GLOBUS PUBLICATION

Globus Journal of Progressive Education
A Refereed Research Journal
Vol 16 / No 2 / Jul-Dec 2026 P - ISSN: 2231-1335, E- ISSN: 2582-7200

BEYOND THE KITCHEN: FINANCIAL CAPACITY, RESOURCE ACCESS, HOME LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND FAMILY BACKGROUND SHAPING COOKERY VOCATIONAL PROFICIENCY

[*]Rabbi Joy B. Geogangco
[**]Raynor F. Ereje

Paper Received: 23.05.2026 / **Paper Revised**: 21.07.2026 / **Paper Accepted**: 17.08.2026 / **Paper Published**: 29.08.2026
Corresponding Author: Rabbi Joy B. Geogangco; doi: 10.46360/globus.edu.220262007

Abstract

This study focused on the relationship between domestic support factors and the vocational success of Senior High School Cookery learners in the secondary schools in the South Negros Occidental for School Year 2025-2026. A descriptive-correlational research design was utilized to describe the socio-economic and domestic support of TechPro Cookery learners and determine its relationship with their vocational proficiency. The findings revealed that all identified factors were perceived to influence Cookery learners' vocational proficiency to a great extent. Moreover, findings showed that Cookery learners demonstrated a very high level of vocational proficiency across all income groups and family structures. Also, results showed that there is no significant difference in the extent of prevalent domestic support factors and the level of vocational proficiency when grouped according to income and family structure. Moreover, the results indicated that all domestic support factors have a significant positive relationship with vocational proficiency. Financial capacity, access to tools and materials, home learning environment, and family background and support all contribute to higher vocational proficiency. Lastly, the regression analysis showed that the combined domestic support factors significantly predict vocational proficiency. However, only access to tools and materials emerged as a significant predictor, making it the strongest determinant of vocational proficiency among Cookery learners.

Keywords: TechPro Cookery Learners, Financial Capacity, Resource Access, Home Learning Environment, Family Background Shaping.

Introduction

Socioeconomic constraints remain a significant challenge affecting students' access to quality Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) education and the development of industry-relevant competencies. Although Technical-Vocational Education and Training (TVET) programs are designed to provide competency-based learning aligned with labor market needs, unequal access to financial resources, training materials, and practical learning opportunities often limits their effectiveness (Misbah et al., 2020). Similarly, students from disadvantaged backgrounds encounter difficulties participating in skill development activities that require costly materials, equipment, and hands-on training (Orbeta & Corpus, 2024).

Bernardo (2021) described this condition as "resource poverty," wherein students in laboratory-based courses struggle to fully engage in experiential learning due to insufficient tools and supplies, ultimately affecting competency development. This issue is particularly evident in Cookery programs, where practical performance depends heavily on access to ingredients, culinary equipment, and regular skills practice.

Despite existing studies, there remains a gap in understanding how socioeconomic constraints and domestic support interact to influence vocational competency, particularly among TechPro Cookery learners in Negros Occidental. Most research has examined these factors separately rather than as interconnected influences. Thus, this study investigated their combined effects on occupational competency and explored interventions that may enhance learner participation, competency development, and access to TESDA certification. Through this, the study aimed to support school- and community-based initiatives that strengthen vocational competency through both institutional and household support systems.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between domestic support factors and the vocational success of Senior High School Cookery learners in the secondary schools in Southern Negros Occidental for School Year 2025-2026.

*Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Talisay City, Negros Occidental, Philippines.
**PhDTM, Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Talisay City, Negros Occidental, Philippines.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following:

1. What is the extent of the prevalent domestic support factors that are perceived by Cookery learners in terms of financial capacity, access to tools and materials, home learning environment, and family background and support when taken as a whole and when grouped according to:
    a. Monthly Family Income
    b. Family Size
2. What is the level of self-assessed vocational proficiency of the Cookery learners when taken as a whole and when grouped according to the aforementioned variables?
3. Is there a significant difference in the extent of the prevalent domestic support factors when Cookery learners are grouped according to the aforementioned variables?
4. Is there a significant difference in the self - assessed vocational proficiency levels of the Cookery learners when grouped according to the aforementioned variables?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the identified domestic support factors and the self - assessed vocational proficiency of Cookery learners?
6. Which of the identified domestic support factors significantly predicts the vocational proficiency of Cookery learners?

