ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan363

Literature Review on Socio-Demographic Variables and Their Impact on Educational Outcomes

Jecca Marie C. Malicay[1]; Marvin Gomez[2]; Hermie B. Cordita[3]

[1]Faculty Member, San Juan National High School, DepEd -Division of Bayugan City, DepEd Division of Bayugan City
[2]Faculty Member, Agusan Del Sur National Science High School, DepEd-Division of Agusan Del Sur
[3]Faculty Member, Magsaysay National High School, DepEd-Division of Agusan Del Sur

[1]ORCID: 0009-0000-3492-7515
[3]ORCID: 0009-0007-8500-0120

Publication Date: 2026/01/17

Abstract: This literature review explores the critical role of socio-demographic variables—such as age, gender, socioeconomic status (SES), parental education, school type, and geographical location—in shaping students' educational experiences and outcomes, specifically focusing on mathematics achievement and Project-Based Learning (PBL) environments. Methodologically, this review synthesizes qualitative and quantitative studies to identify causal influences and pathways that link these variables to academic success. The findings emphasize the need for educators and policymakers to consider these factors when designing equitable instructional strategies to enhance student engagement and learning outcomes.

Keywords: *Socio-Demographic Variables, Educational Outcomes, Project-Based Learning, Mathematics Achievement, Age, Gender, Socioeconomic Status, Parental Education.*

How to Cite: Jecca Marie C. Malicay; Marvin Gomez; Hermie B. Cordita (2026) Literature Review on Socio-Demographic Variables and Their Impact on Educational Outcomes. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(1), 863-865. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan363

I. INTRODUCTION

Socio-demographic variables—age, gender, socioeconomic status (SES), parental education, school type, and area of residence—are consistently recognized as key determinants of educational success. These variables shape students' opportunities, engagement, and achievement levels, particularly within educational frameworks such as Project-Based Learning (PBL). This literature review synthesizes research findings on how these factors causally influence educational outcomes, particularly in mathematics.

II. METHODOLOGY

This literature review employed a systematic approach to identify and analyze relevant empirical studies published in peer-reviewed academic journals. The search encompassed databases like Google Scholar, JSTOR, ERIC, and SpringerLink, focusing on publications from the last two decades that relate socio-demographic variables to educational outcomes, especially in PBL contexts. Key terms such as "socio-demographic variables," "educational outcomes," "Project-Based Learning," and "mathematics achievement" were utilized. After screening for quality criteria, including study design, sample size, and relevance, selected studies were categorized by socio-demographic variable and analyzed for findings, methods, and implications.

- *Age*

Age significantly correlates with cognitive development, learning capabilities, and readiness for student-centered pedagogies such as PBL. According to Piaget's theory (1972) students move through distinct cognitive stages that affect their engagement with complex tasks. Research by Jackson and Smith (2019) indicates that older students exhibit improved critical thinking skills, facilitating their success in self-directed learning and PBL settings. Consequently, age influences engagement depth and learning outcomes in mathematics, with older students better equipped to navigate the demands of PBL compared to younger learners who require guided support.

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan363

➢ *Gender*

Gender differences significantly impact learning preferences, motivation, and academic performance. Meta-analytic data from Lindberg et al. (2010) shows that while the mathematics performance gap between genders has narrowed, differences in attitudes toward collaborative versus competitive learning environments persist. Females tend to thrive in collaborative settings integral to PBL, while males may engage more in competitive contexts. Gendered social factors, including stereotypes, also influence self-efficacy and motivation, which are pivotal mediators of educational success in PBL (Eccles & Wang, 2016). Thus, the emphasis should be on minimizing stereotype threats and fostering an inclusive learning environment.

➢ *Socioeconomic Status (SES)*

Among the socio-demographic variables, SES stands out as one of the most significant predictors of educational achievement. Studies, including those from the National Center for Children in Poverty (2018), illustrate that students from higher SES backgrounds often enjoy better access to educational resources, technology, and enrichment opportunities, translating into superior academic performance. In contrast, students from lower SES backgrounds typically face barriers that hinder their academic success (Reardon, 2011). This SES disparity particularly affects engagement and performance in resource-intensive pedagogies like PBL, emphasizing the necessity for schools to provide compensatory supports (Davis-Kean, 2005).

➢ *Parental Education Level*

Parental education levels strongly influence children's academic success via multiple pathways, including expectations, involvement, and the home learning environment. Research by Davis-Kean (2005) suggests that higher parental education is associated with greater student engagement and performance, especially in supportive contexts like PBL. Children whose parents possess higher educational attainment tend to receive robust academic support, such as assistance with project work. This relationship is causal, as changes in parental education levels correspond with systematic variations in student outcomes (McNeal, 1999).

