Relationship Between Parental Financial Support and Student Spending Pattern at the Tertiary Level

 **ABSTRACT**

This study examined the relationship between parental financial support and student spending patterns among 321 tertiary students at Davao Oriental State University-Cateel Campus using a descriptive correlation research design. Findings revealed that students generally received a high level of parental financial support, which significantly influenced their spending behaviors across four categories: personal needs, food, academic purposes, and transportation. The results showed that students prioritized academic-related expenses the most, followed by food, transportation, and personal needs. Pearson correlation analysis revealed a moderate and significant relationship (r = 0.453, p < 0.05) between parental financial support and overall student spending patterns. Regression analysis further confirmed that parental support significantly predicted student spending behavior, accounting for 20.5% of the variation. The study highlights the importance of parental financial support in shaping students' financial decisions and emphasizes the need for financial literacy programs to promote responsible spending habits. The findings may guide parents, educators, and policymakers in developing interventions to enhance students' financial management skills and autonomy.
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**1. INTRODUCTION**

Students in higher education typically divide their expenses between necessities and non-essential items, spending on tuition, food, transportation, and at times, leisure or luxury products. These spending habits are largely influenced by the level of financial support they receive and their socioeconomic background (Shim et al., 2010). Research over the past decades has shown that students with parental financial assistance often have different spending behaviors compared to those who depend entirely on their own income or scholarship funds (Smith et al., 2021).

Students without financial support from their parents usually prioritize their spending on basic daily needs, excluding expenses like housing and tuition (Jones & Roberts, 2019). Their ability to manage money is also influenced by their financial literacy, allowing them to distinguish more effectively between necessities and wants (Ablay et al., 2023). Research has shown that students receiving financial assistance from their parents are more likely to spend on leisure activities, dining, and travel compared to those who rely on personal income or scholarships (Kim & Chatterjee, 2020). On the other hand, students who fund themselves often cut back on social and recreational spending to focus on essential costs like housing, food, and tuition, practicing more careful financial management (Pinto et al., 2019).

In the Philippines, student financial behavior has become a growing concern due to the rising costs of tertiary education, as many Filipino families consider education a vital long-term investment. Parents often dedicate their hard-earned income to support their children's college education (Dela Cruz & Fernandez, 2019). According to Panganiban and Castro (2020), students who do not shoulder most of their own expenses—largely due to parental financial support—tend to spend more on non-essential items such as gadgets, clothing, and dining out, rather than on educational or basic living needs.

This study emphasizes the importance of promoting financial literacy at Davao Oriental State University-Cateel Campus to help address existing gaps in financial inclusion, which could influence students' ability to manage their finances and attain financial independence in the future. The research was specifically conducted at the Cateel Campus to provide localized insights and enhance the understanding of student financial behavior. While parental financial support helps students cope with the rising costs of higher education, it should be paired with efforts to teach students responsible money management and financial discipline (Desello & Agner, 2023). To ensure the findings reach the intended audience, the researchers plan to present the results to university stakeholders and distribute printed copies to parents, students, and faculty. A copy will also be placed in the university library for future reference. Furthermore, the researchers aim to present or publish the study in a national research forum to contribute to broader discussions on student financial behavior and influence educational and financial policy development.

**2. OBJECTIVES**

This study aimed to determine the level of relationship between parental financial support and student spending patterns at the tertiary level. Specifically, it aimed to:

1. Determine the level of parental financial support of students in Davao Oriental State University-Cateel Campus.
2. Determine the level of student spending patterns in Davao Oriental State University-Cateel Campus in terms of:
	1. Personal Needs;
	2. Food;
	3. Academic Purposes; and
	4. Transportation
3. Determine the significant relationship between parental financial support and student spending patterns of students in Davao Oriental State University-Cateel Campus.
4. Determine if parental financial support predicts student spending patterns.

**3. METHODOLOGY**

**3.1 Research Design**

In this study, the researchers employed a **descriptive correlational design** to investigate the relationship between parental financial support and students' spending patterns. The **descriptive aspect** summarized the levels of financial support and spending behaviors, while the **correlational design** identified the strength of their relationship. A **quantitative approach** enabled systematic data collection and statistical analysis, allowing for the drawing of meaningful conclusions (Creswell, 2014).