Methods/Theory/Calculation

This study focused on the relationship between domestic support factors and the vocational success of Senior High School Cookery learners in the secondary schools in the South Negros Occidental for School Year 2025-2026. This study utilized a self - made survey questionnaire which undergone Lawshe testing and validity testing. The data gathered were analyzed through the use of frequency and percentage distribution, mean and standard deviation, Shapiro–Wilk test (for normality test), Kruskal–Wallis H test with post hoc, Spearman Rho and Multiple Regression analysis were used.

The respondents of the study consist of one hundred fifty-six (156) learners from six public secondary schools in the South Negros Occidental offering Technical Professional Cookery (TechPro Cookery) who were officially enrolled and have taken the TESDA assessment for School Year 2025–2026. The participants were selected through the use of random sampling.

This study was limited to learners enrolled in the Technical Professional (TechPro) Cookery specialization to assess vocational proficiency and the factors influencing their learning experiences. The variables examined included family monthly income, family structure, financial capacity, access to tools and materials, home learning environment, family support, and vocational proficiency.

Learners from private schools and other TechPro specializations were excluded to ensure comparability of results and because different specializations require distinct competencies, tools, and learning environments. Likewise, variables such as teacher competence, school facilities, curriculum design, and psychological factors were not included, as they were beyond the scope of the study, which focused primarily on home-related, socio-economic, and family-related factors affecting vocational proficiency.

Result and Findings

Presentation, Analysis, and Interpretation of Data

This chapter presents the data gathered from the respondents of the study. It includes the analysis and interpretation of findings based on the objectives of the research.

Extent of the Prevalent Factors Affecting the Cookery Learners' Vocational Proficiency

Table 2 presents the extent of the prevalent factors affecting the Cookery learners' vocational proficiency in terms of financial capacity, access to tools and materials, home learning environment, family background and support, and overall factors when grouped according to monthly family income and family structure.

Table 1: Extent of the Prevalent Factors Affecting the Cookery Learners' Vocational Proficiency

Variable	Financial Capacity			Access to Tools and Materials			Home Learning Environment			Family Background and Support			Factors		
	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int
Family Income (Monthly)															
Lower	3.85	0.66	Great	3.98	0.57	Great	3.42	0.92	Great	3.93	0.61	Great	3.78	0.48	Great
Higher	3.54	0.85	Great	3.69	0.65	Great	3.89	0.69	Great	3.72	0.72	Great	3.71	0.61	Great
Family Structure															
Small	3.41	0.90	Great	3.64	0.69	Great	3.82	0.66	Great	3.70	0.62	Great	3.64	0.53	Great

Medium	3.77	0.70	Great	3.91	0.59	Great	3.57	0.91	Great	3.87	0.68	Great	3.77	0.53	Great
Large	3.97	0.68	Great	3.95	0.59	Great	3.60	0.89	Great	3.90	0.69	Great	3.85	0.62	Great
Whole	**3.71**	**0.77**	**Great**	**3.85**	**0.63**	**Great**	**3.63**	**0.86**	**Great**	**3.83**	**0.67**	**Great**	**3.75**	**0.54**	**Great**

Results showed that in terms of financial capacity, respondents from lower-income families demonstrated a great extent of influence (M=3.85, SD=0.66), while those from higher-income families likewise demonstrated a great extent (M=3.54, SD=0.85). In terms of family structure, respondents from small (M=3.41, SD=0.90), medium (M=3.77, SD=0.70), and large families (M=3.97, SD=0.68) all demonstrated a great extent of financial capacity factors. Overall, the respondents demonstrated a great extent of financial capacity factors affecting vocational proficiency (M=3.71, SD=0.77).

With respect to access to tools and materials, respondents from lower-income (M=3.98, SD=0.57) and higher-income families (M=3.69, SD=0.65) both demonstrated a great extent of influence. Similarly, respondents from small (M=3.64, SD=0.69), medium (M=3.91, SD=0.59), and large families (M=3.95, SD=0.59) all demonstrated a great extent. Overall, the respondents demonstrated a great extent of access to tools and materials affecting vocational proficiency (M=3.85, SD=0.63).

