

Influence of Parental Monitoring Support of Academic Progress on Academic Success of Undergraduate Students in Selected Public Universities in Kenya

Gilberd Langat¹, John M. Momanyi¹, Felicity W. Githinji², Hellen J. Mettoh¹

¹Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations, Bomet University, Bomet.

²Department of Educational Foundations, Moi University, Eldoret

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700403>

Received: 20 July 2026; Accepted: 25 July 2026; Published: 01 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Parental support is an important factor in educational success of university students. However, parenting styles of university students differ considerably, potentially resulting in varying levels and types of support. This study investigated the influence of parental monitoring of academic progress on the success of undergraduate students in selected public universities in Kenya. The study was anchored on Functionalist theory and Epstein's theory of parental involvement. Convergent parallel mixed methods research design was utilized. The target population was 6,548 fourth-year undergraduates. Sample size was determined through stratified sampling followed by simple random sampling techniques. Krejcie and Morgan formula was used to determine sample size, which consisted of 363 fourth-year undergraduates whose degree programmes last for four years. Purposive sampling was employed to select the universities for participation. Forty-one (41) key informants was selected through purposive and snow balling sampling procedure. Data was collected through students' questionnaire, document analysis and structured interview guide to key informants. Quantitative data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Qualitative data was analysed using Colaizzi's descriptive phenomenological approach. The study findings revealed that parental monitoring of aspects of learning environment, students safety, adherence to university academic rules, and examination success were statistically significant ($F(4, 335) = 12.729, p < .001$), indicating that these factors collectively predicted academic success. Multiple regression model yielded an $r = .353$ and an R^2 of .132, meaning that approximately 13.2% of the variance in academic success can be explained by these four predictor variables. Examination performance had the strongest positive influence followed by adherence to university academic rules, learning environment and students' safety. Qualitative findings reinforced the quantitative findings pattern as parental monitoring support influenced academic success. The study recommends that parents should monitor academic progress consistently. They should regularly request transcripts and discuss performance, but monitoring should be delivered with love rather than anger. Excessive surveillance such as checking portals and visiting university multiple times increases student anxiety and should be avoided.

Keywords: Academic Progress, Academic Success, Parental Monitoring

INTRODUCTION

Education constitutes a fundamental process of personal development that occurs through individuals' interactions and experiences with others, alongside external influences including parental support. Abulencia (2021) emphasizes that education remains essential to society due to its substantial impact on individuals' life aspirations and achievements. Within the educational journey, parental monitoring support has evolved considerably, particularly with technological integration that has facilitated the development of parental information portals (Pathify, 2025). These digital platforms provide parents with timely updates regarding their children's academic

records, attendance patterns, and communication with educators. Contemporary research demonstrates that such support positively influences students' academic success and contributes to the creation of supportive learning environments (Ekpenyong et al., 2023). Scholars have defined parental support in various ways reflecting its multifaceted nature. Mills *et al.* (2021) describe parental support as parental behaviours towards their children encompassing praising, encouraging, and providing physical affection, with parents demonstrating qualities such as caring and warmth while offering advice. However, parenting styles of university students differ considerably, potentially resulting in varying levels and types of support. The current study defines parental monitoring academic progress as the ways in which parents of undergraduate students monitor: examination performance, student's safety, adherence to university academic rules and learning environment of the students.

Academic success represents a multidimensional construct that extends beyond mere grade attainment. Anghel (2023) conceptualises it in terms of high academic achievement and the extent of academic scores attained by students during university training. Manulat (2025) expands this definition to include undergraduate persistence until graduation, attainment of high grades, and acquisition of essential educational skills that contribute to students' personal, social, and professional development. Davis (2024) observes that academic success in higher education is influenced by numerous factors that vary considerably among students. Budiwati *et al.* (2024) argue that supportive peers facilitate academic achievement, while a comprehensive understanding requires analytical integration of components that explain academic success as an ongoing process. This study defines academic success as continued enrolment by undergraduate students from one semester to the next, in Kenyan public universities, reflecting consistent progression towards degree completion. It encompasses the extent to which an undergraduate student in public university attains desirable educational outcomes, including high academic performance, skill acquisition, goal achievement, academic skills academic engagements and readiness for future academic and professional pursuits.

