The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 1, Issue 4, April 2026, pp. 773-788
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19964732

Parental School Involvement, Teacher Humor Styles, and Student Engagement Among Grade 7 Students in Catholic Schools

[1]Christian Jelt M. Faunillan, [2]Luningning D. Viterbo
University of the Immaculate Conception
[1]cfaunillan_240000002036@uic.edu.ph, [2]lviterbo@uic.edu.ph

Article Details:

Received: 5 April 2026
Revised: 12 April 2026
Accepted: 20 April 2026
Published: 30 April 2026
Corresponding Email:
cfaunillan_240000002036@uic.edu.ph

Recommended Citation:

Faunillan, C. J. M., Viterbo, L. D. (2026). Parental School Involvement, Teacher Humor Styles, and Student Engagement Among Grade 7 Students in Catholic Schools. The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research. 1 (4), 773-788. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19964732

Index Terms:

engagement, humor styles, parental involvement, student engagement, values education

Abstract. This study examined the influence of parental school involvement and humor styles of teachers on student engagement in Values Education among Grade 7 students in Catholic schools. A quantitative research approach utilizing a descriptive–correlational design was employed to determine the levels, relationships, and predictive influence of the identified variables. A total of two hundred and one (201) Grade 7 students from the University of the Immaculate Conception and Holy Cross of Mintal in Davao voluntarily served as research respondents. The research instruments that were utilized were validated and pilot-tested. These research instruments were used to measure parental school involvement in terms of parental expectations, parent–child communication, homework support, and school-based involvement; humor styles of teachers in terms of affiliative, self-enhancing, aggressive, and self-defeating humor; and student engagement across affective, behavioral, and cognitive dimensions. Statistical tools such as mean, standard deviation, Pearson product–moment correlation, and multiple regression analysis were utilized in analyzing the data. Findings revealed that parental school involvement, humor styles of teachers, and student engagement were generally at high levels, indicating that supportive parental practices, constructive teacher humor, and active student participation were frequently experienced among Grade 7 students. Results further showed significant relationships between parental school involvement and student engagement, as well as between humor styles of teachers and student engagement. Moreover, the combined influence of parental school involvement and humor styles of teachers significantly predicted student engagement in Values Education, suggesting that both home and classroom environments play vital roles in fostering meaningful participation and moral learning among students.

Introduction

Student engagement, defined as the degree to which learners actively participate emotionally, behaviorally, and cognitively in learning activities, is widely recognized as a critical determinant of effective learning and academic success across educational systems worldwide (Fredricks et al., 2019). Engagement reflects not merely participation but the willingness of students to invest effort, attention, and personal meaning in educational experiences. As emphasized by Metu (2024), engaged students demonstrate the qualities closely linked to the social value of active participation in learning communities such as persistence, collaboration, and responsibility. However, despite its recognized importance, disengagement remains a persistent educational concern. Lawson and Lawson (2013) observed that many students exhibit low participation and reduced social responsibility, highlighting the urgency of addressing engagement issues in contemporary education.

Globally, empirical evidence points to the consequences of student disengagement across different educational contexts. In Canada, Archambault et al. (2022) found that school dropout is often preceded by progressive disengagement, characterized by declining motivation, absenteeism, and withdrawal from classroom activities. Similarly, in Australia,

Chipchase et al. (2017) reported that disengagement contributes to poor academic performance and increased dropout risk in higher education. In the United States, Finn and Zimmer (2015) established that disengaged students are more likely to experience lower academic achievement, chronic absenteeism, and reduced school completion rates. These findings collectively suggest that student engagement is not only an instructional concern but also a systemic educational issue.
In the Philippine context, similar patterns of disengagement have been documented among the Filipino learners. De Guzman and Fernandez (2018) noted that many Filipino learners demonstrate low levels of classroom engagement, which may hinder their academic and moral development. In Metro Manila, Cruz (2023) observed limited student participation and weak self-regulation in learning, while Reyes (2022) reported passive classroom behavior and low academic interest among university students. These national-level findings indicate that sustaining student engagement remains a challenge across educational levels.

More specifically, engagement in Values Education presents a unique concern. Bautista and Alampay (2020) found that students tend to show limited engagement in values-based subjects, while Santos (2021) emphasized that ineffective instructional strategies often result in reduced participation in discussions on ethics and morality. This suggests that beyond content, the manner in which Values Education is delivered significantly affects student engagement.

At the regional level, studies in Mindanao further highlight factors contributing to disengagement. In Lanao del Norte, Gubaten and Abarquez (2024) identified lack of motivation, fear of judgment, and limited parental support as key barriers to engagement. In Davao City, Lombres (2024) found that students become more engaged when they experience supportive classroom environments and meaningful learning activities. Similarly, Reyes (2024) confirmed that positive learning environments characterized by encouragement and respect significantly enhance student participation and academic performance. These findings underscore the importance of both home and school environments in shaping student engagement.

Given these challenges, it becomes necessary to examine key factors that influence student engagement. One major factor is parental school involvement. Globally, Barger et al. (2019) established that parental involvement is positively associated with student engagement and academic achievement. Froiland (2021) further explained that supportive parental behaviors enhance motivation and participation of the students in learning. In the Philippine setting, Darias-Behemino et al. (2024) found that parental involvement, particularly through expectations, communication, and encouragement, significantly predicts the affective, behavioral, and cognitive engagement of the students. Similarly, Manalo et al. (2023) reported that parental support strengthens participation and interpersonal development of the students. These findings indicate that parental school involvement plays a crucial role in fostering student engagement by reinforcing learning behaviors and values at home.

