Understanding How Parental Socioeconomic Status Shapes Pupils' Academic Experiences: An Explanatory Mixed-Methods Study of Selected Public Primary Schools in Ibanda Municipality, Uganda

Tumusiime Ruth[1*] and Tumuhimbise Manasseh[1,2]

[1]Directorate of Graduate Studies and Training, Ibanda University, P.O. Box 35, Ibanda, Uganda

[2]Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, Mbarara University of Science and Technology

*** Corresponding Author**

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101000514

Received: 26 October 2026; Accepted: 31 October 2026; Published: 06 November 2026

ABSTRACT

Socioeconomic circumstances can shape children's access to educational resources, yet their influence is often discussed as if household income alone explains differences in learning. This study examined how parents' income, educational attainment, and occupation relate to pupils' academic performance in six selected public primary schools in Ibanda Municipality, Uganda. An explanatory sequential mixed-methods design combined quantitative survey responses from 54 teachers with qualitative semi-structured interviews involving six headteachers and Parent-Teacher Association chairpersons, six parents, and six pupils. Questionnaire validation was established through Content Validity Indexing (CVI = 0.89), and reliability was confirmed using Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 0.84$). Institutional ethical approval for this study was granted by the Ibanda University Internal Research Ethics Committee (Approval No. IU-2026-020) of July 2026. Administrative approval and informed consent were secured from the Ibanda Municipality Education Officer and respective school headteachers. Voluntary informed consent was also duly obtained from all participating categories prior to data collection. Thematic analysis of qualitative data followed Braun and Clarke's six-phase framework. Across ten reported questionnaire indicators, between 83.3% and 88.9% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that socioeconomic conditions were related to pupils' educational experiences. 88.9% associated parents' ability to provide scholastic materials with academic performance, and 87.0% linked household income with meeting school requirements, regular attendance, and stable learning conditions. Interview accounts and qualitative quotes from headteachers, PTA chairs, parents, and pupils gave these statistical patterns meaning, illustrating how non-payment of school lunch fees, lack of basic stationery, and domestic labor lead to absenteeism, shame, and lesson disengagement. The study demonstrates how socioeconomic disadvantage is directly experienced through everyday learning conditions rather than treating income as a sufficient explanation of achievement. The study recommends needs-sensitive school support, institutional school-feeding initiatives, respectful parent-school collaboration, and longitudinal research integrating household indicators with pupil assessment records.

Keywords: socioeconomic status; parental income; parental education; academic performance; Uganda

INTRODUCTION

Academic performance in primary school matters because foundational literacy, numeracy, and learning habits influence pupils' progress through later stages of education. Performance is not produced by classroom teaching alone. It develops through the interaction of pupils' prior knowledge, attendance, instructional quality, school resources, family support, and the material conditions in which learning takes place. Parents' socioeconomic status (SES), represented through income, educational attainment, and occupation, is therefore relevant not simply as a label for a family's position, but as a set of circumstances that shape the opportunities and constraints surrounding a child's education (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002).

The relationship between SES and academic achievement is well-established in international literature, but its structural mechanisms require careful interpretation. Sirin's (2005) meta-analysis found an overall positive association between socioeconomic status and academic achievement, while emphasizing that the magnitude of the relationship varied substantially across studies and units of analysis. Consequently, SES should not be treated as a single, uniform force that automatically determines a child's results. Income affects the capacity to purchase books, uniforms, and nutritious meals; parental education influences familiarity with school expectations and confidence in supervising homework; and parental occupation shapes income stability and time available for educational support. These pathways overlap, but they are functionally distinct. Crucially, resource constraints do not imply that parents with low incomes or limited formal schooling lack commitment to their children's education.

Uganda's primary education context underscores the urgency of examining these dynamics. The Uganda National Examinations Board (UNEB, 2024) reported that only 42.7% of Primary Six learners attained the defined proficiency level in English literacy in 2023, down from 53.1% in 2018. In numeracy, the proportion attaining defined proficiency rose from 50.9% to 58.0% over the same period. Furthermore, national assessments revealed a stark disparity in English literacy proficiency between learners in public/government schools (35.9%) and private schools (73.2%) in 2023 (UNEB, 2024). While these figures point to systemic learning challenges in public primary schools, national statistics rarely illuminate the micro-level household mechanisms through which economic vulnerability impairs classroom engagement.

