

CAUSES OF STUDENT SUCCESS IN SCHOOL

Šejla Bjelopoljak, Bernadin Ibrahimpašić and Arijana Midžić*

University of Bihać, Faculty of Education
Bihać, Bosnia and Herzegovina

DOI: 10.7906/indecs.21.6.2
Regular article

Received: 14 September 2022.
Accepted: 21 November 2023.

ABSTRACT

The article presents the contribution of socio-demographic, socio-economic, employment status and level of education of parents/guardians to students' school success. The aim of this article is to discover the causes of school (un)success given the contribution of predictor variables. The predictor set of variables consists of four scales: socio-demographic status (total number of brothers, total number of sisters, marital status of parents, distance from home to school and number of members households), socio-economic status (total monthly income of parents/guardians, place to study in the house/apartment, possession of laptop/computer, constant internet access in the house/apartment and the way they come to school), employment status of parents/guardian and educated status of parent/guardian. In addition to the set of predictors, a criterion variable was used, which consists of three dimensions, namely school success at the end of the sixth, seventh and eighth grade of primary school. The results of the research confirm a statistically significant correlation between socio-demographic, socio-economic, employment status and the level of education of parents/guardians and school success of children, provided that socio-demographic status has a higher predictive power on students' school success. It was confirmed that students have a positive attitude about the importance of the grade as well as that they perceive that their parents have the same attitude.

KEY WORDS

school success, socio-economic status, socio-demographic status, employment status, level of education

CLASSIFICATION

JEL: C1, I2

*Corresponding author, *η*: ari_jana_91@windowslive.com; -;
Faculty of Education, University of Bihać, Luke Marjanovića bb, 77000 Bihać, Bosnia and Herzegovina

INTRODUCTION

In the school, evaluation/assessment of students' knowledge, skills, abilities and their application is carried out in the function of monitoring the overall progress during and at the end of the knowledge assessment period (continuous, quarterly, semi-annual and at the end of the year. For many docimologists, the question of valuation objectives is an essential question of assessment, i.e. evaluation of knowledge. This question arises [1] in the form of doubts about the justification of valuation procedures, whatever they may be, in education. The next step of these reflections is that each evaluation procedure contains an unpleasant moment of „pedagogical relationship“. As an argument for this, it is stated that it is difficult to achieve that the roles of educators and evaluators are aligned in one person. It is also pointed out that this opposite, mismatch, is even more strongly manifested when the pedagogue should evaluate his students „in continuity“ and finally assess which grade on a numerical or descriptive scale best represents the student's school performance. This, it is believed, is basically the fact that evaluation, evaluation, is one of the most difficult tasks. Students are supported by continuously evaluating the conditions that enable better learning. In a traditional class, the evaluation of a student's work is considered the final part of teaching during which the teacher gives the final judgment of how much the student knows, how much he can and what grade he/she has earned. Such a form of assessment that takes place at the end of the processing of a thematic unit and / or the educational period using tests, control tasks, knowledge tests and / oral tests and which is always expressed by numerical and / or descriptive assessment - is called summative assessment, most often present in the current school system. Research shows that summative assessment has very little or no positive effect on either student learning or teacher teaching quality as opposed to a combination of diagnostic and formative assessment [2]. When a student receives a low grade based on traditional, summative forms of assessment, it is most often included in the final sum of grades (entering the grade point average) even when the student has “corrected” the grade or improved his knowledge, which is often justified by “evaluating the student's effort” even though this is done without clear criteria. However, despite the ambiguity and inconvenience, the question of grading is nevertheless repeatedly presented as an indispensable task that pedagogues cannot refuse to perform. Although the previous aspects of grading and examples are extreme, and although the situations of final school success of students are not caused only by grading, nevertheless, in the overall reflections on the pedagogical function of assessment, the effect of the assessment on the developmental flows of the young personality should be taken into account. This aspect is particularly considered in the article through the analysis and measurement of the impact of additional factors, given that it has been confirmed that the socio-demographic status and socio-economic status of the family with a special focus on the number of household members and parental employment further reinforce the starting differences among students, complicating the process of achieving school success.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In practice, it is common for school success to be operationalized in different ways and equated with the notions of school performance, school competencies and abilities. When it comes to evaluating school success, it is usually reduced to forms of assessment, and it is accompanied by additional collection of information in order to encourage the progress of children from the current level of knowledge to reach expectations. School success also refers to educational outcomes, and outcomes on the purpose and goals of the subject in accordance with the expectations of students to understand and apply what they have learned.

