

Persistence of Parent and Non-Parent College Students: A Comparative Study

Dr. Claire H. Lacerna
College of Education
San Agustin Institute of Technology
Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines

Grace Syril M. Corpuz
College of Social Work
San Agustin Institute of Technology
Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines

Analyn G. Logronio
College of Social Work
San Agustin Institute of Technology
Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines

Leo Mari R. Castro
College of Social Work
San Agustin Institute of Technology
Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines

Ella M. Trazo
College of Social Work
San Agustin Institute of Technology
Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines

Abstract:- The purpose of this quantitative comparative study was to determine the factors that contribute to the persistence among undergraduate college students in San Agustin Institute of Technology who are parents compared to those students who are not parents. The study employed a descriptive research design. Descriptive statistics such as frequency count, percentage, mean and standard deviation and t-test were used. The study took place in San Agustin Institute of Technology with one hundred thirty-one (131) respondents. To achieve the objectives of the study, an adapted questionnaire was used. Significant findings of the study revealed that majority of the respondents are between 21 to 24 years old, female, enrolled in Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) course, and mostly are non-parent college students. The level of persistence of parent college students of San Agustin Institute of Technology is extremely high. Similarly, the level of persistence of non-parent college students is also extremely high. However, a significant difference on the level of persistence of the parent college students and non-parent college students is found. Henceforward, amidst the changing educational landscape, institutions need to focus on efforts to persistence strategies for the parent college students.

Keywords:- Persistence; Non-Parent College Student; Parent College Student.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Rationale of the Study

The number of parent college students has risen in recent years as a result of the options and opportunities that people should have once their degrees are completed. As a result, many parents and non-parent college students continue their studies despite the conflict, particularly for parents who are pursuing post-secondary education. Due to their roles as parents in their separate households, it was a significant challenge for the parents to complete their education. They must know how to use and manage their time wisely as parents

take care of their children, especially if they have a busy schedule.

The level of persistence of parent college students in the Philippines has increased, considering the difficulty they face every day because of the duties they have in their families, as well as the education of their children (Roland, Frenay, & Boudrenghien, 2016). Student-parent, pursuing their schooling was quite a challenge, but with the support of their family, it would be helpful for them to continue their schooling and gain some strength. When the student-parents were studying in college, their children's age had a huge effect on the student's progress, since they also handled their duties as mother and wife at home (Lovel, 2011). It would be moiling to balance the duty of a student and a parent; however, certain student-parents have strategies about how to manage their time and cope with stress. Strategies on managing it were very necessary for their well-being as well as their work in their respective homes due to their loaded schedule being a parent and student. The objective or common goal would be to seek a better life, not for themselves, but for their children, who are their motivation in their hard work.

Time and stress management, double job (work at home and child), family support, and loaded schedules are the most common problems and issues about the persistence of non-parent college students, especially the parent college students in San Agustin Institute of Technology. Most of these parent college students are having a hard time leaving their kids at home balancing academics and child care. Different duties of raising children, housework, and earning would not give them enough time for themselves, which results in additional burden, pressure, and stress that may cause them not to continue their studies.

Based on the previous studies mentioned above, the current researchers believe that a substantial study on how to enhance persistence among parent and non-parent college students in pursuing college degrees is needed. This time, the contributing elements influencing levels of persistence will be

explored in terms of their possible impact on college exit. However, no studies on the similarities and differences in terms of explaining decision-making among students attending and leaving college have been undertaken yet. This is one of the reasons for conducting this study.

B. Objectives and Hypothesis

Generally, this study aims to evaluate the significant difference between the persistence of parent college students and non-parent college students. Specifically, this study aims to identify the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, course, year and status; determine the level of persistence of the parent college students; identify the level of persistence of the non-parent college students; and examine whether persistence differs among the college students when grouped according to parent and non-parent. Meanwhile, the null hypothesis tested at 0.05 level of significance states that, "There is no significant difference on the persistence of the college students when grouped according to parent and non-parent."

II. METHODS

A. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach using a descriptive-comparative research design. It utilized an adapted survey questionnaire to gather the data. This is a design where the researchers consider two variables (not manipulated) and establish a formal procedure to compare and conclude that one is better than the other if significant difference exists. In contrast to experimental studies, the researchers do not monitor or manipulate any of the variables, only observing and measuring those (MacCombes, 2019). The researchers opted to use this design since the researchers aim to: (1) describe the data gathered from the respondents, (2) investigate the level of persistence between parent and non-parent college student, and (3) examine whether parent and non-parent college students significantly differ in persistence.

B. Research Locale

This study was conducted at San Agustin Institute of Technology (SAIT), Fr. Caroselli Street, Valencia City, Bukidnon. This school is a private Catholic institution founded by an Italian missionary priest, Fr. Manlio Caroselli, S.J. in 1960. The school has elementary, high school, and college department.