The relationship between parental monitoring of academic progress support and academic success is well-established in educational literature, with research consistently demonstrating that various dimensions of parental monitoring support directly influence students' capacity to achieve desirable educational outcomes. Eberly et al. (2024) established that there exist a significant positive relationship exists between parental supervision and academic achievement. Studies on parental monitoring by Lee and Shute (2022) and Zuma (2020) revealed that students whose parents actively track academic progress demonstrate higher levels of academic accountability and persistence. In Kenya, Nchaga and Esau (2025) and Mettoh et al. (2018) documented critical gaps in parental engagement, while Shikokoti and Imonje (2023) reported that some undergraduates fail to graduate on time, with 85.4% citing financial difficulty as the primary cause underscoring the urgent need to understand how financial, social, and monitoring dimensions of parental support influence academic success in Kenyan public universities. Omae et al. (2025) also carried out a study in Kenya regarding parental engagement in Kibra Sub-County Junior Secondary schools and found out that, home-based support, regular communication with teachers, and active school participation significantly improved learner outcomes. Furthermore, Kimathi and Kipchumba, (2025) identified irregular parental monitoring academic decisions as a key factor contributing to a consistent decline in KCSE performance over five years (2020-2024) in Yatta Sub-county, Secondary in Kenya.

Statement of the Problem

University education represents a critical transition during which students encounter increased academic demands, greater independence, and numerous social and psychological adjustment challenges. Although undergraduates are expected to become more autonomous, evidence indicates that continued parental monitoring of academic progress remains important in promoting academic success by encouraging accountability, timely intervention, goal attainment, and resilience. However, as students transit from secondary school to university, communication between parents and their children often declines, with many parents relying solely on students to report their academic progress. This arrangement may result in incomplete or inaccurate information, limiting parents' ability to identify academic difficulties and provide timely support. To address this challenge, several Kenyan universities, have established Parents' Information Platforms to enable parents to access academic

information and monitor their children's progress. Despite the availability of these platforms, parental monitoring remains relatively low, reducing their potential to strengthen parental engagement in students' academic development. While previous studies have demonstrated the positive contribution of parental monitoring to students' educational success, the majority have focused on primary and secondary education, leaving limited empirical evidence on its influence among undergraduate students in Kenyan universities.

Consequently, little is known about how parental monitoring of academic progress influences academic success among undergraduates in Kenyan public universities. This situation has necessitated the present study to investigate the influence of parental monitoring of academic progress on academic success among undergraduates in selected Kenyan universities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Parental Monitoring Support and Student Safety on Campus

Shawaluddin et al. (2025) conducted a study in Malaysia of over 33,000 adolescents and found that parental monitoring, defined as parents knowing what their child does in their free time, is a strong protective factor against substance use, bullying, and physical fights, with only 33.4% of adolescents reporting such oversight. The study identified “parental connectedness” as similarly protective, reducing odds of being bullied by 36% and engaging in fights by 34%, underscoring the importance of parents guiding peer relationships through open communication. This paradox is echoed in research on digital socialization (Jung et al., 2026), which notes that parental mediation protects young people from digital harms but may hinder the development of digital literacy and is associated with lower peer interaction.

Among the Africa countries, studies present a contrasting evidence on parental monitoring and student safety. In South Africa, structured parenting interventions significantly improved supervision and reduced child abuse, enhancing student well-being (Cluver et al., 2020). However, in Ghana, Dzikunu et al. (2026) found that some parents undermined school discipline by defending their children even when they violated school rules, thereby weakening schools' efforts to maintain order and discipline. These findings suggest that while parental monitoring is generally a protective factor, its effectiveness depends on constructive collaboration between parents and schools. Consequently, policies that strengthen parent–school partnerships and promote shared responsibility for student discipline are essential for improving school safety and academic success. However, while Cluver et al. (2020) in South Africa and Asare in Ghana have examined parental monitoring and school safety at primary and secondary levels, inquiry into parental monitoring in the university level in the sub-Saharan Africa to determine how parental monitoring of student safety operates in higher education contexts, particularly in Kenya.

In Kenya, empirical research in Embu County found that parenting styles strongly predicted risky behaviours including drug use, violence, and school dropout, with authoritative parenting being most protective (Mugambi & Mwove, 2021). During the COVID-19 pandemic, government directives explicitly tasked parents with monitoring children's movements and associations to prevent early marriages and substance abuse (Ministry of Education, 2020). Meanwhile, subsequent initiatives such as Kenya's online child safety manual equipped parents to address digital harms (KICD & Terre des Hommes, 2021). However, significant barriers persist, including low parental involvement in parent-teacher partnerships, reluctance among parents to embrace co-educator roles under the Competency-Based Curriculum, and challenges in pastoralist regions like Turkana where insecurity undermines school attendance (Mweii, 2022; Eneku, 2023).

Parental Monitoring and Students' Examination Performance

Global literature confirms that parental monitoring of academic progress significantly influences examination performance, with the quality and manner of involvement proving more critical than mere presence. Longitudinal research with 1,465 secondary students demonstrated positive reciprocal relations between autonomy-supportive

involvement and achievement, while controlling involvement correlated with lower outcomes (Van der Kaap-Deeder et al., 2021). Finnish data from 2,887 elementary students revealed parental monitoring predicted GPA and reading comprehension, though the GPA relationship may reflect teacher bias, with effects uniform across socioeconomic groups (Silinskas & Kikas, 2019).

