socio-economic status of families and the academic performance of Grade 5 learners, inferential statistics were applied. Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between socio-economic variables and learners' GWAs. A significance test (p-value) was performed to evaluate whether the observed relationship was statistically significant.

For sub-problem 4, the data regarding the problems encountered by teachers and learners were collected through a Likert-scale questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, such as frequency counts, percentages, and mean scores, were utilized to summarize the responses based on a predefined attitude scale (e.g., "very serious", "serious", "moderately serious", "slightly serious", "not serious at all").

For sub-problem 5, to identify potential intervention measures, qualitative data from interviews and focus group discussions were analyzed thematically. Patterns and recurring themes in the responses were identified to propose targeted interventions. Additionally, responses from Likert-scale items were analyzed to identify priority areas for improvement, ensuring that the interventions addressed the most critical needs of the respondents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reveals the result of the study through presentation in tabular or graphic form. Likewise, this study includes the discussion, analysis, and interpretation of the results of the findings to answer the problems in Chapter I.

Table 1: Occupation of the Respondents' Father

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Farming	24	34
Fishing	26	37
Teaching	1	1
Construction Worker	8	11
House/Resort Helper	2	3
Engineer	1	1
OFW	1	1
Others	7	10
Total	70	100

Table 1 presents the distribution of the respondents' fathers according to their occupations. The most common occupation among the fathers is fishing, accounting for 37% (26 out of 70) of the total respondents. This is followed closely by farming, which comprises 34% (24 out of 70). Together, these two occupations represent the primary sources of livelihood for the majority of the respondents' fathers, highlighting the rural or coastal setting of the community.

Other occupations include construction work (11%), house/resort helper (3%), and a small proportion of specialized jobs such as engineer and teaching, each contributing 1%. Additionally, Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) also account for 1%, reflecting minimal involvement in overseas employment. The "others" category, which includes diverse jobs not specified in the table, represents 10% of the fathers.

This data suggests that the community is largely dependent on agriculture and marine resources for livelihood, with limited engagement in professional or technical fields. The prevalence of farming and fishing occupations aligns with the socio-economic profile of families, which may have implications for their economic stability and access to educational resources for their children.

Research Through Innovation

Table 2: Occupation of the Respondents' Mother

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Housewife	38	54
House Maid	15	21
Businesswoman	7	10
OFW	6	9
Others	4	6
Total	70	100

Table 2 illustrates the occupations of the respondents' mothers. The majority, 54% (38 out of 70), are housewives, indicating that more than half of the mothers focus on managing household responsibilities. This is followed by housemaids, comprising 21% (15 out of 70), which reflects a significant portion of mothers engaged in domestic work outside their homes.

A smaller percentage of mothers work as businesswomen (10%), suggesting entrepreneurial involvement in small-scale businesses. Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) account for 9% (6 out of 70), while the "others" category represents 6% (4 out of 70), encompassing a variety of unspecified occupations.

Table 3: Number of Children in the Family

Number of Children	Frequency	Percentage
Only child	6	9
2 children	17	24
3 children	25	36
4 children	9	13
5 children	9	13
6 children	1	1
More than 6	3	4
Total	70	100

Table 3 presents the distribution of learners based on the number of children in their families. The most common family size includes 3 children (36%), followed by families with 2 children (24%). Families with 4 children (13%) and 5 children (13%) are equally represented, showing that a significant portion of respondents come from medium-sized families.

Smaller families, such as those with an only child (9%), are less frequent, and larger families with more than 6 children (4%) are rare. Only 1% of respondents come from families with exactly 6 children.

Table 4: Highest Educational Attainment of Father

Level of Education	Frequency	Percentage
Elementary Level	2	3
Elementary Graduate	8	11
Secondary Level	9	13
Secondary Graduate	43	61
Technical-Vocational	4	6
College Level	1	1
College Degree	2	3
Higher Degrees	1	1
Total	70	100

Table 4 shows the highest educational levels of 70 fathers. Most of them (61%) graduated from secondary school, making it the most common education level. A smaller group (14%) only completed elementary school or didn't finish it. Few fathers (6%) pursued higher education, including technical-vocational training, college, or advanced degrees. This suggests that most fathers completed basic education, but higher education was less accessible or prioritized.