C. Population and Sample

The respondents of the study were the parent and non-parent college students in San Agustin Institute of Technology, Valencia City, Bukidnon. The researchers intended to choose them as the respondents of the study since the focus of the present study is on their persistence. Non-probability sampling particularly complete enumeration due to the least identified number of student parents. Using Raosoft – an online sample size calculator, the researchers selected 61 parents and 70 non-parent college students out of 834 total population.

D. Research Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study was adapted from the study of Lovell (2011) entitled, "Motivation and Persistence of College Students Who Are Parents Compared to Non-Parent College Students." The first part of the questionnaire consists of the demographic profile in terms of age, gender, course year, and status. The second part aims to measure the level of persistence of the respondents. After all of the corrections during the proposal defense have been integrated and the researchers submit their questionnaire for checking and reliability testing. It obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.910 described as highly reliable.

E. Scoring Procedure

The respondents were able to answer the instrument for the persistence using a five-point Likert scale. Below is a tabular presentation of the scale used with its limits, description, and interpretation.

Scale	Limits	Description	Interpretation
5	4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	This means that the level of persistence of the respondents is extremely high.
4	3.41 – 4.20	Agree	This means that the level of persistence of the respondents is high.
3	2.61 – 3.40	Neutral	This means that the level of persistence of the respondents is neither high nor low.
2	1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	This means that the level of persistence of the respondents is low.
1	1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	This means that the level of persistence of the respondents is extremely low.

F. Data Collection

The researchers asked permission from the College Dean by writing a communication letter at the onset of the study. Given the permission, the researchers immediately asked for the consent of the respondents for the conduct of the study. The researchers tabulated the responses of the respondents after retrieving the questionnaires. After that, the data were submitted to a statistician for statistical analysis. The researchers then interpreted the findings by the time they obtained the statistical analysis results.

G. Statistical Treatment

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to answer the research questions of this study. To answer research objective number 1, frequency count and percentage was used. Meanwhile, to answer research objectives number 2 and 3, mean and standard deviation was used and to answer research objective number 4, t-test was used.

H. Ethical Consideration

The researchers ensured that ethical protocols are followed throughout the study process. Prior to the conduct of the study, approval from the College Dean and Program Head, as well as approval from the respondents, was obtained. Respondents were fully briefed about the study's goals as well as any potential risks associated with its implementation. Participants were asked to take part in the research, but they were never forced to do so if they decline. In other words, the researchers made certain that all respondents who completed the questionnaires do so willingly. The researchers took steps to ensure that the respondents' identifiable information was kept private and confidential. The respondents' personal details were not disclosed. There were no falsified or fabricated data in the report. Deception of any sort was avoided. Moreover, the researchers have their manuscript checked in a plagiarism software to ensure that their thesis is original. They strictly follow all ethical guidelines to produce a high-quality and ethically-bound report.

III. RESULTS

A. Demographic Profile

Table 1.1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age. The table shows that most respondents are **21-24 years old** comprising **76 (58%)** of the total number of samples. This is closely followed by respondents who are **25-28 years old** and above comprising **31 (23.7%)** of the total number of samples. Meanwhile, **13 (9.9%)** of the respondents are **29 years old** and above, **11 (8.4%)** are **17-20 years old** respectively.

Table 1.1: Frequency distribution of respondents' age.

Indicators	Frequency	Percent
17-20 years old	11	8.4
21-24 years old	76	58.0
25-28 years old	31	23.7
29 years old and above	13	9.9
Total	131	100

Table 1.2 displays the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of gender. It can be gleaned that most respondents are female comprising **106 (80.9%)** of the total number of samples. Meanwhile, males as respondents comprise **25 (19.1%)** of the total number of samples.

Table 1.2: Frequency distribution of respondents' gender.

Indicators	Frequency	Percent
Male	25	19.1
Female	106	80.9
Total	131	100

Shown in Table 1.3 is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of course. The table presents that most respondents are **BEED** comprising **55 (42%)** of the total number of samples. This is followed by respondents who are **BSBA** comprising **32 (24.4%)** of the total number of samples. Meanwhile, there are **21 (16%)** respondents who are **BSSW**, **13 (9.9%)** **BSOA**, **8 (6.1%)** **BSM** and **2 (1.5%)** are **BTVTED**.

Table 1.3: Frequency distribution of respondents' course.

Indicators	Frequency	Percent
BEED	55	42.0
BSSW	21	16.0
BTVTED	2	1.5
BSOA	13	9.9
BSBA	32	24.4
BSM	8	6.1
Total	131	100

Footnote:

BEED- Bachelor of Elementary Education

BSSW-Bachelor of Science in Social Work

BTVTED- Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education

BSOA-Bachelor of Science in Office Administration

BSBA-Bachelor of Science in Business Administration

BSM-Bachelor of Science in Midwifery

The frequency distribution of respondents in terms of year level is presented in Table 1.4. It is displayed that most of the respondents are third-year comprising **53 or 40.5%** of the total sample. This is followed by second-year comprising **36 or 27.5%** of the total respondents. Meanwhile, **29 or 22.1%** of the respondents are fourth-year, and only **13 or 9.9%** are in their first-year.