In addition to parental influence, the humor styles of teachers have emerged as an important classroom factor affecting student engagement. Wanzer et al. (2018) found that appropriate instructional humor enhances student attention, participation, and teacher–student relationships. Likewise, Banas et al. (2019) emphasized that humor contributes to a positive classroom climate that supports engagement. In the Philippine context, Isagan et al. (2023) reported that affiliative humor promotes student participation and strengthens classroom relationships. Conversely, Wanzer et al. (2020) and Garcia and Santos (2021) found that aggressive or inappropriate humor can reduce student motivation, weaken trust, and negatively affect engagement. Globally, Torres and Zhang (2023) and Kim and Park (2020) confirmed that constructive humor enhances engagement, while negative humor contributes to disengagement and withdrawal. These findings suggest that the humor styles of teachers significantly shape the emotional and social environment of the classroom, thereby influencing student engagement.

Despite the growing body of literature, several gaps remain. Methodologically, most studies rely on quantitative approaches, with limited exploration of the lived experiences of student engagement. Conceptually, few studies have examined the combined influence of parental school involvement and the humor styles of teachers on the three dimensions of student engagement. This indicates the need for a more integrated analysis of home and classroom factors.

In response to these gaps, this study investigates how parental school involvement and humor styles of teachers influence student engagement in Values Education among Grade 7 students in Catholic schools. By examining both external support systems and classroom dynamics, this research aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of engagement.

Furthermore, this study is aligned with the goals of quality education, emphasizing the development of active, morally grounded, and engaged learners. The findings are expected to inform educators, school administrators, and policymakers in designing strategies that strengthen student engagement through both family involvement and effective classroom practices.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to examine the significance of the influence of parental school involvement and humor styles of teachers on student engagement among Grade 7 students in Catholic schools. Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1 What is the level of parental school involvement in terms of:
- 1.1.parental expectations;
- 1.2. parent-child communication;
- 1.3. homework support; and
- 1.4. school-based involvement?

2. What is the level of humor styles of teachers in terms of:
- 2.1. affiliative humor;
- 2.2. self-enhancing humor;
- 2.3. Aggressive Style; and
- 2.4. Self-defeating Style?

3. What is the level of student engagement in terms of:
- 3.1. affective engagement;
- 3.2. behavioral engagement; and
- 3.3. cognitive engagement?

4. Is there a significant relationship between:
- 4.1 parental school involvement and student engagement; and
- 4.2. humor styles and student engagement?

5. Do parental school involvement and humor styles significantly influence student engagement?

Methodology

This study employed a quantitative research approach using a descriptive–correlational design to examine the relationship between parental school involvement, humor styles of teachers, and student engagement.

Quantitative research is a systematic method of collecting and analyzing numerical data to describe variables and examine relationships among them, as explained by Creswell and Creswell (2018). Similarly, Saunders et al. (2019) emphasized that quantitative research allows the use of statistical tools to ensure objectivity, reliability, and generalizability of findings. In addition, Johnson and Christensen (2020) stated that quantitative designs are appropriate when the goal is to measure variables and test relationships using statistical techniques.

Descriptive research was utilized to present an accurate portrayal of the perceptions of the respondents regarding parental involvement, humor styles, and student engagement. Lodico et al. (2023) explained that descriptive research focuses on describing existing conditions without manipulating variables, while Shuttleworth 2019 added that it provides a clear snapshot of behaviors, attitudes, and characteristics of a population.

Correlational research, on the other hand, was employed to determine the relationship between variables. Fraenkel et al. (2019) defined correlational research as a method used to examine the degree of association between two or more variables without implying causation. Likewise, Cohen et al. (2018) emphasized that correlational design is appropriate in educational research when investigating naturally occurring relationships.

In this study, descriptive correlational design enabled the researcher to describe the levels of parental school involvement, humor styles of teachers, and student engagement, and to determine whether significant relationships exist among these variables within the context of Values Education.

This study was conducted in selected Catholic schools in Davao City, Region XI, Philippines. Davao City is one of the major urban centers in Mindanao known for its diverse educational institutions and strong emphasis on values-based education. Two Catholic schools were selected and are herein referred to as School A and School B. School A is a private Catholic institution known for its strong academic programs and integration of religious instruction in its curriculum. School B is a faith-based school that emphasizes holistic development through spiritual formation, discipline, and academic excellence.

Catholic schools were chosen because they explicitly integrate Values Education, moral formation, and character development into their curriculum. These schools provide an appropriate setting for examining student engagement in values-oriented learning environments, where both academic and moral dimensions are emphasized. The alignment of

home, school, and religious values makes Catholic schools' ideal contexts for studying the combined influence of parental involvement and teacher behaviors on student engagement.

The respondents of this study were the 201 Grade 7 students enrolled in University of the Immaculate Conception and Holy Cross of Mintal in Davao City.

Raosoft Sample Size Calculator was utilized to determine the appropriate sample size using a 95 percent confidence level, 5 percent margin of error, and 50 percent response distribution. Raosoft Inc. (2004) explained that sample size calculators are used to determine a statistically valid sample that represents the population while minimizing sampling error. Taherdoost (2017) further emphasized that an appropriate sample size ensures reliability and validity in quantitative research. To ensure representation, stratified random sampling was employed. Stratified random sampling is a technique where the population is divided into subgroups and respondents are randomly selected from each subgroup, as explained by Creswell (2014). Similarly, Etikan and Bala (2017) noted that this method improves representativeness and reduces sampling bias.