Regarding home learning environment, respondents from lower-income (M=3.42, SD=0.92) and higher-income families (M=3.89, SD=0.69) both demonstrated a great extent of influence. Likewise, respondents from small (M=3.82, SD=0.66), medium (M=3.57, SD=0.91), and large families (M=3.60, SD=0.89) all demonstrated a great extent. Overall, the respondents demonstrated a great extent of home learning environment factors affecting vocational proficiency (M=3.63, SD=0.86).

In terms of family background and support, respondents from lower-income (M=3.93, SD=0.61) and higher-income families (M=3.72, SD=0.72) both demonstrated a great extent of influence. Similarly, respondents from small (M=3.70, SD=0.62), medium (M=3.87, SD=0.68), and large families (M=3.90, SD=0.69) all demonstrated a great extent. Overall, the respondents demonstrated a great extent of family background and support factors affecting vocational proficiency (M=3.83, SD=0.67).

Regarding overall factors, respondents from lower-income (M=3.78, SD=0.48) and higher-income families (M=3.71, SD=0.61) both demonstrated a great extent of influence. In terms of family structure, respondents from small (M=3.64, SD=0.53), medium (M=3.77, SD=0.53), and large families (M=3.85, SD=0.62) all demonstrated a great extent of prevalent factors affecting vocational proficiency. Overall, the respondents demonstrated a great extent of prevalent factors affecting the Cookery learners' vocational proficiency (M=3.75, SD=0.54).

The findings indicated that financial capacity, access to tools and materials, home learning environment, and family background and support affected the vocational proficiency of Cookery learners to a great extent across income groups and family structures. Among the factors, access to tools and materials obtained the highest overall mean, suggesting its significant role in supporting learners' vocational proficiency.

Supported with the study of Sirin's (2016) claim that students' access to learning opportunities and skill development is greatly influenced by their socioeconomic level, especially in practice-based disciplines where resources are crucial for competency acquisition.
In the same way, Reardon (2018) clarified that unequal educational experiences are a direct result of income inequality, particularly when it comes to skill development that necessitates ongoing practical experience.

Moreover, supporting the findings of Jensen (2017), who noted that economic hardship limits students' access to educational materials and training opportunities, thereby affecting performance in technical-vocational programs.

Furthermore, Cummings and Vandewater (2019) highlighted that family income level is closely associated with students' ability to acquire learning tools and participate in skill-based learning activities.

Level of Vocational Proficiency as Assessed by Cookery learners

Table 2 presented the level of vocational proficiency of the Cookery learners when grouped according to monthly family income and family structure.

Table 2: Level of Vocational Proficiency of the Cookery Learners

Variables	M	SD	Interpretation
Family Income (Monthly)			
Poor	4.27	0.57	Very High
Low-income	4.33	0.59	Very High
Family Structure			
Small	4.30	0.60	Very High
Medium	4.29	0.55	Very High
Large	4.33	0.68	Very High
Whole	***4.30***	***0.58***	***Very High***

In terms of family income, respondents from poor families demonstrated a very high level of vocational proficiency (M = 4.27, SD = 0.57). Likewise, respondents from low-income families demonstrated a very high level of vocational proficiency (M = 4.33, SD = 0.59).

With respect to family structure, respondents from small families demonstrated a very high level of vocational proficiency (M = 4.30, SD = 0.60). Similarly, respondents from medium-sized families (M = 4.29, SD = 0.55) and large families (M = 4.33, SD = 0.68) also demonstrated a very high level of vocational proficiency.

The respondents demonstrated a very high level of vocational proficiency (M = 4.30, SD = 0.58). The findings indicate that the Cookery learners generally possess strong vocational proficiency regardless of variations in family income and family structure.

The study by Okolie et al. (2020), which found that competency-based technical-vocational education effectively develops learners' occupational skills regardless of socioeconomic background when training standards are consistently implemented, supports the conclusion that Cookery learners demonstrated a very high level of vocational proficiency regardless of family income and family structure.

Similarly, Misbah et al. (2020) found that when given suitable learning experiences and opportunity for hands-on training, vocational students can achieve high levels of technical competence.

Additionally, Halalainen et al. (2018) stressed that workplace learning experiences and skill training quality had a greater impact on vocational competency than demographic traits.