Table 1.4: Frequency distribution of respondents' year level.

Indicators	Frequency	Percent
First Year	13	9.9
Second Year	36	27.5
Third Year	53	40.5
Fourth Year	29	22.1
Total	131	100

Presented in Table 1.5 is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of status. The table shows that **61 or 46.6%** of the respondents are parent and **70 or 53.4%** are non – parent.

Table 1.5: Frequency distribution of respondents' status.

Indicators	Frequency	Percent
Parent	61	46.6
Non-Parent	70	53.4
Total	131	100

B. Level of Persistence of the Parent College Students

Table 2.1 presents the level of persistence of the parent-college students in terms of decision to attend college, with a total mean of **4.29** and a standard deviation of **0.45** described as **“strongly agree.”** It must be noted that the indicator/item, **“I decided to attend college to get a better job”** got the highest mean of **4.84** with a standard deviation of **0.61** described as **“strongly agree.”** Meanwhile, **“I do not have difficulty with studying my subjects”** got the lowest mean of **3.39** with a standard deviation of **0.86** described as **“agree.”**

Table 2.1: Level of persistence of the parent-college students in terms of decision to attend college.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. I decided to attend college to get a better job.	4.84	0.61	Strongly Agree
2. I decided to attend college for my family.	4.79	0.61	Strongly Agree
3. I have been motivated to get high paying job in the future.	4.56	0.76	Strongly Agree
4. I decided to attend college for myself achievement.	4.54	0.85	Strongly Agree
5. Despite of too many other demands outside of school, I am willing to attend classes and comply needed assignment, project, researches and other requirements.	4.33	0.70	Strongly Agree
6. A mentor/role model encouraged me to go to school.	4.16	0.73	Agree
7. I need more computer skills for better career.	4.08	0.80	Agree
8. I am here because my current job needs college skills.	3.93	1.09	Agree
9. I do not have difficulty with studying my subjects.	3.39	0.86	Agree
Overall Mean	4.29	0.45	Strongly Agree

Table 2.2 shows the level of persistence of the parent-college students in terms of classroom experiences, with a total mean of **4.21** and a standard deviation of **0.49** described as **“strongly agree.”** It must be noted that the indicator / item, **“The courses are challenging”** got the highest mean of **4.64** with a standard deviation of **0.68** described as **“strongly agree.”** Meanwhile, **“I know and feel comfortable talking to my professor”** got the lowest mean of **3.82** with a standard deviation of **0.81** described as **“agree.”**

Table 2.2: Level of persistence of the parent-college students in terms of classroom experiences.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The courses are challenging.	4.64	0.68	Strongly Agree
My professors are helpful.	4.33	0.65	Strongly Agree
The content is relevant.	4.31	0.65	Strongly Agree
My professor's effort is high in teaching.	4.30	0.59	Strongly Agree
My participation is valued.	4.18	0.89	Agree
Professors are interested in my development.	4.08	0.76	Agree
My professor is reasonable in demands.	3.97	0.68	Agree
I know and feel comfortable talking to my professor.	3.82	0.81	Agree
Overall Mean	4.21	0.49	Strongly Agree

Table 2.3 presents the level of persistence of the parent-college students in terms of student services on campus; with a total mean of **3.86** and a standard deviation of **0.69** described as **“agree.”** It must be noted that the indicator / item, **“Scholarship/subsidy programs in the school are already available”** got the highest mean of **4.34** with a standard deviation of **0.89** described as **“strongly agree.”** Meanwhile, **“Subsidy provided by CHED is on time”** got the lowest mean of **3.28** with a standard deviation of **0.95** described as **“agree.”**

Table 2.3: Level of persistence of the parent-college students in terms of student services on campus.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Scholarship/subsidy programs in the school are already available.	4.34	0.89	Strongly Agree
Counseling services on campus are adequate.	3.95	0.69	Agree
Subsidy provided by CHED is on time.	3.28	0.95	Agree
Overall Mean	3.86	0.69	Agree

Table 2.4 displays the level of persistence of the parent-college students in terms of goals. It obtained a total mean of **4.62** and a standard deviation of **0.69** described as **“strongly agree.”** It must be noted that the indicator/item, **“I will eventually achieve my academic goals”** got the highest mean of **4.62** with a standard deviation of **0.69** described as **“strongly agree.”** Meanwhile, **“I will not be forced to stop college even when encountered family problem”** got **4.15** mean with a standard deviation of **1.06** described as **“agree.”**

Table 2.4: Level of persistence of the parent-college students in terms of goals.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. I will eventually achieve my academic goals.	4.62	0.69	Strongly Agree
2. I will earn my degree from this college.	4.54	0.56	Strongly Agree
3. I will not transfer to another college.	4.23	0.97	Strongly Agree
4. I will not stop attending college even for one semester.	4.20	0.95	Agree
5. I will not be forced to stop college even when encountered family problem.	4.15	1.06	Agree
Overall Mean	4.35	0.69	Strongly Agree