Socio-demographic status means the social circumstances in which the child grows up, while socio-economic means the material and technical conditions of the family as a community.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Some studies [3] use a concluding grade from individual subjects as well as general success, while others [4] use students' self-assessment of their own achievement. Although standardized tests are used as a measure of success in addition to concluding grades and general success, Keith's [5] research showed that there is a greater correlation between student characteristics and success when the criterion variable uses a final score rather than when standardized tests are used. Anaya [6] also states that a concluding grade is not the best indicator of success because it does not take into account students' previous success. Also, the final grade is not a standardized measure, so it is difficult to compare grades obtained from different school subjects. Research also uses assessments that involve a combination of assessment measures by researchers, teachers and parents, and self-assessment and peer assessment measures [7]. Therefore, it would be good to use a combination of different measures of success, which relate to cognitive and metacognitive teaching strategies. The methodological advantage of using more success indicators improves the validity and reliability of measurements, but can also lead to an increase in errors in statistical inference, and it is necessary to take into account the use of appropriate statistical methods. Research shows that the demographic characteristics of the family as well as socio-economic status, family structure, marital status, specific characteristics of parents/guardians, family size, and family environment further complicate the overall process of school success because they directly affect students' starting positions [8-10]. According to [11] socioeconomic status is defined by family financial income, parental qualifications (highest educational attainment), and occupation-related status. Some research has shown that parents of middle economic status most often emphasize initiative and autonomy, while parents of lower economic status most often encourage conformism. This way of thinking reflects on the first jobs and work experience that students will have, the skills they will develop, and ultimately what jobs they will do when they grow up [12, 13]. The results of research by [14] point to the conclusion that children of parents who work in the field of health care most often want to continue their education in that field, in contrast to students whose parents did manual work. Some authors [15] define socioeconomic status as "a relative position within a social hierarchy depending on access to or availability of financial resources, power, and social prestige". This definition is related to the three-part operationalization, in which the most important predictors of educational success are examined family income and education and occupation of parents [16]. Socio-economic status is not operationalized in the same way in all surveys, as it includes several measures: parent education, income, parent employment, parent occupation, parent performance within occupations, their position in society. Nevertheless, the general conclusion is that income, parental education and their occupation together better represent socio-economic status than each of these measures separately. Research also shows that students living in better socio-economic conditions achieve better schooling success [17-20]. Socio-economic status has proven to be one of the strongest predictors of school success. The results of meta-analyzes showed that the correlation between socio-economic status and school success averaged around $r = 0,3$ [20, 21]. It was found that based on knowledge of socio-economic status, we can predict 10% of the variance in school success [22] and that this is the most consistent and stable indicator in relation to other variables. However, these studies also confirm that, in addition to the socioeconomic status variable, it is recommended to combine two or more indicators since most of the variance was explained through other factors, i.e. regression models: (1) parent education (meeting children with developmentally appropriate books, reading and interpretation of what was read), (2) cultural capital (possession of linguistic competencies and cultural preferences in the form of influencing the academic way of thinking and visiting museums, theatres with parents), (3) possession of cultural goods (making and owning works of art, home library of manuscripts, books and historical documents), (4) income of parents (economic power of the family through

the financial aspect: the possibility of buying equipment and materials, securing excursions, additional teaching resources). Other variables taken into account such as the characteristics of teachers, schools, teaching and principals have shown no significant contribution in explaining students' educational achievements.

When it comes to gender as a personal determinant of school success, research shows that the gender of the child plays an important role, so according to [23, 24] girls achieve better school performance compared to boys. Research suggests that parents are also more involved in girls' school work than boys [25] and have higher expectations of school success than girls [26]. This contribution to parental involvement through an increased focus on girls' academic achievement sought through parental expectations under the influence of social norms related to gender role in education, and the importance of taking into account the context of families with beliefs, social context and cultural factors with regard to the climate that shapes families. Research conducted in Barking and Dagenham in East London showed a link between children's success in school and parental employment, and [27] conducted a survey among 620 children ages 13 to 15 to determine the link between family life and school success. The children filled out a questionnaire and kept a diary of home activities at home for a week, including a description of the time spent with each of the parents. After two years, the authors collected data on the success of the same children in school. Research has shown that several factors affect the overall success of children in school: the financial situation of the family, ambition in terms of education, mother's support and parental employment. Authors in [28] concludes that children achieve better success in school if both parents are employed, but that success is somewhat lower in children whose both parents work full time, while [29, 30] found that children of more educated parents (guardians) achieve better results in school on average. A study [31] found a significant correlation between the father's educational level, family income, and housing conditions and the student's success in school.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF RESEARCH