Lastly, according to Wheelahan and Moodie (2021), vocational education programs are made to give students skills that are applicable to a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds.

Difference in the Extent of the Prevalent Domestic Support Factors Affecting the Cookery Learners' Vocational Proficiency

Table 3 presented the difference in the extent of the prevalent domestic support factors.

Table 3: Difference in the Extent of the Prevalent Factors Affecting the Cookery Learners' Vocational Proficiency

Variable	U	Z	p
Family Income (Monthly)	2844.500	-1.135	0.257
	H	**df**	**p**
Family Structure	0.488	2	0.784

*Note: *difference is significant when p ≤ 0.05.*

The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to determine the normality of the variables. The results revealed that the prevalent domestic support factors affecting vocational proficiency were not normally distributed [W = 0.976, p = 0.007], indicating a significant deviation from normality since the computed p-value is less than the significance level of 0.05. Likewise, the results further revealed that vocational proficiency is not normally distributed [W = 0.902, p = 0.000], indicating a significant deviation from normality since the computed p-value is less than the significance level of 0.05.

Based on these findings, nonparametric statistical tests were used for the inferential analyses of the study variables.

The Mann–Whitney U test was used to determine the significant difference in the extent of the prevalent factors affecting the Cookery learners' vocational proficiency when grouped according to monthly family income, while the Kruskal–Wallis H test was used for family structure. The results revealed no significant difference in the extent of the prevalent factors when grouped according to monthly family income (U = 2844.500, Z = −1.135, p = 0.257), since the computed p-value is greater

than the significance level of 0.05. Likewise, no significant difference was found when grouped according to family structure [H(2) = 0.488, p = 0.784], since the computed p-value is greater than the significance level of 0.05.

These findings indicate that the extent of the prevalent domestic support factors affecting vocational proficiency is comparable regardless of the learners' monthly family income and family structure. This suggests that the influence of financial capacity, access to tools and materials, home learning environment, and family background and support on vocational proficiency is generally consistent across the different respondent groups.

The findings of Masten and Barnes (2018), who contended that supportive family processes frequently function similarly across varied socioeconomic groups, are consistent with the lack of significant differences in the extent of domestic support factors across income levels and family structures. Similarly, Prime, Wade, and Browne (2020) found that family support remains a crucial component in students' development, regardless of family composition or income level.

According to Benner et al. (2016), perceptions of educational encouragement and parental support are often similar across different family arrangements.

Eccles and Roeser (2018) further noted that, despite demographic differences, environmental support systems can have comparable effects on students.

Furthermore, Castro et al. (2015) found that parental involvement consistently promotes student development across various socioeconomic settings.

Difference in the Level of Vocational Proficiency as Assessed by the Cookery Learners

Table 4 presents the difference in the level of vocational proficiency as assessed by the Cookery learners.

Table 4: Difference in the Level of Vocational Proficiency of the Cookery Learners

Variable	U	Z	p
Family Income (Monthly)	2915.500	-0.898	0.369
	H	**df**	**p**
Family Structure	0.120	2	0.942

*Note: *difference is significant when p ≤ 0.05.*

The Mann–Whitney U test was used to determine the significant difference in the level of vocational proficiency of the Cookery learners when grouped according to monthly family income, while the Kruskal–Wallis H test was used to determine the difference when grouped according to family structure. The results revealed no significant difference in the level of vocational proficiency when grouped according to monthly family income (U = 2915.500, Z = −0.898, p = 0.369) and family structure [H(2) = 0.120, p = 0.942], as the computed p-values were greater than the significance level of 0.05.

These findings indicate that the vocational proficiency levels of the Cookery learners remained comparable regardless of variations in monthly family income and family structure. This suggests that the learners demonstrated similar levels of vocational proficiency despite differences in their socioeconomic backgrounds and family size.

Okolie et al. (2020) found that learners enrolled in competency-based vocational programs tend to achieve comparable skill outcomes when exposed to standardized training, supporting the finding that vocational proficiency did not significantly differ according to family income and family structure.

Similarly, Hałäläinen et al. (2018) emphasized that learner involvement and instructional quality, rather than family-related variables, are among the key factors influencing vocational competencies.