**3.2 Research Locale**

This study aimed to determine the level of parental financial support and student spending patterns at the tertiary level. The research was conducted at Davao Oriental State University Cateel Campus.
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*Figure 1. Map of the research location*

**3.3 Research Respondents**

The study involved students from Davao Oriental State University-Cateel Campus. Using Yamane's formula, the researchers calculated the sample size and employed stratified random sampling to ensure fair representation from each department. The proportion of respondents per department was based on their enrollment figures for the first semester of 2024–2025. According to Taherdoost (2016), stratified random sampling enhances accuracy and generalizability by ensuring that all key subgroups are adequately represented.

Table 1. Distribution of respondents

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department** | **Enrollment Data as of the first sem. 2024- 2025** | **Percentage of Each Department** | **Sample Size** |
| BSBA-FM | 739 | 46% | 148 |
| BSC | 289 | 18% | 58 |
| BSAM | 346 | 21% | 67 |
| BAT/BSA | 142 | 9% | 29 |
| BEED | 104 | 6% | 19 |
| **Total Population** | **1,620** | **100%** | **321** |

**3.4 Research Instrument**

The research instruments used in this study were adapted from the works of Moneva et al. (2020) and Abawag et al. (2019). The instrument by Moneva et al. (2020) was employed to determine parental financial support, while the instrument by Abawag et al. (2019) was used to assess student spending patterns. Additionally, the researchers selected a Likert-scale type survey questionnaire to measure the level of parental financial support and student spending patterns, using the following scale: (5) strongly agree, (4) agree, (3) neutral, (2) disagree, and (1) strongly disagree.

**3.5 Data Gathering Procedure**

The researchers followed standard protocols in collecting data and obtaining the necessary information for the study. The data collection process involved the following steps:

1. **Obtaining Ethical Clearance:** Prior to starting the study, the researchers secured ethical approval from the Davao Oriental State University Ethics Review Committee. This ensured that the research complied with ethical guidelines, particularly in safeguarding participants' rights, privacy, and welfare during the data collection process.
2. **Gathering the Total Population List:** The researchers coordinated with the registrar's office to acquire the official list of students enrolled for the academic year 2024–2025. This data was crucial for determining the total population and for proportionally distributing the sample across departments using stratified random sampling.
3. **Requesting Permission to Conduct the Study:** Before administering the survey, the researchers formally asked for consent from the selected participants. Respondents were informed about their rights, including the voluntary nature of participation and their freedom to withdraw from the study at any point without facing any consequences.
4. **Distributing and Administering the Questionnaires:** After securing consent, the researchers held a short orientation to explain the study's purpose, scope, and confidentiality measures. The validated survey questionnaires were then distributed according to the respondents' availability to avoid interrupting their usual activities.
5. **Collecting the Completed Questionnaires:** Once the participants finished answering the surveys, the researchers personally retrieved the questionnaires to ensure the completeness of data and to avoid any potential loss or tampering.

**3.6 Data Analysis**

The following tools were employed to analyze the data gathered during the study:

**Mean**: This measure represents the average value of variables like parental financial support and student spending patterns among students at Davao Oriental State University-Cateel Campus. Calculating the mean allowed the researchers to determine the typical spending behavior of students and the average amount of financial assistance provided by their parents.

**Pearson's r:** This statistical method was used to assess the correlation between parental financial support and student spending patterns, providing insight into the relationship between these two variables.

Table 2. Interpretation of the level of parental financial support

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Range of Means | Verbal Description | Interpretation | Remarks |
| 4.50-5.00 | Strongly agree | Very High | This means that students of DOrSU-CC highly agree with the financial support they receive from their parents. |
| 3.50-4.49 | Agree | High | This means that the students of DOrSU-CC agree with the financial support they receive from their parents. |
| 2.50-3.39 | Neutral | Moderate | This means that the students of DOrSU-CC moderately agree with the parental financial support. |
| 1.50-2.49 | Disagree | Low | This implies that parental financial support has a limited impact on student spending. Students may not rely heavily on parental funds for their spending behavior. |
| 1.50-2.49 | Strongly disagree | Very Low | This means that parental financial support does not affect most student spending categories. |

**Multiple Linear Regression:** This tool was used to analyze how parental financial support and other factors simultaneously influenced students' spending patterns.