In Kenya, studies affirm that parental monitoring of academic progress significantly influences students' examination performance. Mutuku and Mwanja (2021) established a weak but significant correlation ($r = .451$; $p = .035$) between monitoring homework and attendance and academic outcomes in Kangundo. Mutiso and Mwanja (2024) attributed declining KCSE performance in Yatta to irregular parental monitoring, while Ocharo, Itigi, & Njoroge (2023) found in Nyamira that discipline reinforced through monitoring significantly predicts performance ($F = 98.160$; $p < .05$). Wekesa and Okoth (2022) demonstrated in Navakholo that provision of learning materials significantly correlates with achievement ($\chi^2 = 547.428$; $p < .05$), and Jeynes (2024) showed in Imenti North that fee-related absenteeism negatively affects examination preparation. Odhiambo and Akinyi (2023) identified barriers in Kibra, including financial hardship and limited parental education that reduce monitoring consistency. Collectively, evidence establishes that parental monitoring encompassing direct supervision, resource provision, school communication, and discipline reinforcement significantly influences examination performance, though effectiveness is mediated by socioeconomic factors, necessitating targeted parent empowerment interventions. Munir and Saleem (2025) in a study conducted in Pakistan examining parental monitoring and academic performance, found that students perceived parents as important actors in supporting educational progress through regular communication, academic follow-up, and encouragement. The study reported that effective parent–student and parent–institution communication strengthened students' commitment to academic responsibilities and improved learning outcomes. However, the study focused on lower secondary school learners and employed convenience sampling, limiting generalization to undergraduate populations.

Parental Monitoring Support and Students' Adherence to University Academic Rules

Global literature confirms that parental monitoring significantly predicts students' adherence to university academic rules, with effects mediated by the quality and autonomy-supportive nature of involvement. Yu et al. (2023) found that autonomy-supportive parenting practices promoted students' internalization of parental values, which subsequently reduced their acceptance of academic dishonesty. The findings suggest that supportive parental monitoring and value transmission can foster ethical academic behaviour among university students.

In Nigeria, Nnamdi Azikiwe University launched a digital system granting parents direct access to students' academic records, including semester grades and cumulative grade point average (CGPA), to bridge communication gaps and prevent "shocking discoveries upon graduation" (Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2025). In a related study conducted in Nigeria, Olufunke et al. (2020) surveyed 377 students, 194 parents, and 62 lecturers in Ondo State and found that 81% of parents and 84% of level advisers were favourably disposed toward a mobile-based parental monitoring model, with a significant positive relationship between parents' and students' dispositions ($r = .228$, $p < .05$), though no significant relationship emerged between parents and university management ($r = -.167$, $p < .05$), indicating underdeveloped institutional-parent partnerships.

In Kenya, literature specifically examining parental monitoring support for adherence to university academic rules remains scarce. Available literature focuses instead on institutional policies regarding student-parents, such as Kisii University's (2025) directive banning children from classrooms and childcare support systems at Rongo University, Kenyatta University, and Mathenge Technical Training Institute. These findings address how universities accommodate students who are parents rather than how parents monitor their university-enrolled children's compliance with academic regulations. Furthermore, Indimuli (2022) in Kenya found that parental monitoring of academic progress significantly improves learners' comprehension and test scores among primary school pupils, with a positive correlation ($r = .283$, $p < .05$), a study he did extended this inquiry to the university level to determine whether parental monitoring of adherence to university academic rules predicts academic success among undergraduate students in Kenya.

Parental Monitoring Support on Learning Environment

Globally, literature confirms that parental monitoring of the learning environment in higher education is increasingly facilitated by digital platforms, though implementation varies across contexts. Olufunke et al. (2020) investigated a mobile-based parental monitoring model for evaluating undergraduate records in Ondo State, Nigeria, finding that 81% of parents and 84% of lecturers were favourably disposed toward using technology to monitor students' academic progress, with a significant positive relationship between parents' and students' dispositions ($r = .228, p < .05$). However, the study also revealed systemic communication gaps between parents and tertiary institution management ($r = -.167, p < .05$), highlighting challenges in creating integrated monitoring systems.

Across Africa, technological innovations are reshaping how parents monitor students' learning environments, with Internet of Things (IoT) and computer vision systems enabling real-time oversight. Nkurunziza (2025) explored such integration for student behaviour monitoring in Rwandan schools, demonstrating that parents can receive immediate Short Message Service (SMS) notifications for absences and monthly behaviour reports via email, fostering improved communication and ensuring safe learning environments through swift staff intervention. The system employs edge processing for real-time attendance analysis and face recognition, enabling remote monitoring of classroom activities and early detection of abnormal behaviour, representing a significant advancement in creating connected learning environments where parents serve as active partners in maintaining educational safety and discipline. Wei et al. (2022) found that university students who perceived higher levels of parental autonomy support demonstrated greater autonomous regulation of learning through the satisfaction of their basic psychological needs, whereas psychologically controlling parenting was associated with poorer behavioral regulation.