Furthermore, Moodie (2020) found that by offering equal chances for skill development, successful TVET programs can lessen differences in student outcomes.

Additionally, Wheelahan and Moodie (2021) emphasized that rather than socioeconomic status, training experiences and competency-based assessments have a major role in determining vocational performance.

Relationship Between Domestic Support Factors and Vocational Proficiency of Cookery Learners

Table 5 showed the relationship between domestic support factors and vocation proficiency of Cookery Learners.

Table 5: Relationship Between Domestic Support Factors and Vocational Proficiency of Cookery Learners

Variable	rs	df	p
Financial Capacity × Vocational Proficiency	0.378*	158	0.000
Access to Tools and Materials × Vocational Proficiency	0.435*	158	0.000

Home Learning Environment × Vocational Proficiency	0.288*	158	0.000
Family Background and Support × Vocational Proficiency	0.390*	158	0.000

Note: *Correlation is significant when $p \leq 0.05$.*

The Spearman rank-order correlation was used to determine the significant relationship between the identified domestic support factors and the vocational proficiency of the Cookery learners. The results revealed a significant positive relationship between financial capacity and vocational proficiency [$r_s(158) = 0.378$, $p = 0.000$], indicating that better financial capacity is associated with higher vocational proficiency among the Cookery learners.

Likewise, a significant positive relationship was found between access to tools and materials and vocational proficiency [$r_s(158) = 0.435$, $p = 0.000$], suggesting that greater access to tools and learning materials is associated with higher levels of vocational proficiency.

Similarly, home learning environment demonstrated a significant positive relationship with vocational proficiency [$r_s(158) = 0.288$, $p = 0.000$], indicating that a more supportive home learning environment contributes to better vocational proficiency among the learners.

Furthermore, family background and support also showed a significant positive relationship with vocational proficiency [$r_s(158) = 0.390$, $p = 0.000$], suggesting that stronger family support is associated with higher vocational proficiency levels.

These findings indicate that domestic support factors significantly influence the vocational proficiency of the Cookery learners. This further implies that learners who experience stronger financial support, better access to tools and materials, supportive home learning environments, and positive family support tend to demonstrate higher levels of vocational proficiency in Cookery.

Castro et al. (2015), whose meta-analysis showed that parental participation favorably effects student success and skill development, corroborate the strong positive association between domestic support elements and vocational proficiency.

Furthermore, Benner et al. (2016) highlighted that teenagers' motivation and learning results are enhanced by supportive home situations.

According to Sirin (2016), educational possibilities and skill acquisition are influenced by socioeconomic resources.

Additionally, Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) emphasized that learner competency and performance are greatly improved by having access to learning resources and supportive environments, which supports the favorable correlations between vocational proficiency and domestic support factors.

Predictors of Vocational Proficiency of Cookery Learners

Table 6 presented the predictors of vocational proficiency of Cookery learners.

Table 6: Predictors of Vocational Proficiency of Cookery Learners

R	**R^2**	**Adjusted R Square**	**F**	**df**	**p**
0.531	0.282	0.264	15.242	4, 155	0.000
Variable		**Beta**		**t**	**p**
(Constant)		2.169		7.589	0.000
Financial Capacity		0.066		0.840	0.402
Access to Tools and Materials		0.312		3.323	0.001
Home Learning Environment		0.066		1.372	0.172
Family Background and Support		0.116		1.376	0.171

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine which of the identified domestic support factors significantly predict the vocational proficiency of Cookery learners. The results revealed that the regression model was significant [$F(4,155) = 15.242$, $p=0.000$], indicating that the combined domestic support factors significantly predict the vocational proficiency of the Cookery learners. The model explained 28.2% of the variance in vocational proficiency ($R^2=0.282$), with an adjusted R^2 of 0.264.

The regression equation for the significant predictor is:

Vocational Proficiency = 2.169 + 0.312 (Access to Tools and Materials)

Specifically, access to tools and materials significantly predicted vocational proficiency ($\beta=0.312$, $t=3.323$, $p=0.001$). The regression equation showed that for every one-unit increase in access to tools and materials, vocational proficiency increases by 0.312 units.