METHOD OF WORK

In order to define a sufficiently focused subject area of research, for the purposes of this article we have singled out predictor variables by which we want to examine their contribution to student success in school. A predictor set of variables consists of four scales: socio-demographic status (total number of brothers, total number of sisters, marital status of parents, distance from home to school and number of household members), socio-economic status (total monthly income of parents/guardians, place to study at home/apartment, possession of laptop/computer, constant internet access in the house/apartment and the way they come to school), parental employment (parent/guardian employment status) and educated parent/guardian status. In addition to the set of predictors, a criterion variable was used, which consists of three dimensions, namely school success at the end of the sixth, seventh and eighth grade of primary school.

The aim of the research is to examine the causes of school (un)success given the contribution of predictor variables. For this purpose, three tasks were set aside. The *first task* was to examine the correlation between the socio-economic and socio-demographic status of parents/guardians and the school performance of students in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades. Two hypotheses were tested:

H₁: It is assumed that there is a correlation between the socio-economic, socio-demographic status of parents and school student success.

H₂: Socio-demographic status of the family has a greater power to contribute to student success than socio-economic.

The second task was to examine the attitudes of the student on the importance of assessment and their perception of parents' attitudes, taking into account the gender variable. One hypothesis was tested:

H₃: It is to be assumed that students have a positive attitude about the importance of the grade as well as that they perceive that their parents have the same attitude, regardless of the gender of the students.

Quantitative – qualitative paradigm prevails in the research. Three research methods were applied in the research, namely descriptive, correlation and causal.

JASPO.16.1 statistical software was used for data processing, which includes other open source software components such as SPSS. SPSS served partial calculations of individual contributions of tested hypotheses. Taking into account the distribution of results, parametric statistics measures were used, and the characteristics of the stratified sample were explained by descriptive statistics measures.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

After obtaining the consent of parents and competent educational institutions, the created e-instrument "Causes of students' school success" was applied, which contains instructions on giving answers and expressing students' views. The reliability of predictor subscales was tested by calculating the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, and was confirmed based on its value of 0,86. The subscales of individual subjects (0,97) and student success in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades (0,94) have a high level of reliability.

STATISTICAL SAMPLE

The research sample is stratified and includes 1252 primary school students (VI, VII and VIII grades), which largely exceeds the required statistical minimum. The research was conducted in the schools of Una-Sana Canton. The research is transversal and empirically based on character. Table 1 contains overview of the characteristics of the variables.

Table 1. Characteristics of the variable – level of education of parents.

Education	Mother		Father	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
No school	77	6,2	30	2,4
Elementary School	428	34,2	284	22,7
High school	554	44,2	715	57,1
University degree	75	6,0	85	6,8
College and more	118	9,4	138	11,0
Total	1252	100,0	1252	100,0

The characteristics of the sample show that more mothers (34,2%) than fathers (22,7%) have completed only primary school, while this relationship is reversed if we take into account high school. 6,2% of mothers and 2,4% of fathers have not finished primary school. Data for university degree and college of parents are approximately the same (15,4% and 17,8%).

According to Table 2, 78,8% of fathers in the sample were employed, as opposed to only 39,0% of mothers. Unemployed mothers from the survey sample are 56,6%, while fathers are 13,1%. This implies a higher employment rate of fathers, which can be understood as one of the consequences of the data from the previous table which shows the level of education of parents.

Additional analysis of summative assessment, Table 3, reveals that teachers in the eighth grade have a slightly milder assessment criteria $M = 4,10$, $s = 0,9$, than in the sixth ($M = 4,04$, $s = 0,9$) and seventh ($M = 4,01$, $s = 0,9$). Frequencies of Table 3 shows a slight growth trend in the

Table 2. Characteristics of the variable – working status of parents.

Work status	Mother		Father	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Unemployed	709	56,6	164	13,1
Occasionally employed	68	5,4	93	7,4
In a permanent employment relationship	413	33,0	885	70,7
Employed and does not receive a salary	8	0,6	9	0,7
Retired	9	0,7	39	3,1
Other	45	3,6	62	4,9
Total	1252	100,0	1252	100,0

Table 3. Characteristics of the student success variable.

Grades	Eighth grade		Seventh grade		Sixth grade	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1	9	0,7	7	0,6	3	0,2
2	46	3,7	50	4,0	65	5,2
3	271	21,6	335	26,8	312	24,9
4	417	33,3	397	31,7	372	29,7
5	509	40,7	463	37,0	500	39,9
Total	1252	100,0	1252	100,0	1252	100,0

number of students with very good and excellent results, while among students with sufficient and good results this trend is reversed, ie. in older grades they score better. The number of students with negative success is negligible (smaller than 1%).