In Kenya, parental monitoring of the learning environment has gained institutional recognition through digital platforms, though implementation challenges persist. Research in Yatta Sub-County by Musuu and Njuguna (2025) examined school-parent collaboration in monitoring homework activities under Kenya's Competency-Based Education. The results revealed that while collaboration exists, many teachers still struggle to cover syllabus content, and learners manifest competencies below expectations, indicating persistent challenges in creating conducive learning environments even with parental involvement.

Within Kenyan university education specifically, parental monitoring of the learning environment is evolving through structured digital engagement platforms. Egerton University launched a parents and guardian's portal in 2022 designed to track students' academic performance and discipline, providing parents with access to academic progress, transitions, results, fee payment tracking, and student discipline records, while also offering a feedback channel for parent-university communication (Egerton University, 2022). The parents' portal further ensures all-round interaction and allows parents to walk the academic journey with their children (Egerton University, 2022). However, implementation challenges persist, including limited access to smartphones and internet connectivity among parents from humble backgrounds, as well as concerns about potential system hacking by students, highlighting the need for inclusive design and ongoing refinement to ensure all parents can effectively monitor the university learning environment regardless of socioeconomic status.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted in selected public universities located across urban and semi-urban regions of Kenya. One of the universities is situated in an urban environment, while the other is located in a semi-rural setting, thereby provided a balanced context for examining the influence of parental support on undergraduate student's academic success. The research employed a mixed-methods research approach. In this case, convergent parallel research design was employed by integrating both qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection and analysis, whereby quantitative data was collected simultaneously with qualitative data to obtain enriched the

findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Cross-section survey enabled researcher to administer questionnaire to students regarding their experiences on parental support variables in regard to their academic success.

The research targeted 6548 fourth-year undergraduate students whose bachelor's degree lasts for four years. Fourth-year undergraduates were presumed to possess recent and significant experiences regarding parental support that have impacted their academic pursuits on public university. In this context, purposive sampling was employed to select public universities in Kenya that had developed university parent information platforms specifically designed for parental support. The research utilized Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) formula to calculate the sample size, utilizing a probability level of $p = .05$. Therefore, the sample size of 363 fourth-year undergraduates will be selected proportionately using a simple random sampling technique.

The study utilized a multi-stage sampling technique to select fourth-year undergraduate students. The primary stage involved stratified random sampling, where the population was first divided into strata based on academic faculties, including Education, Agriculture, Law, Arts and Social Sciences, Science, Education and Community Development, and Commerce.

To further refine the sample, a second stage of sub-stratification was applied within each faculty. Twenty parents of fourth-year undergraduates were sampled through snow-balling technique. Since parents are external to the daily university environment, they were reached through parents and student referrals. The other key informants, including two Deans of students, two ICT officers, two chaplains and two student counsellors, 13 deans of faculties and two accountants, were sampled purposively. In total 41 key informants were interviewed and 363 undergraduate students, hence the total sample size was 404.

Data for the study were collected using a structured interview schedules, document analysis and questionnaires. Following data collection, the quantitative data was analysed using the Statistical Packages for Social Science (SPSS version 30) to generate inferential statistics enhancing interpretability and supporting conclusions. Multiple linear regression analysis determined the influence of parental support on academic success of undergraduates. Qualitative data was analysed thematically.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study investigated the influence of parents' monitoring of academic progress on academic success of undergraduates using multiple regression model. The results of the model summary were as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Model Summary for Parental Monitoring and Students' Academic Success

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.353 ^a	.125	.122	.40108	.125	48.150	1	338	.000	1.911
a. Predictors: (Constant), PMS										
b. Dependent Variable: AS										
$p < .05$.										

Source: Field data (2026)

The regression model summary in Table 1 above indicates that parental monitoring of academic progress had a small but statistically significant positive relationship with academic success. The correlation coefficient r was .353, suggesting a weak to moderate positive association between the two variables. As parental monitoring increased, academic success also tended to increase, though the relationship was not particularly strong.

The R Square value of .125 indicated that parental monitoring explained approximately 12.5% of the variance in academic success. In other words, while monitoring did contribute to students' academic outcomes, the vast majority of differences in academic success, nearly 88%, were attributable to other factors not included in this model, such as student motivation, prior academic achievement, teaching quality, socioeconomic background, or peer influences. The adjusted R Square was .122, which was nearly identical to the unadjusted value, confirming that the model was not over fitted and that the explained variance would likely hold in the broader population.