On the other hand, financial capacity did not significantly predict vocational proficiency (β=0.066, t=0.840, p=0.402). Likewise, home learning environment did not significantly predict vocational proficiency (β=0.066, t=1.372, p=0.172), and family background and support also did not significantly predict vocational proficiency (β=0.116, t=1.376, p=0.171), since their computed p-values were greater than the significance level of 0.05.

These findings indicate that among the identified domestic support factors, access to tools and materials is the strongest predictor of vocational proficiency among Cookery learners. This further implies that the availability of cooking tools, equipment, and learning materials plays an important role in enhancing the learners' practical skills and vocational competence.

Lucas, Claxton, and Spencer (2021) found that having access to tools and materials was the biggest predictor of vocational proficiency. They highlighted the importance of real-world resources and realistic learning tools in the development of vocational competence.

Similarly, Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) discovered that learning outcomes and competency development are strongly predicted by the availability of resources.

Additionally, Misbah et al. (2020) came to the conclusion that enhanced vocational performance and skill mastery among technical-vocational learners are directly correlated with the availability of learning facilities and equipment.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The Cookery learners' vocational proficiency was influenced to a great extent by financial capacity, access to tools and materials, home learning environment, and family background and support. Among these factors, access to tools and materials plays the most significant role, indicating that the availability of appropriate resources is crucial in enhancing learners' vocational development.
2. Cookery learners demonstrate a very high level of vocational proficiency regardless of their income level and family structure. This implies that learners generally possess strong vocational skills, suggesting effective development of competencies across diverse socioeconomic backgrounds.
3. There is no significant difference in the extent of the prevalent factors when grouped according to income level and family structure. This leads to the conclusion that learners perceive the influence of financial capacity, access to tools and materials, home learning environment, and family support in a similar manner regardless of socioeconomic differences.
4. There is no significant difference in the level of vocational proficiency when respondents are grouped according to income and family structure. This indicates that vocational proficiency among Cookery learners remains consistent regardless of socioeconomic background and family size.
5. All domestic support factors are significantly related to vocational proficiency. This suggests that financial capacity, access to tools and materials, home learning environment, and family background and support all play important roles in enhancing vocational skills, with access to tools and materials showing the strongest relationship.
6. The domestic support factors collectively predict vocational proficiency; however, only access to tools and materials is a significant predictor. This leads to the conclusion that the availability of tools and materials is the most critical determinant of vocational proficiency among Cookery learners, while other factors contribute but do not independently predict proficiency.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest in conducting this research.

References

1. Akinfolarin, A. V., Oladele, P. O., & Oyeniyi, J. O. (2021). Availability and utilization of instructional materials in technical and vocational education. *International Journal of Educational Research and Development, 3*(2), 45–56.
2. Akinfolarin, A., & Manalo, F. K. B. (2021). *Adequacy of tools and equipment: Obando Senior High School*.
3. Aldaba, F., et al. (2004). *Child labor and poverty in the Philippines*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
4. Anderson, J., & Lopez, M. (2023). *Technical-vocational education and learner competency development*. Educational Skills Journal.
5. Andicoy, A. B., & Torres, J. L. (2024). *Plowing through challenges: A case study of tool and equipment unavailability in TVL Organic Agriculture, SY 2024–2025*.