C. Level of Persistence of the Non-parent College Students

The level of persistence of the non-parent college students in terms of decision to attend college is presented in Table 3.1. It has a total mean of **4.44** and a standard deviation of **0.61** described as “**strongly agree.**” It must be noted that the indicator/item, “**I decided to attend college to get a better job**” got the highest mean of **4.87** with a standard deviation of **0.34** described as “**strongly agree.**” Meanwhile, “**I do not have difficulty with studying my subjects**” got the lowest mean of **3.60** with a standard deviation of **0.89** described as “**agree.**”

Table 3.1: Level of persistence of the non-parent college students in terms of decision to attend college.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. I decided to attend college to get a better job.	4.87	0.34	Strongly Agree
2. I decided to attend college for my family.	4.84	0.37	Strongly Agree
3. I decided to attend college for myself achievement	4.60	0.60	Strongly Agree
4. I have been motivated to get high paying job in the future.	4.59	0.60	Strongly Agree
5. Despite of too many other demands outside of school, I am willing to attend classes and complied needed assignment, project, researches and other requirements.	4.57	0.55	Strongly Agree
6. A mentor/role model encouraged me to go to school.	4.54	0.67	Strongly Agree
7. I need more computer skills for better career	4.37	0.80	Strongly Agree

8. I am here because my current job needs college skills.	4.00	1.14	Agree
9. I do not have difficulty with studying my subjects	3.60	0.89	Agree
Overall Mean	4.44	0.40	Strongly Agree

Table 3.2 shows the level persistence of the non-parent college students in terms of classroom experiences with a total mean of **4.71** and a standard deviation of **0.54** described as “**strongly agree.**” It must be noted that the indicator/item, “**The courses are challenging**” got the highest mean of **4.71** with a standard deviation of **0.54** described as “**strongly agree.**” Meanwhile, “**I know and feel comfortable talking to my professor**” got the lowest mean of **3.99** with a standard deviation of **0.83** described as “**agree.**”

Table 3.2: Level of Persistence of the non-parent college students in terms of classroom experiences.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. The courses are challenging	4.71	0.54	Strongly Agree
2. My professor's effort is high in teaching.	4.51	0.58	Strongly Agree
3. My participation is valued	4.43	0.60	Strongly Agree
4. The content is relevant	4.36	0.66	Strongly Agree
5. My professors are helpful	4.31	0.67	Strongly Agree
6. Professors are interested in my development.	4.27	0.66	Strongly Agree
7. My professor is reasonable in demands.	4.21	0.63	Strongly Agree
8. I know and feel comfortable talking to my professor.	3.99	0.83	Agree
Overall Mean	4.35	0.49	Strongly Agree

Table 3.3 displays the level of persistence of the non-parent college students in terms of services on campus with a total mean of **4.14** and a standard deviation of **0.57** described as “**agree.**” It must be noted that the indicator, “**Scholarship/subsidy programs in the school are already available**” got the highest mean of **4.64** with a standard deviation of **0.51** described as “**strongly agree.**” Meanwhile, “**Subsidy provided by CHED is on time**” got the lowest mean of **3.47** with a standard deviation of **1.05** described as “**agree.**”

Table 3.3: Level of the Non-parent College Students in Terms of Student Services on Campus.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. Scholarship/subsidy programs in the school are already available.	4.64	0.51	Strongly Agree
2. Counseling services on campus are adequate.	4.30	0.75	Strongly Agree
3. Subsidy provided by CHED is on time.	3.47	1.05	Agree
Overall Mean	4.14	0.57	Agree

The level of persistence of the non-parent college students in terms of students' services on campus is displayed in Table 3.4. It obtained an overall mean score of **4.51** and a standard deviation of **0.58** described as **"strongly agree."** It must be noted that the indicator, **"I will earn my degree from this college"** got the highest mean of **4.59** with a standard deviation of **0.65** described as **"strongly agree."** Meanwhile, **"I will not transfer to another college"** got the lowest mean of **4.46** with a standard deviation of **0.93** described as **"agree."**

Table 3.4: Level of Persistence of the Non-parent College Students in Terms of Goals.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. I will earn my degree from this college.	4.59	0.65	Strongly Agree
2. I will not stop attending college even for one semester	4.53	0.74	Strongly Agree
3. I will eventually achieve my academic goals	4.49	0.68	Strongly Agree
4. I will not be forced to stop college even when encountered family problem.	4.49	0.81	Agree
5. I will not transfer to another college.	4.46	0.93	Agree
Overall Mean	4.51	0.58	Strongly Agree

D. Level of Persistence When Grouped According to Status of Non-parent and Parent College Students

Table 4 shows the t-test analysis of students' persistence when grouped according to status in terms of non-parent and parent college students. T-test analysis was done to determine the difference of persistence between non-parent and parent college students.