**4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**4.1 Level of Parental Financial Support**

Table 3 shows that the level of financial support received an overall mean score of 3.77, categorized as high, indicating that most students are well-supported in covering their academic and personal expenses. This aligns with the findings of Kim and Choi (2019) and Panganiban and Castro (2020), who emphasized the strong impact of parental assistance on students' financial stability and spending habits. The standard deviation of 0.70 suggests that students' views on parental financial support are fairly consistent, with little variation from the average.

The statement "The student is financially supported by their parents in their studies" had a mean score of 4.63, classified as very high, showing that most students receive substantial and steady financial help from their parents for their education. Johnson (2020) highlighted that students with reliable parental support tend to display different spending patterns because of the financial stability it offers. Furthermore, Wilson and Taylor (2018) observed that consistent financial assistance allows students to better plan and manage their budgets, which helps lower financial stress and encourages more focused academic involvement.

Conversely, the statement "The student does not feel worried about school payments" had the lowest mean score of 3.41 and a standard deviation of 1.12, reflecting a moderate level of agreement among respondents. This implies that despite receiving financial support from their parents, many students still feel some worry or anxiety about covering school expenses.

This could be because financial assistance is irregular or limited, creating uncertainty in covering tuition and other school expenses. Garcia (2021) noted that even with parental support, students may still face financial stress if the aid is inadequate or delayed, resulting in cautious spending and anxiety about educational costs.

Table 3. Level of parental financial support

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Description** | **Mean** | **Std.****Deviation** | **Interpretation** |
| 1 | The student is financially supported by their parents in their studies. | 4.63 | 0.76 | Very High |
| 2 | The student’s parents can provide enough money for school projects and activities. | 4.21 | 0.84 | High |
| 3 | The student is satisfied with their daily allowance. | 4.11 | 0.93 | High |
| 4 | The student does not feel worried about school payments. | 3.41 | 1.12 | Moderate |
| 5 | The student receives extra money from their parents for personal needs. | 3.63 | 1.07 | High |
| 6 | The student’s parents give them money immediately when they ask for it. | 3.44 | 1.01 | Moderate |
| 7 | The student can save money from their daily allowance. | 3.78 | 1.02 | Moderate |
| 8 | The student does not need to borrow money from classmates. | 3.37 | 1.14 | Moderate |
| 9 | The student can buy all the necessary school requirements. | 3.62 | 0.95 | High |
| 10 | The student can spend their extra allowance on personal wants and needs. | 3.55 | 1.08 | High |
| **Average** | 3.77 | 0.70 | High |

**4.2 Level of Student Spending Patterns**

Table 4 displays data on students' spending for personal needs, with an overall mean of 3.04, indicating a moderate level. This means students sometimes spend on items like clothing, cosmetics, and rent but do not always prioritize these over essential expenses (Shim et al., 2010). The standard deviation of 0.79 reflects moderate differences in students' spending habits, showing that while some practice careful budgeting, others adjust their spending based on the financial support they receive and their personal priorities.

Table 4. Level of student spending pattern in terms of personal needs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Description** | **Mean** | **Std.****Deviation** | **Interpretation** |
| 1 | The student compares prices when buying clothes, shoes, and cosmetics. | 4.09 | 0.99 | High |
| 2 | The student spends money on the latest fashion designs for clothes, shoes, and bags. | 2.73 | 1.12 | Moderate |
| 3 | The student prefers higher-end personal items that are more expensive than regular ones. | 2.63 | 1.16 | Moderate |
| 4 | A portion of the student's allowance is spent on rent for an apartment or boarding house. | 2.69 | 1.39 | Moderate |
| **Average** | 3.04 | 0.79 | Moderate |

The item with the highest mean score is "The student compares prices when buying clothes, shoes, and cosmetics," scoring 4.09, which reflects a high level of agreement. This indicates that students frequently compare prices before making personal purchases, showing practical and cost-conscious behavior. LeBaron-Black et al. (2020) noted that students with moderate parental financial support are generally more careful with their spending, often looking for the best value.