Likewise, the inclusion criteria included students who were officially enrolled in Grade 7, regularly attending classes, and whose parents or guardians provided informed consent, while the students provided assent. Exclusion criteria included students not enrolled in Grade 7, those with irregular attendance, or those who declined participation.

Since the respondents are minors, their participation required both informed consent from their parents or guardians and their personal assent. To safeguard their rights and welfare, the study ensured that all participants were clearly informed about the purpose of the research, its procedures, as well as any possible risks and benefits prior to their involvement. Participation was strictly voluntary, and respondents were free to withdraw at any point without incurring any penalty or academic consequence. In cases where a participant chose to withdraw, any previously collected data were securely discarded unless permission for its continued use was granted. These measures ensured that the study upheld respect for autonomy and protected vulnerable participants.

The main aim of the study was to gather respondents capable of providing relevant information needed to achieve the research objectives. The inclusion criteria required participants to be officially enrolled in the selected senior high schools, specifically Schools A, B, and C, attending face to face classes, and having voluntarily signed the informed consent form along with a signed assent form from their parent or guardian. On the other hand, students who were not enrolled in the selected schools or who did not provide the required informed consent were excluded from the study.

Three adapted survey questionnaires were utilized to gather data from the respondents. These instruments were reviewed and validated by a panel of experts and underwent pilot testing prior to their use. To promote transparency and readiness, respondents were informed that they would complete three separate questionnaires. The total time needed to answer all instruments was estimated to be around 30 to 45 minutes, allowing participants to manage their time effectively and have clear expectations regarding their involvement in the study. The first questionnaire measured the level of parental school involvement as perceived by Grade 7 students across four indicators: parental expectations with 5 items, parent–child communication with 4 items, homework support with 5 items, and school-based involvement with 6 items, for a total of 20 items. This instrument was adapted from Goulet et al. (2023). The second instrument from Martin et al. (2003) and refined by Silvia and Rodriguez (2020) measured humor styles including affiliative humor with 8 items, self-enhancing humor with 8 items, aggressive humor with 8 items, and self-defeating humor with 8 items. The third instrument measured student engagement across three indicators: affective engagement with 9 items, behavioral engagement with 12 items, and cognitive engagement with 12 items. This instrument was adapted from Lam et al. (2014). A five-point Likert scale was used in all the instrument with the following response options: 5 – strongly agree, 4 – agree, 3 – somewhat agree, 2 – disagree, and 1 – strongly disagree.

Prior to data collection, permission was secured from school principals and research coordinators of the selected schools. Coordination was conducted to schedule the administration of the survey.

Parental informed consent form was distributed first, followed by student assent form. According to Alderson and Morrow (2011), obtaining consent and assent ensures ethical participation of minors in research.

Data were collected through face-to-face administration of questionnaires during class hours. Respondents were given 20 to 30 minutes to complete the survey. Instructions were clearly explained, and confidentiality was assured. All responses were collected, encoded, and prepared for statistical analysis.

This study complied with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 or Republic Act 10173, ensuring anonymity through coding of responses. Data were securely stored and retained for one year before disposal.

The following were the statistical tools utilized to analyze the data gathered in this study.

Mean was used to determine the level of parental school involvement, humor styles of teachers, and student engagement.

Standard Deviation was used to measure the variability of responses.

Pearson r was used to determine the significance of the relationship between parental school involvement and student engagement, and between humor styles of teachers and student engagement.

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the influence of parental school involvement and humor styles of teachers on student engagement.

These tools allowed the researcher to analyze the data systematically and address all statements of the problem.
The researcher upheld the highest ethical standards in the conduct of this study by submitting the research for review and approval by the University of the Immaculate Conception Research Ethics Committee (UIC-REC). Informed consent was obtained from student participants and their legal guardians, who were fully informed about the purpose, procedures, and potential risks or benefits of the study. Participation was entirely voluntary, with the option to withdraw at any stage without any negative consequences. Given that the respondents were minors, special attention was given to securing written consent and ensuring their full understanding of the research process. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained through the use of coded identifiers, with all collected data were securely stored and accessible only to the researcher.

The researcher, as a graduate student of the Master of Arts in Values Education program, worked in close collaboration with the thesis adviser and panel members to ensure the academic and ethical rigor of the study. Access to the UIC Library, academic databases, and other institutional facilities provided essential support in completing the study. Moreover, all instruments and procedures were designed to prevent any form of psychological, emotional, or social harm. Cultural norms and practices within the University of the Immaculate Conception community were respected, and the humor component of the study was approached sensitively to ensure appropriateness within the context of Values Education. Parental and school collaboration were prioritized to align with institutional policies, and findings were disseminated responsibly to promote educational improvement and uphold the integrity of ethical research.

Results and Discussion

Level of Parental School Involvement

The overall mean of parental school involvement is 4.07, described as high. This indicates that parental involvement among Grade 7 students is frequently evident across multiple dimensions, including expectations, communication, homework support, and school-based participation. Anchored on the Student-Rated Parental School Involvement Questionnaire, this high level reflects that students generally perceive their parents as actively engaged in their educational experiences not only in monitoring academic performance but also in providing emotional and motivational support.