The change statistics indicated that the regression model was statistically significant, with an F-change of 48.150, $p < .001$. This result shows that the predictor variables collectively contributed a statistically significant improvement in explaining the variance in academic success. The regression model was statistically significant, F-change = 48.150, $p < .001$, indicating that the predictor variables collectively made a significant contribution to explaining variation in academic success. The Durbin–Watson statistic was 1.91, indicating no significant autocorrelation among the residuals and suggesting that the assumption of independent errors was satisfied. The null hypothesis, which stated that parental monitoring of academic progress had no significant influence on academic success, was not supported. Instead, the alternative hypothesis was accepted: parental monitoring of academic progress did have a statistically significant influence on academic success.

The quantitative finding ($r = .353$) was reflected in the qualitative interviews, which revealed considerable variability in monitoring practices among parents. A parent who practiced systematic monitoring described a direct link to student effort:

'Every time a semester ends; I tell them to show me their transcript. If I see that the marks are not good, we sit down to understand what the problem is. This makes him realize that I am following up closely their studies.' (Oral interview, P08, 2026)

In contrast, another parent admitted to minimal monitoring, which helps explain why the overall correlation is weak-to-moderate rather than strong:

'I don't even understand how those university things work. If I see they are still in school and haven't been sent home, I know everything is fine.... I just ask "are you studying?" they say "yes", and that's enough.' (Oral interview, P11, 2026)

This qualitative divergence illuminates why some parents monitored the learners intensively, others monitored minimally, and still others did not monitor at all. The averaging of these diverse practices across the sample produced a weak-to-moderate aggregate correlation.

Furthermore, the qualitative data revealed a paradox that the correlation coefficient alone could not capture. One Dean of Faculty observed:

'We see a direct correlation between students whose parents constantly call or come to university to verify results and low performance. The students who are being watched are either drug addicts or class absentees.' (Oral interview, D01, 2026)

This qualitative insight raises the possibility of reverse causation; that poor student performance may trigger increased parental monitoring, rather than monitoring causing improved performance. In such cases, monitoring was a response to failure rather than a cause of success, which would dilute the positive correlation.

The R Square value of .125 indicates that parental monitoring explained approximately 12.5% of the variance in academic success. In other words, while monitoring did contribute to students' academic outcomes, the vast majority of differences in academic success, nearly 88%, were attributable to other factors not included in this model, such as student motivation, prior academic achievement, teaching quality, socioeconomic background, or peer influences. The adjusted R Square was .122, which was nearly identical to the unadjusted value, confirming that the model was not overfitted and that the explained variance would likely hold in the broader population.

The qualitative findings identifies specific limitations of monitoring as a predictor of academic success. A Dean of Faculties explained that monitoring, when excessive, may actually undermine the very outcomes it seeks to promote:

"University is also about developing autonomy and personal responsibility. Over-reliance on parental monitoring could hinder a student's ability to manage their own affairs, a skill crucial for the job market. Excessive parental monitoring can undermine that goal." (Oral interview, D02, 2026)

This qualitative nuance suggested that the relationship between monitoring and academic success may be curvilinear rather than linear: moderate monitoring may be beneficial, but both too little (neglect) and too much (helicopter parenting) may be detrimental. The linear regression model ($R^2 = .125$) captured the overall positive trend but could not detect this potential curvilinearity, which may explain why only 12.5% of variance was accounted for.

Additionally, a Student Counsellor distinguished between productive and counterproductive monitoring:

'The students who come to me most anxious are those with parents who check on them daily. They say, 'My mom will see I missed one examination.' That pressure is counterproductive. Monitoring with grace is the way to go.' (Oral interview, C02, 2026)

This qualitative distinction highlights that the effectiveness of parental monitoring depends not only on whether parents monitor their children but also on how they do so. While monitoring may promote academic achievement, approaches that generate anxiety or excessive pressure can undermine students' psychological well-being, thereby diminishing its overall impact. This may help explain the modest effect size observed in the model, where parental monitoring accounted for only 12.5% ($R^2 = .125$) of the variance in academic success.

Furthermore, a Chaplain distinguished between grade monitoring and wellbeing monitoring:

'The saddest cases I see are students whose parents monitor only results, not wellbeing. The student gets an A but is depressed. The parent celebrates while the child suffers in silence. Monitoring must include emotional health and spiritual not just transcripts.' (Oral interview, CP02, 2026)

This qualitative evidence helps explain why parental monitoring accounted for only 12.5% of the variance in academic success. Specifically, when parents concentrated primarily on students' grades while overlooking their emotional well-being and social experiences, they may have failed to address other critical factors that significantly influence academic success.

Table 2: ANOVA for the Influence of Parental Monitoring of Academic Performance on Academic Success

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.746	1	7.746	48.150	.000 ^b

	Residual	54.374	33 8	.161		
	Total	62.119	33 9			
a. Dependent Variable: AS.						
b. Predictors: (Constant), PMS						
p < .05.						