In the analysis of student success by gender, Table 4, although the differences are negligible and range within statistical error, it can be observed that in sixth grade girls perform better than boys while in older grades boys perform better. The result obtained is that the boys in the eighth grade do not have negative grades unlike girls, we find it interesting to support future checks and research.

Table 4. Student success by gender and grade.

	Eighth grade		Seventh grade		Sixth grade	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Valid	582	670	582	670	582	670
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4,05	4,03	4,01	4,00	4,09	4,10
Std. Deviation	0,92	0,95	0,94	0,91	0,91	0,91
Minimum	2,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0
Maximum	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0	5,0

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE OBTAINED RESULTS

CORRELATION OF SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC, SOCIO-ECONOMIC, EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF PARENTS/GUARDIANS WITH THE SCHOOL SUCCESS OF STUDENTS IN SIXTH, SEVENTH AND EIGHTH GRADE

Based on standard regression analysis, the magnitude of the contribution of perceived socio-demographic status, socio-economic status, employment status and level of education of parents/guardians to the school success of students in *sixth, seventh and eighth grade* was evaluated. All variables in the regression model were decomposed into the first principal component, and the factor scores were expressed in the form of regression scores. Based on the

correlation matrix for the set of variables included in the regression model, it was determined that all predictor variables statistically significantly correlate with the dimensions of school success of students in sixth, seventh and eighth grade. Although the registered correlations are statistically significant, it should be emphasized that the magnitude of the correlation is relatively modest. By testing the first hypothesis, we find that school success in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades of primary school is poorly correlated with variables: *total number of sisters, marital status of parents, number of household members, total monthly income, place to study at home/ apartment, computer/laptop , way of traveling from home to school, working status of mother, level of education of mother and father*, and correlation coefficients range from $r = -0,02$ to $r = -0,08$. *Father's working status, constant internet access to the house/apartment, distance from the house to the school and the total number of brothers* are variables whose correlation coefficients exceed the order of $r = 0,10$, which indicates a small but still *statistically significant correlation* with school success at the end of sixth, seventh and eighth grade. If we consider that the sample was explained by 70,7 % of employed fathers and 32,5 % of employed mothers, it seems clear why school success did not correlate with the sample of 32,5 % of employed mothers. The aforementioned data imply that the first hypothesis is accepted, with it we assumed *that there is a correlation between socio-economic, socio-demographic status of parents, employment status and level of education of parents / guardians and school performance of students*. A statistically significant difference shows that the observed variables with the school success of students best correlate the employment relationship of the father, and constant Internet access to the house/apartment, the distance from home to school and total number of brothers.

All variables that represent the starting positions operationalized by socio-demographic status, socio-economic status, employment status and level of education of parents/guardians are statistically significantly correlated with each other. As there is no distortion multicollinearity conditions followed the recommendation of leading authors in the field to include all variables in the regression model that do not share more than half of the common variance [32]. As no significant cases of multicollinearity disturbances have been registered in any of the four predictive models, the obtained models can be treated as reliable. A detailed overview of the diagnosis of collinearity is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Multicollinear diagnostics: tolerance coefficients and variance increase factors for regression models of school performance assessment from sixth to eighth grade.

Model	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)		
Total number of brothers	0,871	1,148
Total number of sisters	0,874	1,144
Marital status of parents	0,940	1,064
Distance from home to school	0,915	1,093
Number of members of your household	0,789	1,268
Total monthly income of parents/guardians	0,872	1,146
A place to study in the house/apartment	0,964	1,037
Owning a computer/laptop	0,969	1,032
Constant internet access in the house/ apartment	0,925	1,081
Way to come to school	0,958	1,044
Mother's working status	0,959	1,043
Father's working status	0,856	1,168
Mother's education	0,882	1,134
Father's education	0,880	1,136

The basic question regarding the relations of starting positions (operationalized through socio-demographic, socio-economic and work status of parents/guardians, and the level of education of parents/guardians) is how much these variables contribute to the possibility of predicting school success in sixth, seventh and eighth grade students. In order to answer the question, four successive models were created with the simultaneous use of predictor variables.