This suggests a strong home–school synergy, where education is not confined within the classroom but is reinforced through consistent parental presence at home. The data imply that parents are not passive observers but active contributors who shape the academic behaviors of the students through daily interactions such as discussing school experiences, monitoring homework completion, and emphasizing the importance of education. Consequently, students enter the classroom with a foundation of support that promotes confidence, responsibility, and readiness to learn.

Item	Mean	SD	Description
Parental Expectations			
Important that they are…			
1. succeeding at school	4.72	0.61	Very High
2. having good grades in school	4.54	0.69	Very High
3. going to proceed schooling to college	4.80	0.56	Very High
4. being among the best in their class	3.75	1.21	High
5. going to school.	4.89	0.37	Very High
Category Mean	**4.54**	**0.50**	**Very High**
Parent-Child Communications			
1. talking to them about what they are learning in school	4.02	0.99	High

2. talking to them about their grades	4.26	0.91	Very High
3. talking to them about what they are going through at school with their teacher or their friends	3.99	1.16	High
4. talking to them about the difficulties they are experiencing at school	3.93	1.22	High
Category Mean	**4.05**	**0.89**	**High**
Homework Support			
1. Helping them when they do not understand something in their homework	3.85	1.21	High
2. asking them if they have done their homework.	4.20	1.09	Very High
3. helping them to plan their time and organize their homework	3.58	1.29	High
4. giving them a quiet space to do their homework at home	3.99	1.20	High
5. praising them when their homework is well done.	3.86	1.28	High
Category Mean	**3.90**	**0.93**	**High**
School-based Involvement			
1. speaking with their teacher for example, on the phone, or at school daycare	3.66	1.13	High
2. attending school activities that they are involved in for example sports, or plays	3.83	1.20	High
3. going to parent meetings at school	4.03	1.16	High
4. going to school to get their report card.	4.27	1.06	Very High
5. writing notes to their teacher in their agenda	3.26	1.25	Moderate
6. participating in school committees for example, parent committees	3.61	1.26	High
Category Mean	**3.78**	**0.87**	**High**
Overall Mean	**4.07**	**0.61**	**High**

Table 1. Level of Parental School Involvement

Moreover, the overall standard deviation of 0.61, which is less than one, indicates that responses are closely clustered around the mean, suggesting consistency in the perceptions of the students of parental involvement. This homogeneity implies that parental engagement is not isolated to a few households but is a relatively shared experience among respondents.

This finding aligns with the study of Darias-Behemino et al. (2024), who reported a high level of parental involvement among secondary students. They interpreted this as a sign that when parents communicate high standards and offer consistent support, it strengthens the affective and cognitive investment of the learners. Their study emphasized that parental presence serves as a primary motivator for students to stay committed to their school requirements.

Furthermore, this finding affirms the study of Barger et al. (2019), who established a high correlation between parental involvement and student adjustment. They revealed that home-based support is a global predictor of student success, meaning that parents who are involved in school-related tasks at home contribute significantly to the academic resilience of their children. Their research clarified that this involvement creates a sense of accountability in the student.

Likewise, Froiland (2021) revealed a high level of supportive parental behaviors in his research. He explained that the active role of a parent is essential in fostering a learner's persistence and participation, as it directly impacts the psychological well-being of the student. The study concluded that consistent parental school involvement leads to more positive attitudes toward learning and higher graduation rates.

The category of parental expectations obtained a very high mean of 4.54, indicating that students strongly perceive that their parents place significant value on education. Based on the instrument items such as "it is important that I succeed at school," "have good grades," "go to college," and "school is important" this result reflects a value-laden academic climate within the home. The items in this category range from 3.75 to 4.89. The highest-rated item, "going to school" (M = 4.89), suggests that parents strongly emphasize attendance and educational continuity, while the relatively lower rating for "being among the best in the class" (M = 3.75) indicates that while excellence is valued, it may not be imposed as a rigid competitive expectation. This pattern suggests that parental expectations in this context are aspirational rather than overly competitive, fostering a sense of purpose without necessarily creating extreme academic pressure.

This finding aligns with the study of Liu and Wang (2023), who reported a high level of parental expectations among secondary learners. They stated that students who perceive their parents as holding high standards demonstrate greater motivation and self-regulation. Their study emphasized that clear academic and moral standards function as a "moral compass" that aligns student goals with ethical growth.

In contrast, a study by Yamamoto and Holloway (2015) revealed that while parental expectations are generally high, the nature of these expectations can vary significantly depending on the cultural and family context. They argued that "very high" expectations reflect a parental belief in the child's potential but noted that such results are most stable when the expectations are clear and consistent. Their research suggests that the "Very High" result in the present study indicates a strong, established standard of excellence within the household.

Parent–child communication obtained a high mean of 4.05, indicating that parents frequently engage in discussions about academic experiences. Anchored on the instrument items (e.g., talking about learning, grades, social experiences, and difficulties), this reflects open and multidimensional communication between parents and children. The items in this category range from 3.93 to 4.26. The relatively higher rating for discussing grades (M = 4.26) compared to discussing difficulties (M = 3.93) suggests that while academic monitoring is strong, emotional discussions about challenges may occur slightly less frequently.