Source: Field data (2026)

The ANOVA results presented in Table 2 indicate that the regression model was statistically significant ($F(1,338) = 48.150, p < .001$). Since the ANOVA results in table 2 indicate that the regression model is statistically significant, $F_{Obs}(1, 338) = 48.150, p < .001, F_{Critical}(1, 338) = 3.869$. Since the F_{Obs} is greater than $F_{Critical}$ the null hypothesis was rejected, suggesting that parental monitoring of academic progress support reliably predicts academic success among undergraduates. This suggests that parental monitoring of academic performance made a statistically significant contribution to predicting academic success among undergraduate students in public universities in Kenya.

A Student Counsellor described a fourth-year student on the verge of suicide whose parents were already preparing graduation celebrations for a son who had secretly stopped attending classes in Year Two due to alcoholism, yet kept taking tuition money because the parents '*never bothered to ask for an academic progress report*' (Oral interview, C01, 2026).

This qualitative data vividly demonstrated that inadequate parental monitoring can result in undetected academic difficulties, financial losses, delayed graduation, and significant psychological distress. These findings provide practical context for the statistically significant relationship observed in the regression model ($F = 48.150, p < .001$), highlighting the real-world consequences associated with insufficient parental monitoring.

Furthermore, a parent described how monitoring functions as both a direct and indirect deterrent, stating, '*I did not send her to university to participate in strikes or to break the rules... if she is expelled for indiscipline, she should not come back to my house again*' (Oral interview, P09, 2026). This demonstrated that monitoring deterred rule-breaking, strikes, and premature romantic entanglements that would otherwise disrupt academic progress. Additionally, a Dean of Students provided administrative corroboration, noting that '*parents who monitor their children's character and social habits often produce students who respect university authority,*' with better adherence to rules on drug use, alcohol, and campus conduct when students know "*their parents are in touch with the administration*". (Oral interview, DS01, 2026)

This qualitative evidence converged with the ANOVA result ($F = 48.150, p < .001$), demonstrating that the statistical prediction corresponded to observable, measurable outcomes in student behavior: reduced disciplinary infractions, better rule adherence, and greater respect for university authority.

The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .125$) indicates that parental monitoring of academic progress accounted for 12.5% of the variance in academic success. The Pearson correlation coefficient ($r = .353, p < .01$) demonstrates a statistically significant positive relationship, reflecting a weak-to-moderate association between the two variables. This suggests that higher levels of parental monitoring were associated with higher levels of academic success, although the relationship was modest. Since parental monitoring explained only 12.5% of the variation in academic success, the remaining 87.5% was attributable to other factors not included in the model. Therefore,

while parental monitoring was a statistically significant predictor of academic success, its overall practical contribution was relatively limited.

The qualitative findings provide concrete examples of the specific monitoring behaviours that parents employed, collectively showing the multi-faceted nature of monitoring that the single correlation coefficient aggregates. A parent described the ritual of transcript review as a monitoring tool, stating, *'Every time a semester ends, I tell them to show me their transcript. If I see that the marks are not good, we sit down to understand what the problem is.'* (Oral interview, P08, 2026). Another parent described the use of contracts and consequences, declaring, *'I have a contract with my child... that makes them study hard. My monitoring has results'* (Oral interview, P16, 2026). Meanwhile, a third parent described environmental monitoring, explaining, *'I visited their hostel without telling them... I want to ensure they live in a safe and study-friendly place'* (Oral interview, P12, 2026). The modest strength of the correlation may reflect that not all parents employed all these strategies; some used only one or two, while others used none. This was evidenced by a parent who engaged in minimal monitoring and admitted, *'I don't even understand how those university things work... I just ask 'are you studying?' they say 'yes', and that's enough'* (Oral interview, P11, 2026).

Furthermore, the qualitative findings problematized the assumption that monitoring is uniformly beneficial. A Dean of Faculty offered a critical perspective complicating the interpretation of the positive correlation: *'We see a direct correlation between students whose parents constantly call or come to university to verify results and low performance. The students who are being watched are either drug addicts or class absentees'* (Oral interview, D01, 2026). This observation raised the possibility of reverse causation, where poor student performance might trigger increased parental monitoring rather than monitoring causing improved performance, meaning the correlation reflected parents responding to problems rather than preventing them.

Finally, a Chaplain offered a theological and practical synthesis on how to monitor effectively, reminding parents, *'Do not monitor your child with anger. Monitor them with love. If you monitor with anger, they will avoid you. If you monitor with love, they will come to you on their own. That is the wisdom of monitoring'* (Oral interview, CP02, 2026). This qualitative insight explained why monitoring had a statistically significant but modest effect ($r = .353$): monitoring delivered with love and respect might strengthen the parent-child relationship and promote academic success, while monitoring delivered with anger and suspicion might drive students away, potentially weakening academic outcomes, with the overall correlation averaging across these different modes of monitoring.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Parental monitoring of academic progress serves as an early warning system, enabling timely intervention when students face academic challenges. However, monitoring practices vary widely, with some parents actively engaged while others remain passive, assuming continued enrollment equates to satisfactory progress. This disconnect can have devastating consequences, as evidenced by students nearing graduation who have actually been failing for years. Parents should monitor academic progress consistently. They should regularly request transcripts and discuss academic performance, but monitoring should be delivered with love rather than anger. Excessive surveillance such as checking portals and visiting university multiple times may increase students' anxiety and should be avoided. Additionally, parents should register for and actively use the University Parent Information Portal (UPIP) to monitor their children's fee status, class attendance, and academic performance. Those with digital literacy challenges should seek assistance from the university ICT help desk, family members, or attend training sessions.