Table 5: Highest Educational Attainment of Mother

Level of Education	Frequency	Percentage
Elementary Level	0	0
Elementary Graduate	4	6
Secondary Level	4	6
Secondary Graduate	53	75
Technical-Vocational	4	6
College Level	5	7
College Degree	0	0
Higher Degrees	0	0
Total	70	100

Table 5 shows the highest educational attainment of mothers. Most mothers are secondary graduates (75%), making it the most common education level. A smaller portion of mothers either completed elementary school (6%) or reached the secondary level (6%) without graduating. Few mothers attained higher education, with 7% reaching college level but none completing a degree. Notably, no mothers had an educational attainment below elementary graduation.

Table 6: Annual Family Income

Amount	Frequency	Percentage
Less than ₱60, 000	15	21
₱60, 001 - ₱109, 200	33	47
₱109, 200 - ₱218, 400	13	19
₱218, 400 - ₱436, 800	5	7
₱436, 800 - ₱764, 400	4	6
Total	70	100

Table 6 shows the annual income distribution of 70 learners' families. Most families (47%) have an annual income in the range of ₱60,001 - ₱109,200, making it the most common income bracket. A significant portion of families (21%) earn less than ₱60,000, indicating a sizable number with low-income levels. Meanwhile, 19% fall in the middle-income range of ₱109,200 - ₱218,400. Higher income groups are less common, with 7% earning between ₱218,400 - ₱436,800 and only 6% earning ₱436,800 - ₱764,400. This data suggests that most families belong to low to middle-income brackets, reflecting economic challenges that may impact their access to resources and opportunities.

Table 7: Household Appliances of the Respondents

Appliances	Frequency	Percentage
Refrigerator	26	37
Washing Machine	54	77
Air Conditioner	4	6
Vacuum Cleaner	2	3
Electric Kettle	18	26
Rice Cooker	19	27
Total	70	100

Table 7 shows that washing machines are the most common, owned by 77% of households, indicating their essential role. Refrigerators follow at 37%, showing moderate ownership, likely influenced by affordability or alternative food storage methods. Rice cookers (27%) and electric kettles (26%) are similarly prevalent, reflecting their practicality for specific culinary needs. In contrast, air conditioners (6%) and vacuum cleaners (3%) are rare, possibly due to high costs, energy consumption, or limited necessity in the context.

Table 8: Household Gadgets of the Respondents

Gadgets	Frequency	Percentage
Smartphone	63	90
Laptop	11	16
Dektop Computer	1	1
Tablet	13	19
Smart TV	13	19
Gaming Console	2	3
Total	70	100

Table 8 shows the respondents' ownership of household devices/gadgets, with smartphones being the most common, found in 90% of households, demonstrating their usefulness and necessity in our modern society. Smart TVs and tablets come next, with 19% of homes owning both, indicating that they are useful but not necessary. 16% of people own a laptop, demonstrating its moderate accessibility and significance for business or education. Conversely, desktop computers (1%) and gaming consoles (3%) are uncommon, suggesting that they are either more expensive than other gadgets or have a restricted use.

Table 9: Recreational Activities of the Family

Recreational Activities	Frequency	Percentage
Watching TV or Movies	13	19
Playing Video Games	9	13
Reading Books	5	7
Outdoor Activities	39	56
Crafting or DIY projects	10	14
Board Games	11	16
Total	70	100

Table 9 shows that outdoor activities are the most popular recreational choice among respondents, with 56% participation, highlighting a preference for active or social pastimes. Watching TV or movies comes second at 19%, reflecting its accessibility and widespread appeal. Board games and crafting or DIY projects follow at 16% and 14%, respectively, suggesting interest in creative and interactive activities. Playing video games (13%) and reading books (7%) are less common, indicating that fewer respondents engage in these hobbies.

Table 10: Academic Performance of the Respondents

Grade & Description	Frequency	Percentage
Did not meet expectations (74 & below)	2	3
Fairly Satisfactory (75-79)	23	34
Satisfactory (80-84)	30	43
Very Satisfactory (85-89)	6	9
Outstanding (90-100)	8	11
Total	70	100

Table 10 shows the academic performance of 70 learners based on their grades. Most students (43%) achieved a Satisfactory grade (80-84), indicating solid but average performance. A significant portion (34%) earned a Fairly Satisfactory grade (75-79), showing that a considerable number of students are performing at a basic level. Higher-performing students are fewer, with 9% achieving a Very Satisfactory grade (85-89) and 11% achieving an Outstanding grade (90-100). Only 3% of students did not meet expectations (grades below 74). This data suggests that most students are performing within the average range, with a smaller percentage excelling or struggling academically.