Table 4: T-test analysis of student persistence when grouped according to status.

Indicators	Mean	SD	T-value	Prob (sig)
Parent	4.17	0.37	3.162	0.002**
Non-Parent	4.36	0.30		

** significant at 0.01

Non-parent got a mean of **4.36** and the parent with **4.17**. The computed T-value is **3.162** which means **"significant."** This means that the persistence of non-parent and parent college students in San Agustin Institute of Technology is different. Therefore, the null hypothesis that states, **"There is no significant difference between the non-parent and parent college students of San Agustin Institute of Technology,"** is rejected because it is proven in this study that there is a significant difference between non-parent and parent college students.

IV. DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents a thorough discussion on the implications of the results of the study. The discussion is organized according to the presentation of the results in the previous chapter.

A. Demographic Profile

The distribution of the respondents by age is shown in Table 1.1. The majority of the respondents belong to the age bracket of 21-24 years old with 76 or 58.0% of the respondents since most of them are third-year students. In this age, they further experienced interacting with the formal and informal, and social and academic components of the institution. Moreover, the retention time they spent in this institution gives them a chance to be closer to fulfilling their degree. This finding is supported by the study of Tinto (1993) which states that longitudinal model of institutional departure aids in understanding the relationship that exists between students and institutions before they enroll in education, as well as the outcome of persistence in earning a degree or dropping out. Its central concept is "integration," which asserts that whether a student persists or drops out is strongly predicted by their level of academic and social integration. These change over time as integration and commitment interact, with dropouts based on commitment at the time of decision.

Table 1.2 presents the distribution of the respondents by gender. It shows that the highest frequency are the 106 females or 80.9%. There has been a rapid growth in the gender disparity in education over the last few decades, coinciding with a significant increase in educational attainment. The increase in women's population accounts for a large portion of this growth. Women gradually caught up to men's population levels and attained higher levels of education than men. Whereas there were more boys than girls enrolled in and getting a degree from tertiary education decades ago, a greater increase in the female population over the past decades has resulted in the convergence of female and male patterns, first in most industrialized countries and then in an increasing number of developing countries. Female enrollment rates in tertiary education have tripled globally between 1995 and 2018, growing at a faster rate than male enrollment over the same period. Peterson (2015) said that different problems that arise in schools may have something to do with why women outnumbered men in the education settings. It can be because boys are less focused and less interested in any schoolwork. In consequence, fewer of them enroll in colleges and universities. This was also affirmed in the research for the Higher Education Policy Institute that girls and boys often have

different attitudes and personalities toward academic (Hillman & Robinson, 2016).

The distribution of the respondents' course is revealed in Table 1.3. It shows that most of the respondents are Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) students with 55 or 42.0%. This indicates that the majority of respondents want to teach because of the decent salary and benefits that they will get from the government, especially now that the Duterte administration has implemented a salary increase for teachers in 2019. According to a 2017 article published in Philstar Global, teaching is an attractive profession because of the wide range of jobs available, the job security that comes with many of them, and the improved pay for government teachers in recent years. Aside from that, education graduates have a multitude of job options. It is not just restricted to the classroom. The Commission on Higher Education's (CHED) priority disciplines includes teacher education and business administration.

Teaching is seen as a socially useful and vital work for altruistic-intrinsic reasons. It also includes components of the job itself, such as teaching children and a desire to teach a certain school subject. Many studies suggest that intrinsic motivation is one of the key reasons people choose to teach. In this sense, "intrinsic career value" denotes those students have innate desire to teach and actually like it. Similarly, if we are concerned with promoting people into teaching, it is believed that finding out the qualities of those who are interested or not interested in teaching is useful (Coulthard & Kyriacou, 2002).

Student's instructors, according to Ozbek (2007), pick their careers based on personal criteria rather than economic and social factors. Furthermore, some studies say that students select teaching as a job because it is a self-sufficient profession, while others believe that they may stay young in this profession. Furthermore, while some applicants believe that raising their children in this profession is easier than raising them in any other, others have ideological views such as influencing future generations (Hillman & Robinson, 2016). According to several studies, student instructors are motivated to enter the profession for mostly extrinsic reasons (Chan, 1998). Extrinsic factors include financial, service, and social status considerations. Students are interested in teaching as a career, and teaching is typically seen as a preferred and respected occupation (Lai, Ko, & Li, 2000). Students who are interested in teaching consider teaching as a career because of the huge contribution it makes to society, as well as the decent pay and working conditions it provides.