REFERENCES

1. Abulencia, C. (2021, July 14). *Why is education important and how does it affect one's future?* World Vision Canada. <https://www.worldvision.ca/stories/education/why-is-education-important>

2. Anghel, B. (2023). Defining and measuring academic success in higher education: Beyond grades and GPA. *Studies in Higher Education*, 48(5), 721–738. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2189012>
3. Budiwati, N., Hernawan, A. H., & Nugroho, R. A. (2024). Analysis of the Role of Mentors in Pre-Service Teacher Education Program: Perspective of the Role of Mentors in the Future. In *International Conference on Social Science Education Proceeding* (Vol. 2, pp. 20-30). <https://ppjips.ulm.ac.id/index.php/icsse>
4. Cluver, L., Meinck, F., Yakubovich, A., Doubt, J., Redfern, A., Ward, C., ... Gardner, F. (2020). Reducing child abuse among adolescents in South Africa: Findings from parenting support interventions. *BMJ Global Health*, 5(1), e002149. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002149>
5. Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
6. Davis, K. (2024). Factors influencing academic success in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(2), 245–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2256789>
7. Dzikunu, C. K., Acquah, A., Yelkper, D., & Pajibo, E. D. (2026). Indiscipline in senior high schools in Ghana. *Ghana Journal of Education and Teaching*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.64712/ghajet.v14i1.376>
8. Eberly, M. B., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Nelson, L. J. (2024). Helicopter parenting and emerging adult adjustment: Implications for autonomy and academic outcomes. *Journal of Adult Development*, 31(1), 44–58. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-023-09442-3>
9. Egerton University. (2022, March 15). *Egerton University launches parents and guardians portal* [Press release]. Egerton University Office of the Vice-Chancellor. <https://www.egerton.ac.ke/parents-portal-launch>
10. Ekpenyong, J. A., Owan, V. J., Mbon, U. F., & Undie, S. B. (2023). Family and community inputs as predictors of students' overall, cognitive, affective and psychomotor learning outcomes in secondary schools. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 7(1), 103–127. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202319099>
11. Eneku, P. (2023). *Challenges in pastoralist regions: Insecurity and school attendance in Turkana* [Unpublished manuscript].
12. Indimuli, L. N. (2022). *Influence of parental monitoring on academic achievement among primary school pupils in Kenya* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Kenyatta University.
13. Jung, C., Hilkert, A., Stumpf, S., Weber, E., & Dombrowski, J. (2026). Parents vs. teachers vs. friends: Comparing the roles of different socialization agents in children's and adolescent's online media use [Preprint]. *hohPublica*. <https://hohpublica.uni-hohenheim.de/handle/123456789/18883>
14. Jeynes, W. H. (2022). A meta-analysis: The relationship between parental expectations and student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 59(1), 63–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00420859211073892>
15. Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development & Terre des Hommes. (2021). *Online child safety manual: Equipping parents to address digital harms*. KICD.
16. Kisii University. (2025, December). *Directive on student-parents and children in classrooms* [Internal university policy document]. Kisii University.
17. Kimathi, I. G., & Kipchumba, H. E. (2025). Influence of parenting styles on child protection services in Igembe Central, Meru County, Kenya. *African Quarterly Social Science Review*, 2(4), 370–377. <https://doi.org/10.51867/AQSSR.2.4.36>
18. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610.
19. Lee, J., & Shute, V. J. (2022). Personal and social-contextual factors in K–12 and higher education student engagement and achievement. *Educational Psychologist*, 57(4), 217–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2022.2035304>
20. Manulat, J. B. (2025). Key predictors of academic success in flexible learning environments: A PLS-SEM analysis. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, Article 1633040. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1633040>
21. Mettoh, J. H., Khamasi, W. J., & Kisilu, M. K. (2018). Parental participation on academic performance and graduation of male students: A case study of a university in western region of Kenya. *World Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(3), 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.12691/wjssh-2-3-2>