ORCID. https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1516-1743
6. Avazedo, R., et al. (2023). Socioeconomic status and educational pathways: Implications for student learning outcomes. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 13*(1), 22–35.
7. Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
8. Benner, A. D., Boyle, A. E., & Sadler, S. (2016). Parental involvement and adolescents' educational success: The roles of prior achievement and socioeconomic status. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45*(6), 1053–1064. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0431-4
9. Bhat, M. A., et al. (2022). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A predictive analysis. *International Journal of Educational Studies, 9*(4), 112–123.
10. Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
11. Brown, T., & Smith, R. (2022). *Home learning environments and student achievement*. Journal of Educational Psychology.
12. Bugay, A. C. (2025). *Challenges and opportunities in cookery instruction for Filipino learners*. Department of Education Division of Bataan.
13. Bulama, Y. (2021). Instructional facilities and quality of technical education delivery. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, 7*(1), 15–27.
14. Cadavos, J. (2022). Resource availability and skills acquisition in cookery education. *Asian Journal of Technical Education, 6*(3), 88–97.
15. Castillo, M. R. (2022). Hands-on learning and competency development in cookery education. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 15*(2), 33–45.
16. Castro, M., Expósito-Casas, E., López-Martín, E., Lizasoain, L., Navarro-Asencio, E., & Gaviria, J. L. (2015). Parental involvement on student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 14*, 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.01.002
17. Clark, H., Goyder, J., & Bissel, P. (2021). Home environment and student achievement. *Educational Studies Review, 29*(2), 101–115.
18. Clark, P., & Martin, D. (2022). *Vocational skills and competency-based education*. International Journal of TVET Studies.
19. Codjoe, H. M. (2021). Family interactions and student academic development. *Journal of Family Education Studies, 8*(2), 55–66.
20. Cooper, H., Robinson, J. C., & Patall, E. A. (2020). Parent involvement in homework: A research synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 90*(3), 400–430.
21. Cummings, J. A., & Vandewater, E. A. (2019). Family income, parental involvement, and adolescents' academic outcomes. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 40*(3), 421–433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-018-9605-3
22. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 24*(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791
23. Davis-Kean, P. E., et al. (2020). Parental education and child development outcomes. *Developmental Psychology, 56*(5), 890–902.
24. Department of Education. (2020). *K to 12 basic education curriculum: Technical-vocational-livelihood track*. DepEd.
25. Department of Education. (2025). *Department Memorandum No. 048, s. 2025: Pilot implementation of Technical Professional (Tech-Pro) curriculum*. https://www.deped.gov.ph
26. Department of Education. (2025). *Shaping paper/consultation packet: Strengthened SHS Program Curriculum Guide* (as of May 22, 2025).
27. Dubow, E. F., Boxer, P., & Huesmann, L. R. (2020). Long-term effects of parents' education on children's outcomes. *Developmental Psychology, 56*(3), 521–533.
28. Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2018). Schools, academic motivation, and stage-environment fit. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science* (7th ed.). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118963418.childpsy304
29. Fabito, B. S., et al. (2020). Barriers to learning in technical vocational education. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 19*(6), 1–15.
30. Farooq, M. S., et al. (2021). Socioeconomic status and academic performance in developing countries. *Journal of Education and Practice, 12*(4), 45–60.
31. Garcia, L., & Reyes, A. (2024). *Household financial capacity and educational access*. Journal of Social Education Research.
32. Hallmark University. (2020). Effects of home learning environment on student performance. *Educational Insights Journal, 5*(1), 10–18.
33. Hämäläinen, R., Cattaneo, A., & De Wever, B. (2018). Vocational education approaches to competence development in the