This finding affirms the study of Bernardo (2015), who found a high level of moral dialogue within Filipino families. He revealed that regular emotional openness and moral discussions strengthen the moral identity and empathy of children. The study clarified that this communication bridge enables students to better integrate classroom lessons on values into their personal decision-making.

Furthermore, Wang and Sheikh-Khalil (2014) established a high correlation between parent-child communication and behavioral engagement. They revealed that when communication is frequent and positive, students are less likely to exhibit "problem behaviors" in school. Their findings support the current result by showing that active verbal exchange is a protective factor for student development.

Homework support yielded a high mean of 3.90, indicating that parents actively monitor and assist with academic tasks. Based on the instrument items (e.g., helping with homework, organizing time, providing a study space, and giving praise), parental involvement appears to be both practical and motivational. The items in this category range from 3.58 to 4.20. The highest-rated item, asking about homework (M = 4.20), suggests strong monitoring behavior, while the lower rating for time organization (M = 3.58) indicates that structured academic guidance may vary across households.

This finding corresponds with the study of Silinskas and Kikas (2019), who reported a high frequency of constructive parental homework support. They explained that such involvement promotes perseverance and responsibility in students. Their results indicated that when parents provide structured support, students develop the resilience needed for both academic and moral growth.

However, Moroni et al. (2015) reported a moderate to low level of positive homework involvement in their study, noting that "intrusive" support can actually hinder student autonomy. They argued that if parents are too controlling during homework, it may decrease the student's intrinsic motivation. This suggests that the "High" result in the present study is beneficial only if the support is perceived as autonomy-supportive rather than controlling.

School-based involvement obtained a high mean of 3.78, indicating that parents participate in key school activities, particularly formal events such as report card collection (M = 4.27). However, lower engagement in activities such as writing notes (M = 3.26) suggests less frequent day-to-day interaction with teachers. Anchored on the instrument items, this reflects a pattern where parents are selectively involved, prioritizing significant academic events over routine communication.

This finding aligns with the study of Hornby and Blackwell (2018), who observed a high level of parental participation in school activities. They revealed that this participation strengthens the connection between the student and the school community. Their study concluded that seeing parents involved in school functions encourages students to emulate social responsibility and commitment.

Conversely, Wilder (2014) observed that school-based involvement, such as attending meetings or volunteering, often yields a high level of participation regardless of other school outcomes. He suggested that high levels of school-based participation are primarily indicative of a parent's commitment to the institutional community and their willingness to establish ties with the school system. This implies that the "High" result in the current study reflects a strong sense of civic duty and community presence among the parents.

Level of Humor Styles of Teachers

Presented in Table 2 is the level of humor styles of teachers, with an overall mean of 3.43, described as high, indicating that humor is oftentimes manifested in classroom settings. This suggests that teachers consciously and consistently utilize

humor as a pedagogical and interpersonal strategy to create a positive classroom climate, reduce tension, and facilitate student interaction. In this context, humor functions not merely as entertainment but as a tool for enhancing communication, engagement, and relational dynamics within the classroom.

Item	Mean	SD	Description
Affiliative Humor			
1. joking or laughing usually with students in class.	4.38	0.78	Very High
2. putting much effort into making students laugh during lessons.	4.18	0.89	High
3. making the class laugh by telling funny stories or examples.	4.33	0.83	Very High
4. laughing and joking with students during class discussions.	4.16	1	High
5. telling jokes in class.	4.16	0.95	High
6. enjoy making students laugh during lessons.	4.24	0.91	Very High
7. joking around with students.	4.21	0.92	Very High
8. finding it hard to think of funny or witty remarks during class.	3.48	1.23	High
Category Mean	**4.14**	**0.74**	**High**
Self-Enhancing Humor			
1. using humor to stay positive when class activities become stressful.	4.23	0.9	Very High
2. finding humor in everyday classroom situations.	4.11	0.91	High
3. using humor to help lighten the mood when problems arise in class	4.14	0.88	High
4. having a sense of humor helps them stay calm during difficulties.	4.12	0.91	High
5. thinking of something funny to help everyone feel better when the class atmosphere feels tense	4.06	0.97	High
6. losing their sense of humor when their teacher feels stressed	4.09	0.98	High
7. using humor as a way to cope with challenging classroom situations.	4.1	0.95	High
8. finding things to laugh about even when alone in class preparation or activities	4.13	0.92	High
Category Mean	**4.13**	**0.7**	**High**
Aggressive Style			
1. teasing students sometimes when they make mistakes.	3.15	1.32	Moderate
2. believing that students are not offended by their jokes.	3.03	1.3	Moderate
3. being concerned about how students feel when joking *	4.17	0.99	High
4. having liked using humor that puts students down.	2.64	1.59	Moderate
5. making jokes even when they are not appropriate for class.	2.17	1.58	Low
6. joining in laughing at students.	3.35	1.52	Moderate
7. using humor to put the student down when with a student	2.26	1.61	Low
8. avoiding to make a joke if it might offend a student even if it is something funny *	3.45	1.33	High
Category Mean	**2.63**	**0.79**	**Moderate**
Self-defeating Style			
1. being allowed by their teacher to laugh at them as part of joking in class.	3.61	1.46	High
2. putting down themselves sometimes too much when joking.	2.62	1.25	Moderate
3. trying to make students like them by joking about personal faults.	2.64	1.35	Moderate
4. avoiding jokes that put themselves down.	3.68	1.34	High
5. going overboard in making fun of themselves to be funny.	2.33	1.43	Low
6. becoming often the target of jokes in class.	2.6	1.41	Moderate

7. covering it up by joking when they feel unhappy	3.06	1.28	Moderate
8. believing that letting students laugh at them keeps the class in good spirits.	3.52	1.49	High
Category Mean	**3.01**	**1**	**Moderate**
Overall Mean	**3.43**	**0.49**	**High**

Table 2. Level of Humor Styles of Teachers

The overall standard deviation of 0.49, which is less than one, indicates that the responses are clustered near the mean, suggesting consistency in the perceptions of the students of the use of humor by the teachers. This implies that the use of humor is not isolated to a few teachers but is a relatively common instructional practice.