Conversely, the lowest mean score was recorded for Item No. 3, which states that students prefer expensive, high-end personal items, with a mean of 2.63, reflecting a moderate tendency. This indicates that most students avoid purchasing luxury or branded products, showing a cautious approach to non-essential spending. According to Serido et al. (2013), students with limited parental support often focus on basic needs rather than luxury goods. Similarly, Xiao and Porto (2017) found that financially constrained students usually make careful, need-based spending decisions, prioritizing practicality over indulgence.

The overall mean for students' spending on food is 3.40, interpreted as moderate. This suggests that students practice balanced spending on food, often choosing affordable and practical options. This aligns with Kim and Chatterjee (2020), who found that students' food expenses are influenced by their financial support and their need to manage daily essentials within a limited budget.

Table 5. Level of student spending pattern in terms of food

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Description** | **Mean** | **Std.****Deviation** | **Interpretation** |
| 1 | The student compares prices when spending money on food. | 3.99 | 0.95 | High |
| 2 | The student does not hesitate to spend money on food. | 3.56 | 1.02 | High |
| 3 | The student usually eats at restaurants, carinderia, or fast food chains for breakfast. | 2.74 | 1.21 | Moderate |
| 4 | The student usually eats at restaurants, carinderia, or fast food chains for dinner. | 2.50 | 1.18 | Moderate |
| 5 | The student prefers eating meals at home, in a boarding house, or an apartment. | 4.20 | 1.00 | Very High |
| **Average** | 3.40 | 0.63 | Moderate |

The item with the highest mean score, 4.20, shows that students strongly prefer eating meals at home, in boarding houses, or apartments, which is interpreted as very high. This indicates a tendency to choose home-cooked meals over dining out, reflecting a cost-saving and health-conscious approach. LeBaron-Black et al. (2021) noted that financially responsible students often prepare meals at home to manage limited budgets. Similarly, Kim and Chatterjee (2019) observed that students with restricted financial resources are more likely to cook their own meals, especially when parental support is limited or inconsistent.

On the other hand, because students prefer home-cooked meals, they tend to avoid dining out for dinner. Item 4, "The student usually eats at restaurants, carinderia, or fast food chains for dinner," had the lowest mean score of 2.50, indicating a moderate tendency. This suggests that dining out at night is not a priority, likely due to concerns about cost or time. Jorgensen and Savla (2018) found that students managing tight budgets are less likely to spend regularly on restaurant meals. Similarly, Xiao and Porto (2017) noted that financially aware students often cut back on non-essential food expenses to focus on more important academic or living needs.

The table shows an overall mean score of 3.52, interpreted as high, suggesting that students actively dedicate their finances to academic-related expenses. This aligns with Xiao and Porto (2017), who stated that students prioritize educational costs because they directly influence their academic achievements and future opportunities.

Table 6. Level of student spending pattern in terms of academic purposes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Description** | **Mean** | **Std.****Deviation** | **Interpretation** |
| 1 | The student compares prices when spending on school supplies. | 4.04 | 0.82 | High |
| 2 | The student does not hesitate to spend money for academic purposes. | 4.01 | 0.89 | High |
| 3 | The student prefers to buy school supplies from known or popular bookstores rather than from ordinary ones. | 2.99 | 1.17 | Moderate |
| 4 | The student spends a large percentage of money on review materials such as photocopies or printed handouts. | 3.79 | 0.97 | High |
| 5 | The student spends money at computer shops when working on academic requirements. | 2.77 | 1.17 | Moderate |
| **Average** | 3.52 | 0.61 | High |

The statement "The student compares prices when spending on school supplies" received the highest mean score of 4.04, reflecting a high level of agreement among students. This indicates that most students carefully compare prices when buying academic materials, showing financial awareness in managing school-related expenses. Shim et al. (2010) pointed out that limited financial resources encourage students to make more deliberate purchasing choices. Similarly, Xiao and Porto (2017) noted that students who prioritize educational costs often practice responsible money management, including budgeting and price comparison.