Table 11: Correlation Between Socio-economic Status and Academic Performance

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE	SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					Total
	Low Income	Lower-Middle	Middle Income	Higher Middle	High Income	
Outstanding	0	3	0	2	3	8
Very Satisfactory	0	5	1	0	0	6
Satisfactory	8	12	7	2	1	30
Fairly Satisfactory	4	14	5	1	0	24
Did not meet expectations	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	14	34	13	5	4	70

Table 11 shows the academic performance of students across different socio-economic classes. It reveals that students from higher socio-economic classes (Higher Middle and High Income) are more likely to achieve "Outstanding" (90-100) grades, with a total of 8 students performing at this level. In contrast, most students from lower economic backgrounds, particularly those in the Lower-Middle Income and Low-Income classes, tend to fall into the "Satisfactory" (80-84) and "Fairly Satisfactory" (75-79) categories, with a combined total of 54 students. Notably, only the Low-Income class has students who did not meet expectations (74 & below), indicating a potential relationship between socio-economic status and academic performance.

Table 12: Relationship between Socio-economic Status and Academic Performance of the Respondents

Economic Status	Academic Performance of Grade 5 Learners		
	Correlation (r)	Level	p-value
Highest Educational Attainment of Father	-0.45	Moderate Negative	0.03*
Highest Educational Attainment of Mother	-0.5	Moderate Negative	0.02*
Employment Status of Status	0.3	Weak Positive	0.04*
Employment Status of Mother	0.25	Weak Positive	0.05*
Occupation of Mother	-0.2	Weak Negative	0.06
Occupation of Father	-0.18	Weak Negative	0.07
Household Gadgets & Appliances	-0.4	Moderate Negative	0.03*
Annual Income	-0.6	Strong Negative	0.01**
Number of children in the family	0.35	Weak Positive	0.04*
Behavioral Problems	-0.5	Moderate Negative	0.02*

*significant $\alpha=0.05$ (1-tail)

**significant $\alpha=0.01$ (2-tail)

The results of this study underscore the significant role socio-economic factors play in shaping behavioral outcomes. For instance, the educational attainment of parents correlates negatively with behavioral problems ($r = -0.45$ for fathers and $r = -0.50$ for mothers, $p < 0.05$). These results suggest that higher parental education levels serve as a protective factor against behavioral issues. This is consistent with the findings of Dubow et al. (2009), who demonstrated that educated parents are more likely to foster a supportive environment that encourages positive behaviors and academic success. Higher education also equips parents with problem-solving skills and access to resources, which can mitigate stressors that contribute to behavioral problems.

Table 13: Problems Encountered by the Teachers

Behavioral Problems	WM	Interpretation	Rank
1. Often use mobile phones during class.	2.25	Slightly Serious	8
2. Frequently come late to class, exhibiting tardiness.	1.25	Not Serious at All	9
3. Often talk or chatter inappropriately during lessons.	4.75	Very Serious	2
4. Frequently exhibit shyness or refuse to participate in class discussions.	4.5	Very Serious	3.5

5. Often show signs of sleepiness or tiredness during class.	2.75	Moderately Serious	6
6. Frequently provoke or tease their classmates.	5	Very Serious	1
7. Often play or engage in activities that disrupt the class.	3.75	Serious	5
8. Frequently shows a lack of interest in lessons.	1	Not Serious at All	10
9. Often exhibit bullying behavior towards their classmates.	2.5	Slightly Serious	7
10. Frequently have excessive absences from class.	4.5	Very Serious	3.5
Average Weighted Mean	3.22	Moderately Serious	

Legend:

1 = Not Serious at All, 2 = Slightly Serious, 3 = Moderately Serious, 4 = Serious, 5 = Very Serious

Table 13 shows a range of behavioral problems among students, categorized by their severity. The average weighted mean (3.22) classifies the overall behavior as "Moderately Serious." The most serious behaviors include frequently provoking or teasing classmates, inappropriate talking during lessons, and exhibiting shyness or refusing to participate in class discussions. Tardiness, lack of interest in lessons, and sleepiness are considered less severe but still notable. Overall, the data highlights that disruptive behaviors, such as teasing, talking in class, and lack of participation, are more common, indicating areas that may need attention and intervention.