This finding aligns with the study of Wanzer et al. (2018), who found a high frequency of instructional humor use in successful classrooms. They stated that when humor is used constructively, it fosters a positive classroom climate that is conducive to learning and information retention. Their interpretation suggested that humor acts as an "attention-gainer" that prevents students from becoming bored or distracted during long lectures.

In the same vein, Bieg and Dresel (2021) revealed that a high level of affiliative humor styles significantly increased the emotional stability of students. They clarified that positive humor functions as an emotional regulator that helps students feel more secure and less anxious about making mistakes. Their results indicated that teachers who use humor are perceived as more competent and supportive by their learners.

Additionally, Isagan et al. (2023) reported a high level of humor integration within the Philippine educational context. They revealed that the use of culturally relevant humor promotes active participation and strengthens the interpersonal bond between the teacher and the student. Their study concluded that humor is not merely entertainment but a vital interpersonal strategy that enhances the overall quality of instruction.

Affiliative humor recorded a high category mean of 4.14, indicating that teachers frequently engage in humor that promotes social connection and positive relationships. Based on the items (e.g., joking with students, telling funny stories, laughing during discussions), this form of humor reflects an effort to create a friendly and inclusive classroom atmosphere. The items in this category range from 3.48 to 4.36. The highest-rated item, “joking or laughing usually with students in class” (M = 4.36), indicates that teachers actively use humor to build rapport, while the relatively lower rating for “finding it hard to think of witty remarks” (M = 3.48) suggests that while humor is common, spontaneity may vary among teachers.

This finding aligns with the study of Banas, Dunbar, and Rodriguez (2019), who reported a high degree of affiliative humor use in engaging classrooms. They stated that humor used to connect rather than divide leads to higher student cooperation and group cohesion. Their study emphasized that this humor style fosters respect and care, which are central to character formation.

Additionally, DiDonato (2020) revealed a high level of student-perceived warmth when teachers use affiliative humor. He clarified that this style acts as a social lubricant that makes the learning environment more hospitable. The study concluded that teachers who score high in this area are more effective at maintaining student interest over long periods.

Self-enhancing humor yielded a high mean of 4.13, indicating that teachers use humor as a positive coping mechanism. Based on the instrument items (e.g., finding humor in challenges and maintaining a funny perspective during stress), humor appears to be a tool for emotional regulation. The items in this category range from 4.06 to 4.23. The highest-rated item, using humor to stay positive when class activities become stressful (M = 4.23), suggests strong teacher resilience, while the lower rating for thinking of something funny to help everyone feel better (M = 4.06) still indicates a high frequency of positive intervention. It has a standard deviation of 0.70, which means that the responses are clustered around the mean.
This finding affirms the study of Bieg and Dresel (2021), who revealed a high level of self-enhancing humor among effective educators. They found that teachers who use humor to regulate their own stress improve overall classroom morale and the quality of teacher-student relationships. Their results clarified that this humor style models important virtues such as patience, optimism, and gratitude for the learners, which are essential components of Values Education.

In contrast, Martin et al. (2003) noted in their foundational research that while self-enhancing humor is generally high in healthy individuals, it can be underutilized in high-pressure environments where teachers feel overwhelmed. They argued that for self-enhancing humor to remain high, the school environment must support teacher well-being. This suggests that the "High" result in this study is an indicator of a healthy and supportive institutional climate within the selected Catholic schools.

Aggressive Style has recorded a moderate mean of 2.63, indicating that teachers only occasionally use humor that may involve teasing or sarcasm. The items in this category range from 2.17 to 4.17. Importantly, the low ratings on items such as "making inappropriate jokes" (M = 2.17) and "putting students down" (M = 2.26) suggest that teachers generally avoid harmful or offensive humor. At the same time, the high rating for "being concerned about how students feel when joking" (M = 4.17) indicates a strong awareness of the emotional responses of the students, reflecting ethical and professional sensitivity in humor use.

This finding corresponds with the study of Chabeli (2020), who reported a moderate frequency of aggressive humor in certain educational settings. The author observed that even moderate ridicule or mockery can undermine the self-esteem of students and violate moral principles of respect. The study concluded that educators must exercise extreme caution with sarcasm.

On the other hand, Plester (2015) found that in some "high-stress" environments, a moderate level of aggressive humor or "banter" can actually build resilience and group bonding. While the current study shows a moderate result that might be seen as negative, Plester's research suggests that if the students perceive the sarcasm as "playful" rather than "hurtful," it may not always result in disengagement.