How is the average correlation (father's work status, constant internet access in the house/apartment, distance from home to school and total number of brothers) predictor variables with a criterion above the order of magnitude $r = 0,10$, and the remaining predictor variables with average correlations from $r = -0,02$ to $r = -0,08$ are a small amount of common variance, so the expected predictive potentials of the model are limited. A detailed overview of the overall efficiency of the model is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. General efficiency indicators of regression models: multiple correlation coefficients and multiple determinations. Dependent variable is the School Success. In table, R is a multiple correlation coefficient, R^2 – multiple determination coefficient and ΔR^2 – corrected R^2 .

Model	R	R^2	ΔR^2	Standard error of the estimate
Starting positions	0,307	0,094	0,083	2,51778
Socio-demographic status	0,214	0,046	0,042	2,57352
Socio-economic status	0,178	0,032	0,028	2,59263
Working status of parents/guardians	0,173	0,030	0,028	2,59197
Degree of education of parents/guardians	0,083	0,007	0,005	2,62223

The most efficient model was the regression solution for the score prediction model on the *socio-demographic status* dimension ($R = 0,046$), where 4,6% of the variance in school success was explained. The regression model that deals with the prediction of *socio-economic status* as an aspect of school success in sixth, seventh and eighth grade is less useful in prediction than the previous model ($R = 0,032$) and explained 3,2% of the variance in school success. The regression model that checks the prediction of school success from the aspect of the employment status of parents/guardians ($R = 0,030$), explained 3 % of the variance of school success. The level of education of parents proved to be the least useful regression solution in the prediction of school success. Although the model is statistically significant in practical terms it is extremely marginal ($R = 0,007$). The summarized results of the analysis of variance for all four models are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Summative indicators of of variance for tested regression model (SS – sum of squares; df – degrees of freedom; MS – average squares; F – Fisher F ratio).

Model		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Socio-demographic status	Regression	396,28	5	79,26	11,97	0,00
	Residual	8252,25	1247	6,62		
	Total	8648,54	1252			
Socio-economic status	Regression	273,25	5	54,65	8,13	0,00
	Residual	8375,29	1247	6,72		
	Total	8648,54	1252			
Working status of parents/guardians	Regression	257,37	2	128,68	19,15	0,00
	Residual	8391,17	1250	2		
	Total	8648,54	1252	6,72		
Degree of education of parents/guardians	Regression	60,28	2	30,14	4,38	0,01
	Residual	8588,26	1250	6,88		
	Total	8648,54	1252			

Individual contribution of variables to the regression model it was estimated via standardized regression coefficients β . The first predictive model (*socio-demographic status*) contributes

statistically significantly through four of the five variables, namely: total number of brothers ($\beta = -0,136$, $t = -4,618$, $p < 0,05$); total number of sisters ($\beta = -0,095$, $t = -3,242$, $p < 0,05$), marital status of parents ($\beta = -0,062$, $t = 2,218$, $p < 0,05$) and distance from home to school ($\beta = -0,127$, $t = -4,531$, $p < 0,05$). Through the second predictive model (*socio-economic status*) they contribute statistically significantly: the place for learning in the house/apartment ($\beta = -0,063$, $t = -2,286$, $p < 0,05$); having constant access to the Internet ($\beta = -0,096$, $t = -3,393$, $p < 0,05$) and the way they come to school ($\beta = -0,060$, $t = -2,161$, $p < 0,05$). From the third predictive model (*parent/guardian work status*), father’s work status ($\beta = 0,127$, $t = 4,353$, $p < 0,05$) statistically significantly contributes to students’ school success, while in the fourth predictive model it is the mother’s level of education ($\beta = 0,067$, $t = 2,322$, $p < 0,05$). The results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Individual contributions of predictor variables from the set of starting positions to school success in sixth, seventh and eighth grade.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	β		
Socio-demographic status	(Constant)	12,80	0,44		29,04	0,00
	Total number of brothers	-0,43	0,09	-0,14	-4,61	0,00
	Total number of sisters	-0,23	0,07	-0,10	-3,24	0,00
	Marital status of parents	0,22	0,10	0,06	2,22	0,03
	Distance from home to school	-0,13	0,03	-0,13	-4,53	0,00
	Number of members of your household	0,10	0,06	0,05	1,68	0,09
Socio-economic status	Total monthly income of parents/guardians	0,01	0,04	0,01	0,21	0,83
	A place to study in the house/apartment	-0,19	0,08	-0,06	-2,29	0,02
	Owning a computer/laptop	-0,03	0,09	-0,01	-0,36	0,72
	Constant internet access in the house/apartment	-0,56	0,17	-0,01	-3,39	0,00
	Way to come to school	-0,12	0,06	-0,06	-2,16	0,03
Working status of parents/guardians	Mother’s working status	-0,04	0,04	-0,03	-0,98	0,33
	Father’s working status	0,23	0,05	0,13	4,35	0,00
Degree of education of parents/guardians	Mother’s education	0,17	0,08	0,07	2,32	0,02
	Father’s education	-0,12	0,07	-0,05	-1,70	0,09

Based on the obtained results, the second hypothesis that was extinguished is confirmed: “Socio-demographic status of the family has a greater power of contributing to the student’s school success than socio-economic status”.