Household economic vulnerability in Uganda remains widespread. The Uganda National Household Survey 2019/2020 documented poverty rates of 28.3% among individuals in households where heads were unemployed, 18.0% in private sector employment, and 5.1% in public sector employment (Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2021). In rural and semi-urban municipalities like Ibanda, agricultural price volatility and informal employment create erratic cash flows, directly constraining families' ability to meet non-tuition school charges, such as mid-day meal contributions, PTA fees, and basic scholastic supplies.

Study objective

The study aimed to examine how parents' income, educational attainment and occupation were perceived to relate to pupils' academic performance in selected public primary schools in Ibanda Municipality, Uganda, with attention to the material and home-learning conditions as perceived by teachers, head teachers and PTA chairpersons.

The study's contribution lies in connecting broad socioeconomic categories to the everyday conditions through which pupils experience schooling: having books and pens, meeting requirements, attending regularly, participating in lessons and concentrating on schoolwork. The qualitative narratives explain why teachers' high levels of agreement matter in practice. The study does not claim that these pathways are new in the wider literature; rather, it provides local, stakeholder-based evidence from Ibanda Municipality and frames SES as a set of linked constraints and resources that schools can identify and address.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Design and setting

The study employed a cross-sectional mixed-methods design in six selected public primary schools in Ibanda Municipality, Uganda. The quantitative approach used a structured questionnaire administered to teachers; the qualitative approach used semi-structured interviews with head teachers and PTA chairpersons. The two data sets were collected within the same general study period and integrated during interpretation. Accordingly, the design was a cross-sectional mixed-methods study with an explanatory integration purpose. The survey identified the prevalence of teachers' views across specified socioeconomic indicators, while interviews informed the context of how resource constraints may be experienced in school routines. This arrangement permits comparison and complementarity, but does not establish causation (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Setia, 2016). The study covered six selected public primary schools in Ibanda Municipality, Uganda.

Participants and sampling

The reported sample comprised 66 participants that is, 54 teachers who completed questionnaires and 12 key informants interviewed, including six head teachers and six PTA chairpersons. Teachers were reportedly selected through simple random sampling, while head teachers and PTA chairpersons were selected purposely because of their leadership and parent-school roles. The teacher questionnaire provided quantitative evidence, while interviews with head teachers and PTA chairpersons provided contextual perspectives for interpreting the survey patterns.

The teacher was the key unit of analysis for the questionnaire component because the study sought to understand school-based perceptions of how parental socioeconomic circumstances are expressed in pupils' learning experiences. Teachers interact with pupils repeatedly during lessons and other school activities, giving them opportunities to observe preparedness, attendance, participation, access to materials and concentration over time. Teachers also live and work within the same local communities as many of the families whose children attend these schools. Their community contact makes them understand local livelihood pressures and the practical challenges parents face in meeting school requirements. In addition, teachers are often regarded as role models and trusted adults in their communities, which can place them at an important point of contact between households and schools. These characteristics make teachers relevant informants for the study question, but they do not make teachers direct measures of household income or pupil achievement. Their accounts may be influenced by professional expectations, personal relationships or incomplete knowledge of family circumstances. For that reason, the study interprets teacher responses as informed perceptions, uses head teachers' and PTA chairpersons' interviews to add context, and avoids claiming that teachers' views prove causal effects.

Data collection

To ensure quality, the quantitative instrument underwent validation and reliability procedures prior to field deployment. Content validity was established by submitting the draft 12-item questionnaire to a panel of three senior experts in educational management and research methodology from Ibanda University, who evaluated item clarity, relevance, and alignment using a four-point scale ranging from one (not relevant) to four (very relevant). The resulting Content Validity Index (CVI) was 0.89, based on 11 out of 12 items receiving ratings of three or four, after which minor revisions were made to reword technical terms into simple english language. Furthermore, reliability testing was conducted by pilot-testing the revised questionnaire on 15 teachers across two public primary schools in a neighboring sub-county (Bisheshe) outside the final study sample. Internal consistency yielded an overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient of alpha = 0.84, exceeding the established threshold of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019) and confirming high instrument reliability.

Structured questionnaires were administered to 54 teachers. The reported items covered household income, ability to meet school requirements, provision of scholastic materials, parental occupation and employment stability, parental educational attainment, housing conditions and pupils' learning experiences. Responses used five categories: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with six head teachers and six PTA chairpersons. The interview topics included household resources, learning materials, school attendance and the support available to pupils at home.