Self-defeating humor obtained a moderate mean of 3.01, indicating that teachers sometimes use humor directed at themselves to create relatability. The items in this category range from 2.33 to 3.68. Based on the items (e.g., making fun of oneself, allowing students to laugh at them), this reflects an effort to reduce social distance and appear approachable. However, the low rating for "going overboard in making fun of themselves" (M = 2.33) suggests that teachers generally avoid excessive self-disparagement, maintaining a balance between relatability and authority.

This finding aligns with the study of Ruch and Heintz (2019), who found a moderate level of self-irony in supportive classroom environments. They stated that gentle self-irony promotes psychological closeness and mutual respect. Their interpretation suggested that when used carefully, this style models humility.

In contrast, a study by Kuiper and McHale (2017) revealed that high levels of self-defeating humor can be detrimental to perceived competence. They argued that if a teacher uses too much self-deprecating humor, it may lead students to lose confidence in them. Since the current study only shows a "Moderate" result, it suggests that the teachers are using this style sparingly.

Level of Student Engagement

The level of academic regulated learning is recorded with an overall mean of 4.29. It is described as very high, which means that academic regulated learning is oftentimes evident. This implies that students demonstrate strong emotional, behavioral, and cognitive investment in their learning processes, reflecting active participation and meaningful involvement in academic activities.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Affective Engagement			
1. being very interested in learning.	4.55	0.75	Very High
2. thinking what they are learning in school is interesting.	4.51	0.79	Very High
3. having liked what they are learning in school.	4.44	0.88	Very High
4. enjoy learning new things in class.	4.47	0.87	Very High
5. thinking that learning is boring.	3.17	1.57	Moderate
6. having liked their school.	4.22	1.02	Very High
7. being proud to be at their school.	4.36	0.93	Very High
8. looking forward to going to school most mornings.	3.73	1.31	High
9. being happy to be at their school.	4.27	0.96	Very High
Category Mean	**4.19**	**0.69**	**High**
Behavioral Engagement			
1. trying hard to do well in school.	4.52	0.77	Very High
2. working as hard as they can in class.	4.42	0.86	Very High
3. participating in class activities when they are in class.	4.28	0.91	Very High
4. paying attention in class.	4.45	0.73	Very High
5. just acting like they are working when they are in class.	3.67	1.43	High
6. doing just enough to get by in school.	4.13	1.13	High
7. having their mind wanders when they are in class.	3.97	1.17	High

8. going over it again until they understand it if they are having trouble in understanding.	4.54	0.76	Very High
9. keep working at a difficult homework problem until they think they had solved it.	4.46	0.85	Very High
10. being an active participant of school activities such as sport day and school picnic.	4.13	1.08	High
11. volunteering to help with school activities such as sport day and parent day.	4.14	1.11	High
12. taking an active role in extra-curricular activities in their school.	4.07	1.14	High
Category Mean	**4.23**	**0.65**	**Very High**
Indicators	**Mean**	**SD**	**Description**
Cognitive Engagement			
1. trying to understand the material better by relating it to things they already know when they study.	4.46	0.84	Very High
2. figuring out how the information might be useful in the real world when they study.	4.45	0.89	Very High
3. trying to put the ideas in their own words when learning new information.	4.54	0.83	Very High
4. trying to connect what they are learning with their own experiences when they study.	4.41	0.88	Very High
5. making up their own examples to help them understand the important concepts they learn from school.	4.41	0.9	Very High
6. trying to see how things fit together with other things they already know when learning things for school.	4.43	0.82	Very High
7. often trying to associate what they learned in other classes if they interconnected when they are learning things for school.	4.46	0.84	Very High
8. trying to see the similarities and differences between things they are learning for school and things they know already.	4.43	0.79	Very High
9. trying to understand how the thigs they learn in school fit together with each other.	4.47	.79	Very High
10. trying to match what they already know with things they are trying to learn for school.	4.44	.80	Very High
11. trying to think through topics and deciding what they are supposed to learn from them, rather than studying topics by just reading them over.	4.47	.81	Very High
12. trying to combine different pieces of information from course material in new ways when studying.	4.32	.94	Very High
Category	**4.44**	**.69**	**Very High**
Over-all Mean	**4.29**	**.50**	**Very High**

Table 3. Level of Student Engagement

The overall standard deviation is .50 denoting that responses of the respondents are closer to the mean which means that the scores for student engagement are clustered around the mean. This indicates that the responses are consistent, showing that the majority of the Grade 7 students share a similar high level of engagement, with very little variation in their experiences.

This finding aligns with the study of Metu (2024), who reported a high level of student engagement in modern classrooms. The author emphasized that engaged students are more likely to demonstrate persistence and meaningful learning outcomes compared to those who are passive. The study clarified that high engagement levels serve as a protective factor against school dropout and academic failure.

Moreover, Phan et al. (2021) revealed a high degree of cognitive engagement among secondary learners. They stated that when students are mentally invested, they are better able to connect moral principles with real-life decision-making and ethical judgment. Their interpretation suggested that engagement in values-based subjects leads to a more holistic development of the student's character.

Furthermore, Perry et al. (2024) observed a high level of behavioral engagement in classrooms with supportive environments. They found that students who feel connected to their school community exhibit increased cooperation and responsibility in both academic and social tasks. Their study affirmed that high engagement is a direct result of the interaction between the student's efforts and the support they receive from their surroundings.