STUDENTS’ ATTITUDES ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF ASSESSMENT AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF PARENTS’ ATTITUDES, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE GENDER VARIABLE

Table 9 shows that students attach great importance to their grades: 94,7% of them said that their grade was important or very important, while 5,3% of students said that their grade was irrelevant.

From Table 10 one can see that girls and boys equally attach importance to grades, ie. 94,1% boys and 95,2% girls.

Table 9. Students' attitudes about the importance of assessment.

Student attitudes	Frequency	Percent
It doesn't matter to me	66	5,3
It's important to me	659	52,6
It is very important to me	527	42,1
Total	1252	100,0

Table 10. Students' attitudes about the importance of assessment with regard to gender.

Gender	Student attitudes	Frequency	Percentage
Male	It doesn't matter to me	34	5,9
	It's important to me	311	53,4
	It is very important to me	237	40,7
	Total	582	100,0
Female	It doesn't matter to me	32	4,8
	It's important to me	348	51,9
	It is very important to me	290	43,3
	Total	670	100,0

After examining students' attitudes about the importance of grades, we further checked their perception of parental attitudes, taking into account the gender variable of parents. The results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Students' attitudes about the importance of assessment to their parents/guardians.

Students 'perception of parents' attitudes	Frequency	Percentage
It's important to mom and not to dad	65	5,2
It doesn't matter to them	23	1,8
Dad is important, and mom is not	15	1,2
It's important to them	505	40,3
It is very important to them	644	51,5
Total	1252	100,0

Half of the surveyed ninth grade students, more precisely 51,5% of them, think that their parents/guardians have a very important grade. As seen from Table 12, 91,8% of parents, according to students' attitudes, belong to the scale of answers that the grade is important and/or very important.

Girls and boys alike have a positive attitude that their parents care about or value the grade they receive; 92 % of girls and 91,6 % of boys have this attitude. In addition, 5 % of girls and boys

Table 12. Students' attitudes about the importance of assessment to their parents/guardians with regard to gender.

Students 'perception of parents' attitudes		Frequency	Percent
Female	It's important to mom and not to dad	36	5,4
	It doesn't matter to them	9	1,3
	Dad is important, and mom is not	9	1,3
	It's important to them	273	40,8
	It is very important to them	343	51,2
	Total	670	100,0
Male	It's important to mom and not to dad	29	5,0
	It doesn't matter to them	14	2,4
	Dad is important, and mom is not	6	1,0
	It's important to them	232	39,9
	It is very important to them	301	51,7
	Total	582	100,0

said that the grade they receive is more important to their mother, which we find useful to check, because we had a similar data for the category of mothers who did not finish primary school. We consider it useful to compare the attitudes of students and parents, i.e. to examine which category with regard to the level of education has a positive attitude towards education, how much it contributes to the positive attitude of students and how much it explains the achieved success of students. In accordance with the obtained findings, we confirm the third hypothesis “it is to assume that students have a positive attitude about the importance of assessment as well as to perceive that their parents have the same attitude, regardless of student gender”.

CONCLUSION

By testing the first hypothesis, we confirmed that there is a correlation between socio-demographic, socio-economic, employment status and the level of education of parents/guardians and student success. Considering the relationship between the observed variables and the school performance of students, it was singled out that (1) the working relationship of the father, (2) permanent Internet access to the house / apartment, (3) distance from home to school and (4) the total number of brothers best correlate with the school performance of students, which confirms the first hypothesis.

In support of the second hypothesis tested, it was found that the first predictive model (socio-demographic status) contributes statistically significantly through four of the five variables, namely: total number of brothers, total number of sisters, marital status of parents and distance from home to school. The number of household members as the fifth variable has no predictive power in relation to the listed variables. The obtained results are in accordance with previous researches according to which [8-10] the demographic characteristics of the family such as family structure, marital status, specific characteristics of parents/guardians, family size, and the family environment further complicate the entire process of achieving school success, because they directly affect the starting positions of students. In our work, and in accordance with the results of earlier research, through the second predictive model (*socio-economic status*), it was found that they contribute statistically significantly: a place for learning in the home / apartment, possession of permanent Internet access and the way students come to school. These results can be linked to the results of the above-mentioned studies confirming that students living in better socio-economic conditions achieve better school performance [20, 21] and that the financial income of parents (economic power of the family through the financial aspect: the possibility of buying equipment and materials, securing excursions, additional teaching resources) statistically significantly contribute to the school success of students [16].