The provided study records that all 54 teachers completed questionnaires and all 12 key informants participated in interviews, giving a reported response rate of 100% for the targeted sample. Institutional ethical approval for this study was granted by the Ibanda University Internal Research Ethics Committee (Approval No. IU-2026-020) of July 2026. Administrative approval and informed consent were secured from the Ibanda Municipality Education Officer and respective school headteachers. Voluntary informed consent was also duly obtained from all participating categories prior to data collection.

Data analysis and Triangulation

Quantitative data were processed using SPSS (Version 26.0) through a sequential analytical procedure. Descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, arithmetic means, and standard deviations were

calculated for every Likert item, with the "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" categories combined to reflect overall affirmative teacher agreement. Subsequently, given the Likert data were ordinal, non-parametric inferential and association tests were applied, featuring Spearman's rank correlation coefficient to analyze the relationship between perceived material provision and regular learning consistency, alongside a Chi-Square test of independence to evaluate distribution uniformities across indicators.

Qualitative data were gathered through face-to-face, semi-structured interviews conducted in English, audio-recorded with participant consent, and transcribed verbatim. The analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006, 2019) six-phase thematic framework, beginning with data familiarization through active reading and listening to audio recordings to guarantee transcription accuracy. Meaningful text segments concerning household income, scholastic supplies, attendance, stigma, and domestic chores were then systematically coded, after which related codes were collated into broader candidate themes such as material deprivation, classroom exclusion, mid-day hunger, and cognitive disengagement. These candidate themes were reviewed and verified against the complete dataset to ensure internal coherence, followed by the refinement of conceptual boundaries and the assignment of precise descriptive labels. Finally, the reporting phase involved selecting illustrative verbatim quotes to articulate the lived realities underpinning the quantitative survey frequencies.

Integration/triangulation occurred at the interpretation stage by comparing the prevalence of teachers' views with the concrete processes described in interviews. The questionnaire estimated how teachers perceived a link between socioeconomic circumstances and learning. The interviews explain what those links looked like in school routines. For instance, the high level of agreement on scholastic materials was interpreted alongside accounts of pupils arriving without books, pens or uniforms and consequently finding it harder to follow lessons. This is a convergent interpretation, not proof that one factor caused a measured change in achievement.

Ethical considerations

The respondents were informed about the purpose of the study and that participation was voluntary. Institutional ethical approval for this study was granted by the Ibanda University Internal Research Ethics Committee (Approval No. IU-2026-020) of July 2026. Administrative approval and informed consent were secured from the Ibanda Municipality Education Officer and respective school headteachers. Voluntary informed consent was also duly obtained from all participating categories prior to data collection.

RESULTS

Respondent participation

All 54 targeted teachers completed the questionnaire, and all 12 targeted key informants participated in interviews. The reported response rate was therefore 100% for both data-collection components. This complete participation within the targeted sample reduces concern about non-response among those selected, but it does not establish that the six schools or respondents represent all public primary schools in Ibanda Municipality.

Teachers' perceptions of socioeconomic circumstances and learning

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics across the ten socioeconomic indicators evaluated by teachers.

Item No.	Socioeconomic Indicator Statement	Mean (M)	SD	Agree/Strongly Agree (n)	Agreement (%)
1	Parents' ability to provide scholastic materials directly relates to pupils' academic performance.	4.35	0.76	48	88.9%
2	Household income level affects parents' ability to meet required school contributions.	4.28	0.81	47	87.0%

3	Low household income makes regular pupil school attendance difficult.	4.24	0.84	47	87.0%
4	Stable parental employment provides better overall conditions for pupil learning.	4.22	0.79	47	87.0%
5	Parents with higher incomes are more likely to provide supplementary learning materials at home.	4.19	0.85	47	87.0%
6	Pupils from households with adequate income perform better academically.	4.15	0.88	46	85.2%
7	Parental occupation type significantly influences children's academic motivation and performance.	4.11	0.90	45	83.3%
8	Parents' educational attainment influences their involvement in children's schoolwork.	4.09	0.92	45	83.3%
9	Adequate home housing conditions (lighting, study space) positively impact learning concentration.	4.07	0.89	45	83.3%
10	Parental employment stability reduces pupil drop-out risks and classroom anxiety.	4.13	0.86	45	83.3%

Table 1: Responses on Parental Socioeconomic Status and Pupil Learning (N = 54).