Additionally, the lowest mean score of 2.77, classified as moderate, indicates that students spend less on computer shop services for academic tasks. This may be because they have access to personal devices or school-provided resources. Lusardi et al. (2010) found that financially literate students often reduce optional academic expenses when cost-effective alternatives are available. Likewise, Pinto et al. (2004) observed that students from financially challenged backgrounds usually focus on essential academic needs, avoiding extra costs when cheaper options exist.

Table 7 shows that the overall mean score for student spending on transportation is 3.09, interpreted as moderate. This indicates that students take a balanced approach to transportation expenses, spending based on need and access. This finding supports Shim et al. (2010), who noted that students adjust their transportation costs according to their income and the availability of personal or public transportation.

Table 7. Level of student spending pattern in terms of transportation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Description** | **Mean** | **Std.****Deviation** | **Interpretation** |
| 1 | The student spent a portion of their money on gas consumption because they have their service vehicle. | 2.83 | 1.37 | Moderate |
| 2 | The student preferred walking rather than taking a tricycle when going to a nearby place. | 3.59 | 1.24 | High |
| 3 | The student usually paid twice the regular fare or the full capacity fare for transportation. | 3.02 | 1.13 | Moderate |
| 4 | The respondent did not spend a portion of their money or allowance for transportation because they had their own means of transportation. | 2.93 | 1.30 | Moderate |
| **Average** | 3.09 | 0.84 | Moderate |

The statement “The student preferred walking rather than taking a tricycle when going to a nearby place” received the highest mean score of 3.59, classified as "High," showing that many students choose walking as a more affordable transportation option. This likely reflects a cost-saving measure, where students with limited finances or a need to manage expenses carefully opt to walk instead of paying for transport. Shim et al. (2010) noted that students with tight budgets tend to use cheaper transportation methods, and Xiao and Porto (2017) found that cost-conscious students spend less on daily transit fares.

Item No. 1, which relates to spending money on gas for personal vehicles, received the lowest mean score of 2.83, considered moderate. This suggests that only a small number of students use personal vehicles that require fuel expenses. The low score likely reflects students’ preference for cheaper transportation options like walking or public transit. This aligns with Pinto et al. (2004), who observed that the high costs of vehicle ownership discourage students from spending much on fuel. Similarly, Jorgensen and Savla (2018) found that financial limitations often lead students to choose more affordable transportation methods.

Table 8 provides a summary of student spending patterns in four main categories: personal needs, food, academic expenses, and transportation. The overall mean score of 3.26 indicates that students generally demonstrate moderate financial behavior. This supports Xiao and Porto’s (2017) findings that students tend to prioritize essential expenses while staying conscious of budget limits, reflecting a practical and needs-focused approach to spending, particularly within an academic setting.

Table 8. Summary of student spending patterns

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Factors** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **Interpretation** |
| Personal Needs | 3.04 | 0.79 | Moderate |
| Food | 3.40 | 0.63 | Moderate |
| Academic Purposes | 3.52 | 0.61 | High |
| Transportation | 3.09 | 0.84 | Moderate |
| **Overall Spending Pattern** | 3.26 | 0.53 | Moderate |

The results indicate that academic expenses received the highest mean score (M = 3.52), reflecting a strong priority among students who focus their spending on school-related items like supplies and study materials. The other categories—food (M = 3.40), transportation (M = 3.09), and personal needs (M = 3.04)—all fall within a moderate range, showing that students practice balanced yet careful spending in these areas.

**4.3 Significant Relationship Between Parental Financial Support and Student Spending Patterns of Students at DORSU-CC**

This table shows the correlation between parental financial support and students' spending patterns, with all indicators displaying significant relationships (p-value = 0.000) but with different levels of strength. The overall Pearson correlation of 0.453 indicates a moderate yet significant connection, meaning that higher parental financial support generally leads to increased student spending. This supports the findings of Kim and Chatterjee (2020), who noted that more financial assistance from parents often results in greater discretionary spending, reflecting how family support influences student financial behavior.