Table 1.4 shows the distribution of the respondents according to their year level. It shows that majority of the respondents are third year with 40.5%. The third-year level got the highest frequency since they had the highest enrollees in the past school year and they constituted the larger population in San Agustin Institute of Technology. During the academic year 2018-2019, nearly 1.3 million higher education students enrolled in SUCs, according to the Commission on Higher Education (CHED). According to the Philippine Association of State Universities and Colleges (PASUC), 44,069 college students at state universities and colleges (SUCs) would not

enroll for the academic year 2020-2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic in the country. Fear of infection, financial difficulties, a lack of devices, and their location in relation to the institution are all common factors. Meanwhile, "remote asynchronous" refers to students studying at their own pace without the need for internet access.

Table 1.5 displays the distribution of respondents according to their status. The table shows that 70 or 53.4% are non-parents. This revealed that non-parent college students had the highest frequency, implying that the majority wanted to complete their education in order to help their parents and achieve more in life. Some factors also are due to strict parents, and most of them believe that being single has fewer burdens than being a parent college student. While parent college students had the lowest frequency, this indicates that they want to finish college due to the responsibilities of having a child to support, as well as a desire to assist their parents. Parent college students either single parent living with children, living with significant other and children, married with children were most of the problem in terms of persistence due to their role and responsibilities (Mahaffey, Hungerford, & Sill, 2015). Thus, the result shows that non-parent college students have a high rate of persistence in their academics than parent college students. Due to their responsibilities, it seems that student-parent can easily depart from school. They have to divide their responsibility as a parent also as a student, that is why most of them stop attending school.

The bulk of the respondents were between the ages of 21 and 24, owing to our culture's expectation that students who do not have children or a family to help their parents and siblings after graduation continue their education. Filipinos are sensitive, in part because they follow Christianity, which requires them to marry before starting a family. However, no one is perfect; after all, there are still parents who pursue their studies despite their circumstances; sometimes, people are motivated by their children, so there are still parents who continue their education; however, non-parent students are more persistent than parent students, based on our respondents' results.

B. Level of Persistence of the Parent College Students

Table 2.1 presents the level of persistence of the parent-college students in terms of decision to attend college, with a total mean of 4.29 and a standard deviation of 0.45 described as "strongly agree." This means that respondents in San Agustin Institute of Technology demonstrate a positive attitude, which they want to complete a degree to have a better future. They are motivated to complete a degree in order to have a better future, support their own families, and repay their parents for their motivational support. Furthermore, they believed that a better education would open doors to opportunities that would ensure a successful career and eventually lift them out of poverty. The enormous sacrifices they make in order to complete their studies despite obstacles give them the determination to succeed. There is no better motivation to finish college and to appreciate the marrow of the experience than a child whose future depends on your decisions. This finding is parallel to the findings of the study conducted by Astone (1993) which revealed that hope for their

children's education in the future encourages persistence toward their degree attainment because parents do not want their children to experience the hardships of supporting a family without an education.

For the parent college students, their persistence was depending on their family which gave them a reason so that soon they can support their children financially. Life is too hard without a stable job, as a result many parents continue their studies to have a brighter future for themselves and especially for their family.

C. Level of Persistence of the Non-parent College Students

Table 3.1 displays the level of persistence of the non-parent college students in terms of decision to attend college with a total mean of 4.87 and a standard deviation of 0.61 described as "strongly agree." This means that non-parent college students in San Agustin Institute of Technology have a positive attitude towards completing a degree so that they can secure their future. Student-parents are less likely to persist in school and are less likely to enroll as full-time students compared to non-parent college students. Non-parent college students were able to find long-term balance in their academic and employment needs, while parents were statistically less likely to continue working (Carney-Crompton & Tan, 2002).

Non-parent college students who usually have fewer external demands off-campus usually have more time for their schooling. In terms of emotion, non-parent college students found higher psychological functioning in satisfaction than parent college students. This suggested that, despite having fewer sources of support on campus, their psychological functioning to continue attending college may be higher than that of parent college students. Furthermore, they have the support of their family. Friends and relatives have a significant impact on their academic persistence and achievement of their desired goals. As a result, non-parent college students are freer to pursue their academic goals.

D. Level of Persistence When Grouped According to Status in terms of Non-parent and Parent College Students

Presented in Table 4 is the t-test analysis of students' persistence when grouped according to status, with a total mean of 4.36 and a standard deviation of 0.30 described as "significant." This means that non-parent college students have higher levels of persistence compared to parent college students in San Agustin Institute of Technology. College can be difficult for student-parents at times, and they must respond and find ways to cope with difficulties and responsibilities as they balance school, taking care of their child, and extra work outside of school, whereas non-parent college students do not have the same responsibilities and burdens as parent college students. It is consistent with literature that parent students typically have greater constraints on their time. Greater persistence to continue attending college may be necessary to attain parents' goals as they balance multiple roles off-campus compared to non-parent students. Being single or a non-parent student is the moment in life when you will experience the most personal progress. You are still discovering out who you

are, and you cannot do so unless you are alone with yourself, your aspirations, and your objectives.

According to the findings, there is a significant difference between parent and non-parent college students in terms of persistence. As a result, the first null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in respondents' persistence when divided into parent and non-parent college students, is rejected.