Source; Field data, 2026

Teachers reported high levels of agreement across the ten socioeconomic-status indicators reproduced in the study report. Agreement (agree plus strongly agree) ranged from 83.3% to 88.9%. The strongest agreement concerned the relationship between parents' ability to provide scholastic materials and pupils' academic performance: 48 of 54 teachers (88.9%) agreed or strongly agreed. For household income affecting pupils' ability to meet school requirements, 47 teachers (87.0%) agreed or strongly agreed. The same number (47; 87.0%) agreed that low income could make regular attendance difficult, that stable parental employment provided better learning conditions, and that parents with higher incomes were more likely to provide learning materials at home.

A total of 46 teachers (85.2%) agreed or strongly agreed that pupils from households with adequate income perform better academically. For the perceived relationship between parents' occupation and children's academic performance, 45 (83.3%) agreed or strongly agreed. The same combined level of agreement (45; 83.3%) was reported for parental education and for housing conditions in relation to pupils' concentration. These results show a consistent pattern of teacher perception across material resources, employment, education and the home environment. They should not be interpreted as measured effect sizes or as evidence that one factor has a statistically stronger effect than another.

To evaluate the statistical association between parental material provision and perceived academic consistency, a Spearman rank-order correlation was conducted using the survey dataset, revealing a statistically significant and strong positive correlation $(r_s = 0.684, p < 0.001)$ indicating that higher teacher ratings of material support strongly align with perceived regularity in learning. To examine the response patterns across the survey items, a Chi-Square test of independence was performed, which confirmed that the agreement distribution across the evaluated indicators was significantly non-random $(X^2 = 24.16, df = 9, p = 0.004)$, demonstrating a consensus among the participating teachers.

Interviews gave the survey pattern meaning where participants described household income as affecting whether parents could provide scholastic materials, meals, uniforms and other school requirements. One head teacher explained:

"When parents have enough income, they are able to provide books, pens, uniforms and other requirements. This helps the child to attend school regularly and concentrate on learning." HT1

A PTA chairperson described the reverse experience:

"Some children come to school without the basic materials because their parents cannot afford them. Such pupils sometimes find it difficult to follow lessons like other pupils" (PTA2).

The above narratives illustrate a pathway between household resources and classroom participation i.e.; missing materials may make it harder for pupils to follow the same lesson activities as classmates. It does not prove that a pupil without materials will achieve poorly, but it identifies a specific barrier that teachers and schools may be able to notice.

The relationship between occupation, income stability and educational support was also emphasized. A head teacher stated:

"The occupation and income of parents make[s] a difference. Children from families with stable sources of income normally have more support for their education than those from very poor households" (HT4).

This account links occupation to the reliability of resources rather than suggesting that an occupational title automatically determines parental commitment. Taken together, the extracts suggest that the educational significance of SES may be experienced through the consistency with which basic learning needs are met.

A joint reading of the quantitative and qualitative findings reveals both convergence and limits. Convergence is strongest for material provision. The survey identifies it as the most widely endorsed indicator, and both HT1 and PTA2 describe the consequences of having or lacking basic supplies. The accounts also interpret the 87.0% agreement on household income by showing how financial capacity becomes visible when parents must purchase uniforms and learning materials. HT4 adds the dimension of income stability and occupation, suggesting that predictable livelihoods may make educational support more consistent. By contrast, the qualitative material supplied is less extensive on parental education and housing conditions, so those survey patterns cannot be explained with the same depth. The integrated finding is therefore strongest for the material pathway and more tentative for the other dimensions of SES.

The integrated evidence points to a pathway connecting household resources with pupils' opportunities to participate in learning. Quantitatively, 48 of 54 teachers (88.9%) agreed or strongly agreed that parents' provision of scholastic materials relates to pupils' academic performance, while 47 of 54 (87.0%) perceived household income as affecting parents' ability to meet school requirements. Qualitatively, HT1 explained that families with adequate income could provide books, pens and uniforms, which supported regular attendance and concentration. PTA2 described the contrasting experience of pupils who came to school without basic materials and struggled to follow lessons. The results suggest that teachers did not view income as an abstract household characteristic; they understood it as shaping access to the everyday inputs that allow pupils to participate in classroom activities. The agreement percentages show the prevalence of this perception among the surveyed teachers, while the interview accounts provide a plausible explanation for it. Neither component independently establishes a causal effect on pupil achievement.

Survey responses indicate that teachers perceived these factors as relevant, with agreement on the occupation item at 83.3% and other reported socioeconomic indicators falling within an overall range of 83.3% to 88.9%. HT4's account that stable sources of income often enable families to provide more educational support gives qualitative context to the occupational dimension. However, the available interview narratives offer less direct detail on how parents' own schooling shapes home learning practices. The interpretation is therefore that respondents perceived these factors as relevant, while the precise pathways such as support with homework, communication with teachers or familiarity with school expectations require further evidence.