Table 9. Correlation between parental financial support and student spending patterns

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Independent Variables | Parental Financial Support | Interpretation |
| Personal Needs | Pearson Correlation | 0.400 | Moderate relationship and significant |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |
| Food | Pearson Correlation | 0.428 | Moderate relationship and significant |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |
| Academic Purposes | Pearson Correlation | 0.340 | Weak relationships and significant |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |
| Transportation | Pearson Correlation | 0.208 | Weak relationships and significant |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |
| Overall Spending Pattern | Pearson Correlation | 0.453 | Moderate relationship and significant |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |

The Pearson correlation coefficient between parental financial support and spending on personal needs is 0.400, indicating a moderate positive relationship that is statistically significant at the 0.000 level. This means that as parental financial assistance increases, students tend to spend more on personal items like hygiene products, clothing, and leisure activities. However, the moderate correlation suggests that while parental support plays a role in shaping students' spending on personal needs, it is not the only factor affecting their financial decisions.

Other factors like peer influence, personal values, and lifestyle also affect student spending. The significant result (p = 0.000) confirms that parental financial support moderately influences personal spending, but it is not the only factor. Pinto et al. (2004) noted that students with steady financial backing often spend more on non-essentials, influenced by social trends and reduced financial pressure.

The Pearson correlation between parental financial support and food spending is 0.428, indicating a moderate and statistically significant relationship (p = 0.000). This means that as parental financial assistance increases, students’ food spending also tends to rise. However, other factors like living arrangements, budgeting skills, and cultural practices also influence this behavior. Lusardi et al. (2010) found that students’ food expenses vary depending on whether they live on or off campus, while Xiao and Porto (2017) observed that financially literate students often choose cost-saving options like cooking at home.

Students with consistent financial support may feel less pressure to cut costs, resulting in higher food expenses. This suggests that parental assistance not only allows but also influences students' food spending habits, confirming the moderate and significant relationship found in the study.

The Pearson correlation between parental financial support and academic spending is 0.340, indicating a weak but statistically significant relationship (p = 0.000). This suggests that while parental support influences students' academic expenses, such as tuition and school supplies, the effect is limited. Other factors like scholarships, student loans, part-time jobs, or the personal importance placed on education may have a stronger impact. Xiao and Porto (2017) pointed out that students often prioritize academic costs regardless of their financial situation, which may lessen the direct influence of parental support on academic spending.

Shim et al. (2010) also highlighted that students with good financial planning skills handle academic expenses more efficiently. This suggests that financial literacy and resourcefulness lessen their dependence on parental support, which explains the weak correlation. Thus, although parental assistance influences academic spending, students’ commitment to academic success and access to other financial resources likely reduce the extent of this impact.

The table shows that the Pearson correlation between parental financial support and transportation expenses is 0.208, indicating a weak but statistically significant relationship (p = 0.000). This means that while there is a connection, parental financial support only slightly affects how students spend on transportation. This weak link is likely due to practical factors like the student’s distance from campus, the availability of public transport, or access to a personal vehicle. Shim et al. (2010) noted that transportation costs largely depend on where students live and how they commute. For instance, students living in dorms or near school tend to spend less on transportation, regardless of parental support. Additionally, some students may choose cheaper options like walking or biking for convenience, not necessarily due to financial constraints. Pinto et al. (2004) also pointed out that lifestyle choices and proximity to campus significantly influence transportation spending.

In summary, while parental financial support contributes to students' overall budgeting, its direct impact on transportation expenses is minimal, leading to a weak but significant correlation. However, when looking at students' general spending patterns, the Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.453 reflects a moderate and statistically significant relationship (p = 0.000). This indicates that parental financial assistance does influence students' financial decisions, but it is not the only factor. Other elements like peer influence, financial knowledge, and personal values also shape students' spending behaviors.

This moderate correlation indicates that students who receive steady financial support from their parents often have greater spending flexibility, frequently going beyond basic needs. Kim and Choi (2019) found that these students are more likely to spend on non-essential items like leisure and entertainment compared to those with limited support. Harris (2022) also noted that predictable financial aid helps students plan their budgets better, while inconsistent support can lead to impulsive spending. Consequently, this finding highlights the need to incorporate financial literacy programs in schools and universities to equip students—especially those with parental support—with the knowledge to make responsible financial choices. Providing these skills is crucial for promoting independence and ensuring long-term financial well-being.