This finding is supported by the conducted study of Haleman (2004), that parent college students describe their persistence to degree completion throughout their parental roles. Though they were time-pressed due to the short time that they had, parent college students were motivated and dared to continue in their studies because of their children, who were the reasons for their hard work and consistency in school. When compared to parent college students, non-parent college students have more free time, while parent college students' schedules are overburdened. Non-parent college students have significantly higher rates of academic persistence. The instructors' presence has also played a significant role for non-parent college students, and it is one of their reasons for attending class every day (Mahmodi & Embranzade, 2015).

Competing for employment commitments, family and child care responsibilities, and school barriers, particularly for parent college students, making it difficult to stay in school (Battle, 2007). However, with the support of a family member, there is a good probability that they will be more motivated in their academics.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the study's findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

As a result, majority of college students are between the ages 21 to 24, females, and are in their third year of Bachelor of Elementary Education. In terms of persistence, non-parent college students felt themselves to be participative, competent and connected with others. The total result is regarded as strongly agree or the persistence of the respondents is extremely high. This suggests that non-parent college students are more active and have the highest rate of persistence in continuing their academic careers. The level of persistence of parent and non-parent college students obtained an overall descriptive rating of strongly agree, and the non-parent has a larger chance of continuing their academic career since they have more time and do not have obligations such as child care. As a result, non-parent college students at San Agustin Institute of Technology were the most influential. Through each student's support, there is a good chance that both parents and non-parent students will finish their studies. As a result, the null hypothesis which asserts, "there is no significant difference on the persistence of the college students when grouped according to parent and non-parent," is rejected because there is a significant difference between these variables in this study.

Moreover, most freshmen parent college students were still adjusting in terms of their academics owing to the burdens they had in their household, particularly in their duty as a parent to their children. Parent college students balanced their studies, but also pursued academic consistency and done their best to help their children and families (Peterson, 2015).

Furthermore, there was a substantial difference in the level of persistence of non-parent college students against parent college students at San Agustin Institute of Technology. The implication is that parent and non-parent college students' persistence is influenced by their behavior in school. The more parent college students participate in numerous school activities; the more attention they receive for the way they express themselves to others. The theories employed in this study backed up the findings and aid in analyzing the difference between students and institutions before enrolling in education that was stated in Tinto's retention theory, as well as the result of persistence in earning a degree or dropping out, which show that failing to complete a stage of Erikson's psycho-social development theory effectively can result in a diminished ability to complete following stages and, as a result, an unhealthy personality and sense of self which is a big factor that can change their academic performance and result in them not pursuing a degree.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the conclusions, the following recommendations were drawn by the researchers.

For the college students, they must always show respect towards the parent college students in their perspective in life. Also, teachers and staffs should continue to boost parent college students' self-esteem and social involvement by recognizing their hard work and accomplishments, especially those who are not particularly good at academics. In addition, guidance counselor should organize a gender sensitivity seminar at least once a year to raise awareness and advocate for equality. Also, he/she should constantly welcome students who require assistance, particularly parent college students who are experiencing difficulties at school.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Anderson, L. S. (2008). Predictors of parenting stress in a diverse sample of parents of early adolescents in high-risk communities. *Nursing Research*, 57(5), 340–350. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.nnr.0000313502.92227.87>
- [2]. Astone, N. M. (1993). Are adolescent mothers just single mothers? *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 3(4), 353–371. Retrieved from ERIC Montana State University.
- [3]. Battle, L. S. (2007). "I wanna have a good future": Teen mothers' rise in educational aspirations, competing demands, and limited school support. *Youth & Society*; 38; 348 – 371.
- [4]. Brown, R.L., & Amankwaa, A. A. (2007). College females as mothers: Balancing the roles of student and motherhood. *The ABNF Journal*, Winter, 25-29. Retrieved from **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**
- [5]. Brooks, R. (2014). Social and spatial disparities in emotional responses to education: Feelings of 'guilt' among student-parents. *British Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 505–519. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3154>
- [6]. Bryan, E., & Simmons, L. A. (2009). Family involvement: Impacts on post-secondary educational success for first generation Appalachian college students. *Journal 116 of College Student Development*, 50 (4), 391-402. Retrieved from ERIC Montana State University.
- [7]. Burt, M. R., & Nightengale, D. S. (2010). *Repairing the U.S. social safety net*. Washington: The Urban Institute Press.
- [8]. Carney-Crompton, S., & Tan, J. (2002). Support systems, psychological functioning, and academic performance of nontraditional female students. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 52(2), 140-155. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.proxybz.llib.montana.edu>
- [9]. Chan, K. W. (1998). *The role of motives in the professional development of student teachers*. EdUHK Research Repository. <https://repository.eduhk.hk/en/publications/the-role-of-motives-in-the-professional-development-of-student-te-5>.
- [10]. Chartrand, J. M. (1990). A causal analysis to predict the personal and academic adjustment of nontraditional students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37(1), 65–73. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.37.1.65>
- [11]. Coulthard, M., & Kyriacou, C. (2002). Does teaching as a career offer what students are looking for? In I. Menter, M. Hutchings, & A. Ross (Eds.), *The Crisis in Teacher Supply*. Research and strategies for retention. Stoke on Trent: Trentham.
- [12]. Deater-Deckard, K. (2004). *Parenting stress*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- [13]. Erikson, E. (1994). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- [14]. Friedman, B. A., & Mandel, R. G. (2010). The prediction of college student academic performance and retention: Application of expectancy and goal setting theories. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 11(2), 227-246. Abstract retrieved from **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**
- [15]. Halem, D. L. (2004). Great expectations: Single mothers in higher education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17(6), 769–784. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839042000256448>
- [16]. Hatcher, R. (1998). Class differentiation in education: Rational choices? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 19(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142569980190101>
- [17]. Hillman, N., & Robinson, N. (2016). *Boys to men: The underachievement of young men in higher education and how to start tackling it*. Oxford, England: Higher Education Policy Institute. <https://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Boys-to-Men.pdf>.
- [18]. Jennings, P. K. (2004). "What mothers want: Welfare reform and maternal desire." *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 31(3), Article 7. Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol31/iss3/7>