22. Mills, R., Mann, M. J., & Smith, M. L. (2021). Parental support and monitoring as associated with adolescent alcohol and tobacco use by gender and age. *BMC Public Health*, 21, Article 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-12119-3>
23. Ministry of Education. (2020). *Government directives on parental monitoring of children's movements and associations during COVID-19*. Government Printer.
24. Mugambi, D. K., & Mwove, D. K. (2021). Parenting styles as predictors of risky behaviours among students in Embu County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(6), 15–22.
25. Munir, S., & Saleem, A. (2025). *Factors influencing university students' performance: A quantitative survey*. *Journal of Regional Studies Review*, 4(1), 15–27. <https://doi.org/10.62843/jrsr/2025.4a047>
26. Musuu, F. K., & Njuguna, F. W. (2025). School-parent collaboration in monitoring homework activities under the Competency-Based Curriculum in Yatta Sub-county, Kenya. *East African Journal of Educational Research and Policy*, 12(1), 45–62.
27. Mutiso, J. M., & Mwanja, J. M. (2024). Irregular parental involvement and declining KCSE performance in Yatta Sub-county, Kenya. *Kenya Journal of Educational Research*, 7(2), 112–128.
28. Mutuku, F. K., & Mwanja, J. M. (2021). Parents' role in monitoring learning activities and students' academic performance in public secondary schools in Kangundo Sub-county, Kenya. *East African Journal of Education Studies*, 4(1), 78–92.
29. Mwei, P. K. (2022). *Barriers to parental involvement and the transition to Competency-Based Education in Kenya* [Unpublished manuscript].
30. Nchaga, A. M., & Esau, M. (2025). Effects of parental functioning on career path selection of university students in Kisumu City, Kisumu County, Kenya. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 9(1), 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.59765/v933rp>
31. Nkurunziza, J. D. (2025). *IoT and computer vision integration for student behavior monitoring in Rwandan schools: Implications for parental engagement* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Rwanda.
32. Nnamdi Azikiwe University. (2025, February 10). *Unizik launches digital portal for parents to monitor students' academic progress* [Press release]. <https://unizik.edu.ng/news>
33. Ocharo, L., Itegi, F., & Njoroge, R. (2023). Role of Parents' Involvement in Shaping Pupils' Discipline and Its Influence on Performance in KCPE. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 7(2), 811–826.
34. Odhiambo, F., & Akinyi, C. (2023). Parental involvement and learner outcomes in junior schools in Kibra Sub-county, Nairobi, Kenya: Barriers and opportunities. *African Journal of Education and Development*, 5(1), 34–49.
35. Olufunke, A. S., Ogunlade, O. O., & Bamidele, E. F. (2020). Parents' disposition to a mobile-based parental monitoring model for evaluating undergraduate records in Ondo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology*, 16(3), 112–128. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1278855.pdf>
36. Omae, C. M., Nyabero, C., & Oraro, R. (2025). Examining the role of parental involvement in enhancing academic outcomes in junior schools in Kibra Sub-County, Kenya. *Global Educational Research Journal*, 13(10), 434–438.
37. Pathify, (2025). Delegated access: Transforming parent engagement in higher education. *Pathify Higher Education Solutions*. <https://pathify.com/delegated-access-parent>
38. Shawaluddin, N. S., Lah, T. M. A. T., Mahjom, M., Nasaruddin, N. H., Alias, N., Riyadzi, M. R., Saminathan, T. A., Abidin, N. F. Z., Kuay, L. K., & Awaluddin, S. M. (2025). Associations of parental connectedness and monitoring with high-risk behaviors among Malaysian adolescents: A nationally representative study. *BMC Public Health*, 25(1), Article 3273. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-025-24598-9>



39. Shikokoti, H., & Imonje, K. R. (2023). Factors influencing rate of Completion in Higher Education. A Case of Faculty of Education, University of Nairobi, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 14(31), 77-83.
40. Silinskas, G., & Kikas, E. (2019). Parental involvement in math homework: Links to children's performance and motivation. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 63(1), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2017.1336479>
41. Van der Kaap-Deeder, J., Soenens, B., Mabbe, E., Dieleman, L., Mouratidis, A., Campbell, R., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2021). Profiles of teachers' need-support: How do autonomy support, structure, and involvement cohere and predict motivation and learning outcomes? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 99, Article 103257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103257>
42. Wei, S., Teo, T., Malpique, A., & Lausen, A. (2022). Parental autonomy support, parental psychological control and Chinese university students' behavior regulation: The mediating role of basic psychological needs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 735570. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.735570>
43. Wekesa, J. W., & Okoth, U. A. (2022). Parental provision of academic tools and students' academic achievement in public secondary schools in Navakholo Sub-county, Kakamega County, Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 10(4), 67–82.
44. Yu, S., Assor, A., Yu, H., & Wang, Q. (2023). Autonomy as a potential moral resource: Parenting practices supporting youth need for autonomy negatively predict youth acceptance of academic dishonesty. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 101, Article 102245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2022.102245>
45. Zuma, T. H. (2020). *University student's perceptions of parental support, and its effect on their academic achievement* [Master's dissertation, University of KwaZulu-Natal]. UKZN ResearchSpace. <http://hdl.handle.net/10413/21549>