**4.4 Parental Financial Support as a Predictor of Students' Spending Patterns**

Table 10 shows a moderate positive correlation (R = 0.453) between parental financial support and student spending patterns. Parental support explains 20.5% of the variation in spending, with other factors like peer influence and financial literacy accounting for the rest. The adjusted R² of 0.203 confirms the model’s reliability. These findings align with Shim et al. (2010) and LeBaron-Black et al. (2020), emphasizing the significant but not exclusive role of parental financial aid in shaping students’ financial behavior.

Table 10. Model summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | 0.453 | 0.205 | 0.203 | 0.475645 |

The results show a moderate positive correlation (R = 0.453) between parental financial support and student spending patterns. The R-squared value of 0.205 means that 20.5% of the variation in student spending can be explained by the level of parental financial aid. This indicates that as parental support increases, student spending tends to rise as well (LeBaron-Black et al., 2020). While other factors also influence spending, parental support plays a significant role. Kim and Choi (2019) found that students with consistent high financial support are more likely to spend on discretionary items like leisure and personal wants. Conversely, Serido et al. (2013) observed that students with limited parental aid tend to adopt more cautious spending habits, focusing on essentials like food, transportation, and school expenses, and budgeting carefully due to financial limitations.

Table 11. Coefficients

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.959 | .146 |  | 13.431 | .000 |
| Parental Financial Support | .345 | .038 | .453 | 9.077 | .000 |

The regression analysis shows that parental financial support significantly affects students’ spending patterns. The unstandardized coefficient (B = 0.345) means that for each one-unit increase in parental support, student spending increases by 0.345 units. The standardized beta (β = 0.453) reflects a moderate positive relationship, indicating that parental support moderately influences changes in spending behavior. With a t-value of 9.077 and a p-value of 0.000, this relationship is statistically significant and not due to chance. Students receiving more financial support tend to spend more on both academic and non-academic needs, while those with less support focus on essentials. Moneva et al. (2020) noted that parental support is linked to greater student motivation and better access to resources.

**5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Conclusion**

The researchers concluded the following:

1. The findings showed that students at Davao Oriental State University–Cateel Campus (DORSU-CC) typically received substantial financial support from their parents. This reliable assistance played a key role in helping them cover both necessary and discretionary expenses, indicating that parental support is a vital influence on students' financial stability and spending habits.
2. Students exhibited moderate overall spending habits, with the largest portion of their expenses focused on academic needs like school supplies, materials, and educational services. This emphasis underscores the importance they place on education and academic achievement, demonstrating responsible financial management in their academic expenditures.
3. A statistically significant moderate correlation was found between parental financial support and student spending habits, especially concerning food and personal expenses. This suggests that students with more financial support tend to spend more on discretionary items. However, spending on transportation and academic needs seemed to be affected by other factors like accessibility, scholarships, or available institutional resources.
4. Parental financial support significantly predicted student spending patterns, accounting for 20.5% of the variation in spending behavior. This indicates that although parental aid is important, most of the differences in spending are influenced by other factors like peer pressure, part-time jobs, cultural norms, and financial literacy. Together, these factors shape students' overall financial habits and underscore the importance of providing comprehensive financial education and awareness.

**Recommendations**

1. **Enhance Financial Literacy Programs for Students**

Given the study's finding of a moderate link between parental financial support and student spending—especially on food and personal items—students could gain from formal financial literacy programs. Such training would emphasize budgeting, differentiating needs from wants, and responsible allowance management to help ensure that financial assistance is used effectively.

1. **Encourage Parents to Integrate Financial Guidance with Support**

The results show that students with greater financial support often spend more on non-essential items, implying that some may struggle with budgeting. Parents are encouraged to complement their financial help with conversations about spending priorities and fundamental money management to promote responsible financial habits.

1. **Incorporate Spending Awareness in Academic Support Services**

Since academic expenses had the highest spending average, institutions like DORSU-CC could integrate budgeting and planning resources into academic advising or student counseling. This strategy helps ensure that students not only invest in their education but also manage their academic costs effectively.

1. **Target Support for Transportation and Low-Support Students**

Because transportation expenses had the weakest link to parental support, students might face greater financial strain in this area. Schools or local governments could explore providing transportation subsidies or assistance programs, particularly for students with limited parental support, to help reduce their financial burden and promote regular attendance.
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