- [19]. Lai, K., Ko, K., & Li, C. (2000). Teaching as a career: A perspective from Hong Kong senior secondary students. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 31(3), 153–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607470500168974>
- [20]. Leinonen, J., Solantaus, T., & Punamaki, R. (2003). Social support and the quality of parenting under economic pressure and workload in Finland: The role of family structure and parental gender. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 17(3), 409–418. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.17.3.409
- [21]. Lindsay, T. N. (2019). Exploring single-mother college students' perceptions of their college-related experiences and of campus services. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 66(3), 188–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07377363.2018.1537657>
- [22]. Lovell, E. D. (2011). *Motivation and persistence of college students who are parents compared to non-parent college students* (Doctoral dissertation, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana). Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.montana.edu/xmlui/handle/1/1753>.
- [23]. Luyckx, K., Goossens, L., & Soenens, B. (2006). A developmental contextual perspective on identity construction in emerging adulthood: Change dynamics in commitment formation and commitment evaluation. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(2), 366–380. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.366>
- [24]. McCombes, S. (2019). *Descriptive research*. Retrieved on September 28, 2019 from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/descriptive-research/>
- [25]. Mahaffey, B. A., Hungerford, G., & Sill, S. (2015). College student mother needs at regional campuses: An exploratory study. *Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio Journal*, 21, 105–115.
- [26]. Mahmodi, M., & Ebrahimzade, I. (2015). The analysis of Iranian students' persistence in online education. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v16i1.1982>
- [27]. Morris, E. A., Brooks, P. R., & May, J. L. (2003). The relationship between achievement goal orientation and coping style: Traditional vs. nontraditional college students. *College Student Journal*, 37(1), 3–8. Retrieved from PsycInfo database.
- [28]. Ozbek, R. (2007). The perceptions of the efficiency degree of personal, economic and social factors in preferring the teaching profession of teacher candidates. *Firat University Journal of Social Sciences*, 17(1), 145–159.
- [29]. Peterson, S. (2015). Community college student-parents: Priorities for persistence. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 40(5), 370–384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1065210>
- [30]. Piaget, J. (1936). General implications of theories of cognitive development for teachers. *Cognitive Development Today: Piaget and His Critics*, 120–124. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446280591.n12>
- [31]. Riel, R. T. (2007). Educational alternatives for marginalised youth. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 34(3), 53–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03216865>
- [32]. Ritchie, R. A., Meca, A., Madrazo, V. L., Schwartz, S. J., Hardy, S. A., Zamboanga, B. L.,... & Lee, R. M. (2013). Identity dimensions and related processes in emerging adulthood: Helpful or harmful? *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 69(4), 415–432. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.21960>
- [33]. Roland, N., Frenay, M., & Boudrenghien, G. (2016). Understanding academic persistence through the theory of planned behaviour: Normative factors under investigation. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 15, 1–21.
- [34]. Sander, L. (2008). Blue-collar boomers take work ethic to college. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(19), A1–A22.
- [35]. Svinicki, M. D. (1999). New directions in learning and motivation. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 80, 5–27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.8001>
- [36]. [36] Schroeder. (2019). Community college student-parents: Priorities for persistence. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 40(5), 370–384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1065210>
- [37]. Taniguchi, H., & Kaufman, G. (2007). Belated entry: Gender differences and similarities in the pattern of nontraditional college enrollment. *Social Science Research*, 36(2), 550–568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2006.03.003>
- [38]. Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [39]. Wiebe, B. S., & Harvey, C. D. H. (1997). “I’m going to make the effort”: How mothers become successful university students. *Canadian Home Economics Journal*, 47(4), 155–159. Retrieved from PsycInfo database.