➢ *Type of School*

The type of educational institution significantly affects quality and outcomes. Private schools typically provide more resources, smaller class sizes, and greater curricular flexibility, enhancing opportunities for PBL activities (Coleman et al., 1982). In contrast, public schools often grapple with budget constraints that limit resource allocation for innovative teaching methods. Studies illustrate that alternative learning systems designed for marginalized students may struggle with resource limitations, necessitating thoughtful adaptation of PBL to align with their unique needs (Wen et al., 2013). Therefore, the type of school is a crucial determinant of the effectiveness of educational experiences.

➢ *Area of Residence*

Geographical location plays a vital role in educational access and quality. Urban students often benefit from proximity to resources such as well-endowed schools and community partners that enhance PBL experiences, while rural students may confront challenges like teacher shortages and limited access to technology (Heckman, 2008; Noble, 2017). These disparities necessitate context-sensitive policies that consider geographical inequities, ensuring that all students have fair opportunities to engage in effective PBL and achieve desired learning outcomes.

III. CONCLUSION & IMPLICATIONS

The literature reviewed underlines a clear causal relationship between socio-demographic variables and educational outcomes, particularly in mathematics achievement and PBL environments. Recognizing that age, gender, SES, parental education, school type, and area of residence substantially influence students' engagement and academic success is crucial for educators and policymakers.

PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Differentiate PBL Design by Developmental Level: Tailor project complexity and autonomy according to age to maximize engagement and learning.

Minimize Gender Stereotyping: Design inclusive PBL tasks that ensure equitable participation and mitigate stereotype threats.

Compensate for SES Gaps: Provide necessary resources and support for students from lower-SES backgrounds to participate fully in PBL.

Adapt PBL for Diverse Environments: Modify project designs to accommodate low-resource settings, utilizing community partnerships and low-tech materials.

Tailor Approaches to Geography: Implement place-sensitive PBL strategies, including remote mentorship and leveraging local assets to enrich learning experiences.

Future research should focus on experimental and longitudinal studies isolating the effects of specific socio-demographic moderating factors on PBL outcomes, as well as large-scale evaluations of equity-focused PBL adaptations, particularly in underserved regions. Mixed-method research exploring perceptions across demographic groups could also inform culturally and contextually responsive PBL designs.

REFERENCES

[1]. Brusilovsky, P., & Millán, E. (2007). User models for adaptive hypermedia and adaptive educational systems. In P. Brusilovsky, A. Kobsa, & W. Nejdl (Eds.), *The adaptive web* (pp. 3–53). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-72079-9_1

[2]. Coleman, J. S., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S. (1982). *High school achievement: Public, Catholic, and private schools compared.* Basic Books.

[3]. Davis-Kean, P. E. (2005). The influence of parent education and family income on child achievement:

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan363

The indirect role of parental expectations and the home environment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*(2), 294–304. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.19.2.294

[4]. Eccles, J. S., & Wang, M. T. (2016). Cultural and contextual influences on student development and school engagement. *International Journal of Educational Psychology, 5*(2), 185–206. https://doi.org/10.17583/ijep.2016.2130

[5]. Heckman, J. J. (2008). Schools, skills, and synapses (NBER Working Paper No. 14064). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w14064

[6]. Jackson, C., & Smith, J. (2019). Age-related differences in learning motivations among students engaged in project-based learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 111*(4), 765–780. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000312

[7]. Lindberg, S. M., Hyde, J. S., Petersen, J. L., & Linn, M. C. (2010). New trends in gender and mathematics performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*(6), 1123–1135. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021276

[8]. Lubienski, S. T., Crane, C. C., & Lubienski, C. (2009). Charter, private, public schools and academics: New evidence from the ECLS-K. *National Center for Education Statistics*. https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2009045

[9]. McNeal, R. B. (1999). Parental involvement as social capital: Differential effectiveness on academic achievement. *Social Forces, 78*(1), 117–144. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/78.1.117

[10]. Noble, K. (2017). The impact of geographic location on educational equity: A critical review. *Educational Research Review, 23*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2017.08.002

[11]. Piaget, J. (1950/1972). *The psychology of intelligence* (M. Piercy & D. E. Berlyne, Trans.). Routledge.

[12]. Reardon, S. F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In R. Murnane & G. Duncan (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality and the uncertain life chances of low-income children* (pp. 91–116). Russell Sage Foundation Press.

[13]. Wen, Z., Xu, Y., & Zhao, L. (2013). Exploring the effectiveness of alternative learning systems in marginalized communities: Challenges and outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Development, 33*(6), 607–615. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2013.03.001