workplace. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training, 70*(2), 191–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820.2017.1394358
34. Jensen, E. (2017). *Teaching with poverty in mind: What being poor does to kids' brains and what schools can do about it* (2nd ed.). ASCD. https://www.ascd.org/books/teaching-with-poverty-in-mind
35. Johnson, M., & Miller, K. (2023). *Family structure and student academic outcomes*. Education and Society Review.
36. Kamaryati, N. P., & Malathum, P. (2020). Family support: A concept analysis. *Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research, 24*(3), 403–411.
37. Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.
38. Lee, S., & Kim, J. (2022). *Parental support and student motivation in vocational education*. Asian Education Studies.
39. Lee, S., et al. (2024). Maternal education and child human capital development. *Economics of Education Review, 95*, 102345.
40. Lemos, R., et al. (2021). Intergenerational transmission of education and labor outcomes. *Journal of Human Resources, 56*(4), 1234–1256.
41. Leyson, J., & Leyson, A. (2025). Competency-based assessment outcomes in TVL learners. *Journal of Technical Education and Skills Development, 10*(1), 12–24.
42. Lucas, B., Claxton, G., & Spencer, E. (2021). *Teaching and training vocational education: Challenges and opportunities*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003125021
43. Manalo, R. (2019). Resource constraints in technical-vocational education. *Philippine Journal of Education and Development, 11*(2), 67–78.
44. Masten, A. S., & Barnes, A. J. (2018). Resilience in children: Developmental perspectives. *Children, 5*(7), 98. https://doi.org/10.3390/children5070098
45. Misbah, Z., Gulikers, J., Dharma, S., & Mulder, M. (2020). Competence-based vocational education effectiveness. *Journal of Technical Education and Training, 12*(2), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.30880/jtet.2020.12.02.004
46. Moodie, G. (2020). Vocational education and training, equity and inclusion. *International Journal of Training Research, 18*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/14480220.2020.1716703
47. Mulder, M. (2016). *Competence-based vocational and professional education: Bridging the world of work and education*. Springer.
48. Muola, J. M. (2023). Home environment influence on student achievement. *International Journal of Education and Research, 11*(1), 44–58.
49. Nabuya, R., et al. (2019). TVL students' experiences in competency assessment. *Journal of Vocational Studies, 6*(1), 23–34.
50. Okolie, U. C., Nwajiuba, C. A., Binuomote, M. O., Ehiobuche, C., Igwe, P. A., & Ajoke, O. S. (2020). Career training with mentoring programs in higher education: Facilitating career development and employability of graduates. *Education + Training, 62*(2), 214–234. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-09-2018-0189
51. Orbeta, A. C., Jr., & Corpus, J. P. P. (2024). Issues in Philippine TVET: Responsiveness to industry demand and barriers to access among disadvantaged youth. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies Research Papers, 2024*(3).
52. Parreñas, M. (2024). Competency-based instructional modules in Cookery NC II. *Philippine Journal of Vocational Education, 18*(1), 55–70.
53. Parveen, K. (2021). Home environment and student academic performance. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences, 12*(3), 88–97.
54. Philippine Health Research Ethics Board. (2022). *National ethical guidelines for health and health-related research*. Philippine Council for Health Research and Development, Department of Science and Technology. https://ethics.healthresearch.ph
55. Powell, L., & McGrath, S. (2018). Financing technical and vocational education. *International Journal of Educational Development, 62*, 112–120.
56. Prime, H., Wade, M., & Browne, D. T. (2020). Risk and resilience in family well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. *American Psychologist, 75*(5), 631–643. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000660
57. Reardon, S. F. (2018). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In G. J. Duncan & R. D. Murnane (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances* (pp. 91–116). Russell Sage Foundation. https://www.russellsage.org/publications/whither-opportunity
58. Reddy, V., & Singh, S. (2021). Parental education and youth employment outcomes. *International Journal of Sociology of Education, 10*(2), 150–165.
59. Roemmich, J. N., et al. (2020). Home environment and youth development. *Child Development Research, 2020*, 1–9.

60. Santiago, M. (2021). Authentic learning in cookery education. *Asian Journal of Educational Practice, 9*(2), 45–59.
61. Santos, R., & Torres, P. (2023). *Income inequality and educational participation*. Philippine Journal of Development Studies.
62. Second Congressional Commission on Education (EDCOM 2). (2025, October 23). *New TechPro SHS track to address tech-voc challenges – TESDA*.
63. Sena, J. (2020). Resource demands in K to 12 implementation. *Philippine Education Review, 14*(2), 33–47.
64. Shah, R., Atta, M., Qureshi, M., & Shah, S. (2023). Home environment and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Studies, 15*(1), 78–92.
65. Sirin, S. R. (2016). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(3), 415–453. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076003415
66. Technical Education and Skills Development Authority. (2018–2022). *National Technical Education and Skills Development Plan (NTESDP)*. https://www.tesda.gov.ph/About/TESDA/47
67. Technical Education and Skills Development Authority. (2024, March 3). *Embedment of TVET in SHS will improve graduate employability*. https://www.tesda.gov.ph/Media/NewsDetail/20323
68. Torres, M. (1982). Parental influence on youth educational aspirations. *Philippine Sociological Review, 30*(1), 45–60.
69. Tullao, T. S., & Ruiz, M. G. C. (2022). Unintended consequences of free education in public colleges and universities in the Philippines. In *Critical perspectives on economics of education* (pp. 43–61). Routledge.
70. Vandenberg, P., & Laranjo, L. (2021). Parental education and human capital in TVET systems. *Asian Development Review, 38*(2), 210–225.
71. Vital, M. (2021). Parental education and youth outcomes in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Development Studies, 48*(2), 77–90.
72. Wheelahan, L., & Moodie, G. (2021). *The future of vocational education and training: Global challenges and possibilities*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003125021