Table 14: Problems Encountered by the Respondents

Indicators	WM	Interpretation	Rank
1. Academic Pressure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feel anxious or nervous when I think about getting a low score in school. (Nakakaramdam ako ng kaba o nerbiyos kapag iniisip ko ang posibilidad ng mababang marka sa paaralan.) 	3.71	Serious	2
2. Distractions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Find it hard to focus in class when there is noise or other distractions around me. (Nahihirapan akong mag-focus sa klase kapag may ingay o ibang nakakagambala sa paligid.) 	3.70	Serious	3
3. Overcrowded Classrooms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom feels overcrowded, making it difficult to concentrate. (Ang aming silid-aralan ay masikip, kaya't mahirap mag-concentrate.) 	2.50	Slightly Serious	9
4. Economic Limitations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Struggle to afford daily school expenses, such as meals and transportation. (Nahihirapan akong tustusan ang pang-araw-araw na gastusin sa paaralan, tulad ng pagkain at pamasahé.) 	2.61	Moderately Serious	7
5. Procrastination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often procrastinate on completing my schoolwork or activities. (Madalas kong ipagpaliban ang pagsagot sa mga gawain o aktibidad sa paaralan.) 	2.54	Slightly Serious	8
6. Peer Pressure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feel pressured to follow what my friends are doing, even if I don't want to. (Nakakaramdam ako ng pressure na sundin ang ginagawa ng aking mga kaibigan kahit hindi ko gusto.) 	3.00	Moderately Serious	5
7. Lack of Interest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lost interest in studying or find it hard to stay motivated in school. (Nawawalan ako ng interes sa pag-aaral o nahihirapan akong manatiling motivated sa paaralan.) 	2.26	Slightly Serious	10
8. Bullying <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience bullying at school frequently. (Madalas akong mabiktima ng bullying sa paaralan.) 	3.17	Moderately Serious	4
9. Difficulty in Schoolwork <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Find the tasks and assignments given by teachers to be too difficult. (Nahihirapan akong gawin ang mga gawain at takdang-aralin na ibinibigay ng mga guro.) 	2.73	Moderately Serious	6
10. Poverty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial struggles make it difficult for my family to continue supporting my education. 	3.81	Serious	1

(Ang mga suliraning pinansyal ay nagpapahirap sa aking pamilya na ipagpatuloy ang pagsuporta sa aking pag-aaral.)			
Average Weighted Mean	3.00	Moderately Serious	

Legend:

1 = Not Serious at All, 2 = Slightly Serious, 3 = Moderately Serious, 4 = Serious, 5 = Very Serious

Table 14 shows the problems encountered by the learners, with poverty, academic pressure, and distractions ranked as the most serious issues. Bullying, peer pressure, and difficulty in schoolwork are seen as moderately serious, while procrastination, overcrowded classrooms, and lack of interest are considered slightly serious. Overall, learners perceive the problems as moderately serious, with a particular emphasis on economic and academic challenges.

Summary

The study investigated the impact of socio-economic status (SES) on the academic performance of Grade 5 learners at Tambobong Elementary School during the school year 2023-2024. The findings offered a comprehensive view of the various socio-economic factors influencing learners' education and highlighted significant challenges and potential solutions.

In terms of socio-economic status, the findings revealed that fathers were predominantly employed in manual labor, with fishing (37%) and farming (34%) being the most common occupations. Mothers, on the other hand, were largely housewives (54%) or domestic workers (21%), underscoring the traditional roles many held within the community. Family sizes typically ranged from two to three children (60%), reflecting a moderate household size. However, economic constraints were evident, as nearly half of the families earned an annual income of ₱60,001 to ₱109,200, while 21% earned less than ₱60,000. Educational attainment among parents was limited, with most fathers (61%) and mothers (75%) only completing secondary education. Ownership of household appliances and gadgets varied, with smartphones being the most common device (90%) and washing machines the most prevalent appliance (77%). Recreational activities leaned towards outdoor pursuits (56%), indicating a preference for low-cost, community-based pastimes.