In our work, and in accordance with the results of previous research, through another predictive model (socio-economic status) it was found that they contribute statistically significantly: a place to study at home/apartment, having constant internet access and the way students come to school. From the third predictive model (parent/guardian work status), father work status contributes statistically significantly to students' school success, while other authors, such as [28], in their research conclude that children achieve better school performance if both parents are employed, but that success is somewhat lower in children whose both parents work full time, and research by the authors [27] conducted in Barking and Dagenem in East London which showed that several factors affect the overall success of children in school, among other things, is the employment of both parents. Based on the obtained results, we propose to conduct further research on the topic “on the reasons for the unpredictable power of the working status of mothers on student success”. As the most important predictors of educational success, family income is examined, and the education and occupation of parents are stated [16]. Then, in a study for Australia [31], a significant correlation was found between the father's educational level,

family income, and housing conditions and student success in school, while [29, 30] found that children of more educated parents (guardians) achieve better results in school on average. The results of these studies are partly in line with the results of the fourth predictive model, which show that student success is conditioned by the level of education of the mother, but not the father.

Testing the third hypothesis confirmed the positive attitude of students about the importance of assessment as well as the perspective of parents in the same proportion „students have a positive attitude about the importance of assessment, they have the same attitude about the perception of their parents’ attitudes. More precisely, half of the surveyed ninth grade students think that the grade they receive is very important to their parents/guardians. Both girls and boys stated that the grade they receive is more important to the mother than to the father. Available earlier research suggests that parents are more involved in the school work of girls than boys [25] and that they have higher expectations for girls’ school performance [26] and that this contribution to the variable is linked to parental expectations under the influence of social norms related to gender role in education, which is why it is necessary to take into account the context of the conditions in which the family (beliefs, social context and cultural factors) lives to understand the results obtained with regard to the climate that shapes families.

Additional recommendations for further testing refer to the examination of the relations of the investigated predictors and school performance in the remaining grades of subject and classroom teaching in primary school, and the examination of other variables that speak in favor of the aforementioned constructive models in relation to school performance such as the correlation between adult beliefs and the importance of education.

REFERENCES

- [1] Gojkov, G.: *Dokimology*. In Serbian. Viša škola za obrazovanje vaspitača, Vršac, 2003,
- [2] Black, P. and Wiliam, D.: *Assessment and Classroom Learning*. Assessment in Education, 1998,
- [3] Goldman, B.A.; Flake, W.L. and Matheson, M.B.: *Accuracy of College Students' Perceptions of Their Sat Scores, High School and College Grade Point Averages Relative to Their Ability*. Perceptual and Motor Skills **70**(2), 514-514, 1990, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/pms.1990.70.2.514>,
- [4] Cassidy, J.C.: *Self-reported GPA and SAT: A methodological note*. Practical Assessment. Research and Evaluation **7**(12), 1-6, 2001, <http://dx.doi.org/10.7275/5hym-y754>,
- [5] Keith, T.: *Comentary: Academic enablers and school learning*. School Psychology Review **31**(3), 394-402, 2002, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2002.12086163>,
- [6] Anaya, G.: *College impact on student learning: Comparing the use of self- reported gains, standardized test scores, and college grades*. Research in Higher Education **40**(5), 499-526, 1999, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018744326915>,
- [7] Sluijsmans, D.: *Student involvement in assessment. The training of peer assessmen skills*. Datawyse/Universitaire Pers Maastricht, 2002,
- [8] Barry, J.: *The effect of socio-economic status on academic achievement*. Wichita State University, 2005,
- [9] Bilić, V.: *Uzroci, posljedice i prevladavanje školskog neuspjeha*. In Croatian. Hrvatski pedagoško-književni zbor, Zagreb, 2001,
- [10] Čudina-Obradović, M. and Obradović, J.: *The Influence of Parents' Marital Emotional Harmony on School Success and the Behaviour of Children*. In Croatian. Društvena istraživanja **4**(4-5), 627-639, 1995,