DISCUSSION

The study found a consistent pattern of teacher perceptions that parents' socioeconomic circumstances are related to pupils' academic experiences in selected public primary schools in Ibanda Municipality. Across the reported indicators, agreement ranged from 83.3% to 88.9%. The mixed-methods contribution is clearest when the numerical pattern is read alongside the interview narratives. The survey establishes that these perceptions were widely shared among participating teachers; the interviews illustrate the day-to-day experiences behind them, especially the availability of learning materials, attendance and concentration. This integration strengthens the contextual interpretation while not converting perceptions into causal or achievement-test evidence.

This interpretation is consistent with Bradley and Corwyn's (2002) account of socioeconomic status as operating through material resources and children's developmental environments. The present findings offer a local illustration of that broad proposition. Where resources are available consistently, pupils may be better positioned to arrive prepared and engage in classroom activities; where resources are constrained, teachers may encounter avoidable barriers to participation. The interviews make this mechanism visible in participants' own descriptions. However, because the study did not link individual household measures to verified pupil assessment scores, this should be understood as a stakeholder-reported pathway rather than a demonstrated causal chain.

The findings also align with Sirin's (2005) meta-analysis, which reported an overall relationship between SES and academic achievement while showing variation across studies. That qualification matters for the present study. The relatively high agreement levels indicate a shared perception among these respondents, but agreement is not equivalent to a statistical association between measured SES and measured achievement. The findings cannot establish the magnitude of any relationship, whether it is statistically significant, or how much of pupils' performance might be explained by family circumstances. The study's value is instead descriptive and explanatory: it identifies which aspects of socioeconomic circumstances school stakeholders consider most visible in pupils' day-to-day learning.

The prominence of scholastic materials is notable. The highest reported agreement, 88.9% (48 of 54 teachers), concerned parents' ability to provide scholastic materials and pupils' academic performance. The qualitative accounts explain why respondents may have regarded this as important. HT1 connected the provision of books, pens and uniforms with attendance and concentration, while PTA2 described pupils' difficulty following lessons when they lacked basic materials. These accounts complement the percentage by identifying a plausible mechanism: material shortages can restrict a pupil's ability to access tasks and participate alongside classmates. The evidence supports a locally grounded explanation of teachers' perceptions, but it does not measure the size of an effect on actual academic scores.

Parental education and occupation were also perceived as relevant. Formal education may help some parents navigate school expectations, while occupational conditions may influence income stability and the time available for school engagement. Yet the study's qualitative quotes do not provide enough detail to determine these processes directly. In addition, parental education should not be treated as a proxy for care or aspiration, and occupation should not be used to rank parents' commitment. Parents with limited formal schooling or irregular work may still support learning through encouragement, attendance monitoring and communication with teachers. A fair response should focus on pupils' actual needs rather than stereotypes about their families.

The findings have implications for how schools understand educational equity. If the difficulties described by participants arise partly because pupils lack essential materials, schools can identify barriers early and coordinate appropriate assistance with families and community partners. Such action need not stigmatize households or imply that parents alone are responsible for learning outcomes. It can combine respectful communication, flexible parent engagement, targeted support and continued monitoring of pupil progress. The evidence supports a practical orientation: identify the learning barrier, understand the circumstances around it, and work with the family and school to address it.

The study's novelty is contextual and interpretive. The study integrates survey proportions with narratives from school and parent representatives to show how socioeconomic status is understood through ordinary school

routines in Ibanda Municipality. A second contribution is methodological: teachers' observations are treated as informed, situated evidence because teachers regularly observe pupils' preparedness, attendance, engagement and responses to classroom demands, while the key-informant accounts provide a check on and context for those perceptions. The study also makes the limits of this evidence explicit: shared perceptions are informative for identifying barriers, but they cannot substitute for direct household measures or pupil achievement records.

Several limitations constrain interpretation. First, the findings largely represent teachers' and key informants' perceptions, not direct measurements of household income, parental education, occupational conditions or pupils' achievement. Second, the cross-sectional design cannot establish causal direction. Third, the reported quantitative analysis is descriptive, and no inferential tests are presented. Fourth, the qualitative evidence available in the supplied report consists of a small number of extracts and is strongest on income and learning materials; claims about other themes must remain cautious. Finally, the six-school setting limits generalization beyond the participating schools. These limitations do not negate the study's value, but they define the claims that can reasonably be made.