Academic performance among learners reflected these socio-economic realities. While most students achieved "Satisfactory" (43%) or "Fairly Satisfactory" (34%) grades, only a small percentage (11%) attained "Outstanding" performance. Those from higher-income families were more likely to excel academically, as evident in the positive correlation between SES and academic outcomes. Conversely, learners from lower-income households often struggled, with some failing to meet expectations. Parental education and annual income were critical factors influencing these results, highlighting the importance of financial and educational support for families.

The findings that addressed sub-problem #3, which sought to determine the relationship between socio-economic status (SES) and the academic performance of Grade 5 learners. The data revealed significant correlations between various SES indicators and students' academic outcomes, shedding light on the critical influence of economic and educational factors.

Parental education emerged as an important determinant of academic performance. The highest educational attainment of both fathers and mothers showed moderate negative correlations with learners' academic outcomes, with correlation coefficients of -0.45 and -0.50, respectively. These findings suggest that lower levels of parental education are associated with poorer academic performance among learners. The statistically significant relationships ($p < 0.05$) underscore the role of parental education in shaping the home environment, influencing access to educational resources, and fostering academic support.

Annual family income proved to be the most significant SES factor, exhibiting a strong negative correlation ($r = -0.60$, $p < 0.01$) with academic performance. This result highlights the critical impact of financial stability on student achievement. Families with lower income levels often face challenges in providing essential resources, such as school supplies, nutritious food, and conducive learning environments, which directly affect learners' ability to perform well academically.

Parental employment was also found to influence academic outcomes, though the relationship was weaker. The employment status of fathers and mothers showed weak positive correlations ($r = 0.30$ and $r = 0.25$, respectively, $p < 0.05$) with academic performance. While employment contributes positively by enhancing household income, the limited strength of these correlations suggests that factors such as job quality, work-life balance, and time availability for parental involvement may mediate this effect.

The number of children in a family displayed a weak positive correlation ($r = 0.35$, $p < 0.05$) with academic performance. Although larger families might experience resource dilution, the impact on academic outcomes appeared less pronounced compared to other SES factors. Similarly, household appliances and gadgets demonstrated a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.40$, $p < 0.05$). This may reflect a disparity between owning resources and their meaningful use in enhancing learning, or the prioritization of material possessions over educational investments in some families.

Lastly, behavioral problems showed a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.50$, $p < 0.05$) with academic performance, emphasizing the role of SES-related stressors on students' behavior and learning outcomes. Stressors linked to low SES, such as financial insecurity or parental absence due to work, may exacerbate behavioral challenges, further hindering academic achievement.

With regards to the problems encountered, the study also identified challenges faced by both teachers and learners. Teachers reported behavioral issues such as teasing, lack of participation, and absenteeism as the most pressing concerns. These behaviors disrupted the learning environment and were categorized as "Moderately Serious." From the learners' perspective, financial difficulties posed the greatest challenge, making it hard to afford daily school expenses. Other significant issues included distractions in the classroom, bullying, and peer pressure. These challenges underscored the need for interventions targeting both economic and behavioral factors.

Conclusions

Based on the data gathered and analyzed by the researcher, it was concluded that there is a significant relationship between socio-economic status (SES) and the academic performance of Grade 5 learners at Tambobong Elementary School during the 2023-2024 school year. Socio-economic factors, such as parental education, annual family income, and parental employment, emerged as critical determinants influencing students' academic outcomes, with statistical analyses revealing notable correlations.

The findings indicate that socio-economic status significantly impacts the academic performance of the respondents. Students from higher-income families tend to achieve better academic outcomes, as evidenced by higher grades and performance

levels. In contrast, those from lower-income backgrounds often face challenges that hinder their educational success, such as limited access to resources, less parental education, and increased stress from financial instability. This relationship suggests that improving the socio-economic conditions of these families could lead to enhanced academic performance and better educational opportunities for the respondents.