- [11] Brown, M.T.; Fukunaga, C.; Umemoto, D. and Wicker, L.: *Annual review, 1990–1996: Social class, work, and retirement behavior*.
Journal of Vocational Behavior **49**(2), 159-189, 1996,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0039>,
- [12] Bryant, B.K.; Zvonković, A.M. and Reynolds, P.: *Parenting in relation to child and adolescent vocational development*.
Journal of Vocational Behavior **69**(1), 149-175, 2006,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.02.004>,
- [13] Hill, N.E.; Ramirez, C. and Dumka, L.E.: *Early adolescents' career aspirations: A qualitative study of perceived barriers and family support among low-income ethnically diverse adolescents*.
Journal of Family Issues **24**(7), 934-959, 2003,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X03254517>,
- [14] Jacobs, J.A.; Karen, D. and McClelland, K.: *The dynamics of young men's career aspirations*.
Sociological Forum **6**(4), 609-639, 1991,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01114404>,
- [15] Mueller, C.W. and Parcel, T.L.: *Measures of Socioeconomic Status: Alternatives and Recommendations*.
Child Development **52**(1), 13-30, 1981,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1129211>,
- [16] Baranović, B.; Jugović, I. and Puzić, S.: *The Importance of Family Background and Gender for Mathematics Achievement and Secondary School Choice*. In Croatian.
Revija za socijalnu politiku **21**(3), 285-307, 2014,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3935/rsp.v21i3.1174>,
- [17] Gregurović, M. and Kuti, S.: *Effect of Socioeconomic Status on Students' Educational Achievement: the Example of PISA Study, Croatia 2006*. In Croatian.
Revija za socijalnu politiku **17**(2), 179-196, 2010,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3935/rspv17i2.918>,
- [18] Kuterovac Jagodić, G.; Keresteš, G. and Brković, I.: *Individual, Family and Environmental Predictors of School Achievement: Testing the Moderating Role of Growing up in Differently War-affected Areas of Croatia*. In Croatian.
Psihologijske teme **22**(1), 1-28, 2013,
- [19] Matković, T.: *Parental Education, Income Level and Early School Leaving in Croatia: Trends of the Last Decade*. In Croatian.
Društvena istraživanja **19**(4-5), 643-667, 2010,
- [20] Sirin, S.R.: *Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research*.
Review of Educational Research, **75**(3), 417-453, 2005,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003417>,
- [21] White, K.R.: *The relation between socioeconomic status and academic achievement*.
Psychological Bulletin **91**(3), 461-481, 1982,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.91.3.461>,
- [22] Babarović, T.; Burušić, J. and Šakić, M.: *Prediction of Educational Achievements of Primary School Pupils in the Republic of Croatia*. In Croatian.
Društvena istraživanja **18**(4-5), 673-695, 2009,
- [23] Kenney-Benson, G.A.; Pomerantz, E.M.; Ryan, A.M. and Patrick, H.: *Sex differences in math performance: The role of children's approach to schoolwork*.
Developmental Psychology **42**(1), 11-26, 2006,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.1.11>,
- [24] Macuka, I. and Burić, I.: *School Success of Early Adolescents: The Role of Personal and Family Determinants*. In Croatian.
Društvena istraživanja **24**(4), 487-507, 2015,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5559/di.24.4.02>,

- [25] Manz, P.H.; Fantuzzo, J.W. and Power, T.J.: *Multidimensional assessment of family involvement among urban elementary students*.
Journal of School Psychology **42**(6), 461-475, 2004,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2004.08.002>,
- [26] Carranza, F.D.; You, S.; Chhuon, V. and Hudley, C.: *Mexican American adolescent's academic achievement and aspirations: The role of perceived parental educational involvement, acculturation, and self-esteem*.
Adolescence **44**(174), 313-333, 2009,
- [27] O'Brien, M.; Alldred, P. and Jones, D.: *Children's Constructions of Family and Kinship*.
Routledge, London, 1996,
- [28] Giddens, A.: *Sociology*. In Croatian.
Translated by Rusan-Polšek, R. Nakladni zavod Globus, Zagreb, 2007,
- [29] Jokić, B. and Ristić Dedić, Z.: *Differences in Educational Attainment of Third and Seventh Grade Pupils in Croatia with Respect to Gender and Parents' Educational Level: A Population Perspective*.
Revija za socijalnu politiku **17**(3), 345-362, 2010,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3935/rsp.v17i3.954>,
- [30] Rečić, M.: *Family and School Performance of Students*. In Croatian.
Tempo, Đakovo, 2003,
- [31] Young, D.J. and Fraser, B.J.: *Socioeconomic Effects on Science Achievement: An Australian Perspective*.
School Effectiveness and School Improvement **4**(4), 265-289, 1993,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0924345930040403>,
- [32] Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S.: *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 6th Edition.
Person Education, Boston, 2012.