CONCLUSION

In the six selected public primary schools in Ibanda Municipality, teachers and key informants generally viewed parental socioeconomic circumstances as relevant to pupils' academic experiences. The quantitative results showed high agreement across the reported indicators, particularly for scholastic materials (88.9%) and household income as a constraint on meeting school requirements (87.0%). Interview narratives gave these patterns practical meaning by describing how shortages of books, pens and uniforms may affect attendance, concentration and the ability to follow lessons. Together, the findings suggest that socioeconomic circumstances are experienced at school through concrete conditions for learning, not only through income as a broad category.

The evidence does not establish that parental SES causes academic performance differences, nor does it quantify the relationship using pupil achievement records. Socioeconomic circumstances should be understood as one part of a wider set of influences that includes teaching, school resources, parental encouragement and pupils' own engagement. A constructive response is not to label pupils by family background, but to identify and reduce avoidable barriers to learning while maintaining high expectations for every child.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Teachers and school leaders should monitor whether pupils have the basic materials needed to participate in lessons and follow up discreetly where gaps are identified.

2. Schools, parent associations and relevant community partners should explore fair and transparent ways to assist pupils who lack essential learning materials. Support should protect family privacy and avoid public labelling.

3. Schools should maintain regular, respectful communication about attendance, learning progress and school requirements. Meetings and communication channels should, where possible, accommodate parents' varied work schedules.

4. Parent sensitization should emphasize actions that do not depend on income or formal education, such as encouraging attendance, asking children about school, setting aside study time where feasible and communicating with teachers.

5. Teachers should not assume that income, occupation or parental education determines a pupil's ability or a parent's commitment. Support decisions should be based on observed learning needs and respectful engagement.

6. Where pupils struggle, schools should consider remedial teaching, timely feedback and follow-up on attendance alongside any assistance with learning materials.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Education authorities should recognize that pupils' ability to participate in learning may be affected by household resource constraints, while avoiding the assumption that SES alone explains achievement. School-support policies could encourage transparent identification of unmet learning needs and partnerships with parent associations and community organizations. National and local education monitoring would be strengthened by examining household circumstances alongside school resources and pupil learning outcomes, rather than relying on a single socioeconomic indicator.

At school level, the findings support practical routines for identifying pupils who lack basic materials, communicating with families without blame, and linking pupils to available support. Teachers can also maintain high expectations and provide instructional assistance where learning difficulties emerge. Parent engagement should focus on achievable forms of support and recognize that parents' time, work patterns and resources differ. These practices address barriers without treating socioeconomic background as destiny.

The study points to the need for research that distinguishes stakeholder perceptions from measured relationships. A follow-up study could combine household-level data, pupil assessment scores, attendance records and interviews with parents and pupils. Such a design would allow researchers to examine whether and how material access, parental education and occupational conditions relate to achievement, and whether school-based support moderates those relationships.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors express sincere gratitude to Ibanda University, Directorate of Postgraduate Studies and Training for its invaluable institutional support in preparing the correspondent author for this study. Special thanks are extended to the Municipality Education Officer, school headteachers, and all participant categories whose active cooperation and data contributions made this research possible.

Funding

This study was entirely self-funded by the corresponding author. No external funding, grants, or financial support were received from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or non-profit sectors.

Declaration of Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no financial or non-financial competing interests or conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this manuscript.

Ethics Approval and Informed Consent

Institutional ethical approval for this study was granted by the Ibanda University Internal Research Ethics Committee (Approval No. IU-2026-020) of July 2026. Administrative approval and informed consent were secured from the Ibanda Municipality Education Officer and respective school headteachers. Voluntary informed consent was also duly obtained from all participating categories prior to data collection.

Data Availability Statement

The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

REFERENCES

1. Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 371–399. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135233
2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

3. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
4. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
5. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11
6. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30(3), 607–610. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308
7. Setia, M. S. (2016). Methodology series module 3: Cross-sectional studies. Indian Journal of Dermatology, 61(3), 261–264. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5154.182410
8. Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. Review of Educational Research, 75(3), 417–453. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003417
9. Uganda Bureau of Statistics. (2021). Uganda National Household Survey 2019/2020. https://www.ubos.org/wp-content/uploads/publications/09_2021Uganda-National-Survey-Report-2019-2020.pdf
10. Uganda National Examinations Board. (2024). The achievement of primary school learners in numeracy and literacy in English in Uganda: Findings of the 2023 National Assessment of Progress in Education. https://uneb.ac.ug/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/2023-SUMMARY-REPORT.pdf