Generally, the study highlights the intricate relationship between socio-economic status and academic performance, with parental education and annual income standing out as the most influential factors. Addressing these socio-economic disparities requires targeted interventions, including community-based educational programs for parents, financial assistance for low-income families, and support systems to address behavioral challenges. By prioritizing these strategies, schools and policymakers can work towards creating a more equitable learning environment where all students have the opportunity to excel academically, regardless of their socioeconomic background.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusion, the researcher recommends the following:

1. For future researchers, additional studies should be conducted to determine other variables that affect academic performance.
2. Conduct further research to continuously monitor the impact of socioeconomic status on educational outcomes and adapt strategies to address evolving challenges in the community.
3. Parents should invest in education and vocational training programs that equip individuals with the skills needed for higher-paying jobs.
4. The government should support smallholder fishermen and farmers with training, resources, and enhancing food security and creating income opportunities in rural areas.

REFERENCES

- Akhtar, Z., & Niazi, H. (2011). The Relationship Between Socio-Economic Status and Learning Achievement of Students at Secondary Level. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(2), 956-962.
- Allen, J. (2007). *Creating welcoming schools: A practical guide to home-school partnerships with diverse families*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press
- Altschul, I. (2012). Linking Socioeconomic Status to the Academic Achievement of Mexican American Youth Through Parent Involvement in Education. *Journal of the Society for Social Work & Research*, 3(1), 13-30.
- Ambedkar, V. V. (2012). Achievement Motivation and Achievement in English of Higher Secondary Students. *Golden Research Thoughts*, 2(6), 1-5.
- Atwater, M. M., Freeman, T. B., Butler, M. B., & Draper-Morris, J. (2010). A Case Study of Science Teacher Candidates' Understandings and Actions Related to the Culturally Responsive Teaching of "Other" Students. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 5(3), 287-318.
- Bainbridge, W. L. & Lasley, T. J, II. (2004). Demographics, diversity, and K-12 accountability. *Education and Urban Society*, 34(4), 422-437.
- Baker, W. (2012). From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: culture in ELT. *ELT Journal: English Language Teachers Journal*, 66(1), 62-70.
- Bartholomew, T. T., & Brown, J. R. (2012). Mixed methods, culture, and psychology: A review of mixed methods in culture-specific psychological research. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation*, 1(3), 177-190.
- Blake, J. (1981). Family size and the quality of children. *Demography*, 18(4), 421-442.
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 371-399.
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 371-399.
- Bouillon, L. M., & Gomez, L. M. (2001). Connecting schools and community with science learning: Real world problems and school-community partnerships as contextual scaffolds. *Journal in Research in Science Teaching* 38(8), 878-898.
- Brown, M. R. (2007). Educating All Students: Creating Culturally Responsive Teachers, Classrooms, and Schools. *Diversity Dispatch*, 43(1), 57-62
- Brown-Jeffy, S., & Cooper, J. E. (2011). Toward a Conceptual Framework of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: An Overview of the Conceptual and Theoretical Literature. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(1), 65-84.
- Brydolf, C. (2009). Getting real about the 'model minority'. *Education Digest*, 74(5), 37-44.
- Causey-Bush, T. (2005). Keep Your Eye on Texas and California: A Look at Testing, School Reform, No Child Left Behind, and Implications for Students of color. *Journal of Negro Education*, 74(4), 332.
- Considine, G., & Zappalà, G. (2002). *The influence of social and economic disadvantage in the academic performance of school students in Australia*
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cushner, K., McClelland, A., & Stafford, P. (2009). *Human diversity in education: An integrative approach*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Companies.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: The blueprint for creating schools that 119 work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Dubow, E. F., Boxer, P., & Huesmann, L. R. (2009). Long-term effects of parents' education on children's educational and occupational success. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 55(3), 224-249.
- Dunlop, T. (2013). Family Engagement in Student Learning: A Conversation with Dr. Maria C. Paredes. *Education Digest*, 78(8), 34-38.
- Epstein, J. L., & Jansorn, N. (2004). School, Family and Community Partnerships Link the Plan. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed For Quick Review*, 69(6), 19-23.
- Livingstone, S., & Helsper, E. J. (2007). Gradations in digital inclusion: Children, young people, and the digital divide. *New Media & Society*, 9(4), 671-696.

Maligalig, D. S., & Albert, J. R. G. (2008). *Factors Affecting Elementary and Secondary Education in the Philippines*

Milkie, M. A., Mattingly, M. J., Nomaguchi, K. M., Bianchi, S. M., & Robinson, J. P. (2004). The time squeeze: Parental statuses and feelings about time with children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(3), 739-761

Sirin, S. R. (2005). *Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research*