The mean ratings of the different items within Affective Engagement range from 3.17 to 4.55, yielding a category mean of 4.19 described as high. Notably, the item thinking that learning is boring obtained the lowest mean (3.17), while being very interested in learning recorded the highest mean (4.55). This indicates that students generally experience positive emotional dispositions toward learning, characterized by interest, enjoyment, pride, and a sense of belonging in school. Such emotional attachment reflects a strong affective connection to learning environments, which may enhance motivation and willingness to participate in classroom activities.

This finding aligns with the study of Lee (2020), who reported a high level of affective engagement among secondary students. He observed that students who feel emotionally safe are more likely to develop moral insight. The study clarified that relational warmth is a foundational requirement for growth.

In contrast, Quin (2017) revealed that affective engagement often remains moderate in many settings due to a lack of rapport. His study argued that "High" affective engagement, such as that found here, is rare and usually indicates a highly supportive school culture, such as a Catholic school environment.

Behavioral engagement yielded a very high category mean of 4.23, with item means ranging from 3.67 to 4.54. The lowest-rated item, just acting like they are working when they are in class (3.67), suggests that a small proportion of students may occasionally display surface-level participation. In contrast, going over it again until they understand it if they are having trouble (4.54) reflects strong persistence and effort in academic tasks. Overall, the results indicate active participation, sustained effort, and consistent involvement in school-related activities.

This finding affirms the study of Gomes et al. (2023), who revealed a very high degree of behavioral engagement in values-oriented schools. They revealed that such engagement reflects values like cooperation in action. Their study emphasized that when students translate values into deeds, they strengthen their identity.

Furthermore, Fredricks et al. (2016) reported a high correlation between behavioral engagement and academic persistence. They found that students who consistently "show up" and participate, as seen in the current "Very High" results, are significantly less likely to disengage when tasks become difficult.

Cognitive engagement obtained a very high category mean of 4.44, with items ranging from 4.34 to 4.54. The lowest-rated item, trying to combine different pieces of information from course material in new ways (4.34), still indicates strong intellectual processing, while the highest-rated item, trying to put ideas in their own words when learning new information (4.54), reflects deep cognitive processing and active meaning-making. These results suggest that students employ advanced learning strategies such as elaboration, integration, and reflection, indicating high-level cognitive involvement in academic tasks.

This finding corresponds with the study of Phan et al. (2021), who reported a high degree of cognitive engagement among learners. They found that reflective thinking enables students to connect moral principles with real-life decision-making. Their results indicated that reflective inquiry encourages students to align their actions with their conscience.

Furthermore, Greene (2015) established that a high level of cognitive engagement is characterized by the student's use of self-regulation and deep processing strategies. The researcher revealed that students who exhibit this "high" mental investment are those who actively monitor their own understanding and seek to master complex concepts. This supports the current finding that Grade 7 students are not merely following instructions but are deeply and mentally invested in the content of their Values Education classes.

The findings of the study collectively highlight that Grade 7 students experience a highly supportive educational environment characterized by strong parental school involvement, positive teacher humor styles, and very high student engagement. The consistently high levels of parental involvement across expectations, communication, homework support, and school-based participation suggest that learning is strongly reinforced at home, creating a stable foundation for academic development. This supports the findings of Barger et al. (2019), who reported that parental involvement has a significant relationship with student adjustment and academic success. Likewise, Froiland (2021) emphasized that parental engagement promotes persistence and positive attitudes toward learning. In addition, Wanzer et al. (2018) found that instructional humor contributes to a positive classroom climate that enhances student learning experiences. These studies collectively affirm that both home and classroom environments play a crucial role in shaping student development.

Moreover, the very high level of student engagement across affective, behavioral, and cognitive domains underscores the combined influence of parental involvement and teacher humor styles. Students demonstrate strong emotional attachment to learning, active participation in classroom tasks, and deep cognitive processing, indicating meaningful engagement rather than passive compliance. This aligns with Metu (2024), who reported that high student engagement is associated with improved academic outcomes and reduced risk of disengagement. Similarly, Fredricks et al. (2016) emphasized that behavioral engagement is strongly linked to persistence in academic tasks, while Phan et al. (2021) found that cognitive engagement enhances reflective thinking and moral decision-making. Furthermore, Lee (2020) highlighted that affective engagement develops through emotionally supportive learning environments. Overall, the convergence of these findings suggests that strong parental involvement and positive teacher humor styles contribute significantly to the development of engaged and motivated learners.

Significance of the Relationship of Parental School Involvement, Humor Styles and Student Engagement

Parental school involvement has a positive moderate relationship with student engagement, with an r-value of 0.48. Moreover, it reflects a p-value of .00, which is less than the alpha set at .05 (two-tailed), indicating a statistically significant relationship. This means that as parents become more involved in school-related activities, students tend to be more engaged in their learning. Specifically, parental involvement through communication with teachers, monitoring academic progress, and providing support at home contributes to increased participation, attention, and interest among students. However, since the relationship is only moderate, this suggests that while parental school involvement is an important contributing factor to student engagement, it is not the sole determinant. There are still other variables that may influence student engagement, such as peer relationships, teaching strategies, and individual motivation, which were not included in this study.

Variables	r	p-value	Remarks
Parental School Involvement and Student Engagement	.48	.00	Significant
Humor Styles and Student Engagement	.38	.00	Significant

Table 4. Significance of Relationship of Parental School Involvement, Humor Styles, and Student Engagement

Further, the result of the study is supported by the findings of Epstein (1995), who found that parental involvement has a significant positive relationship with student academic engagement, particularly when parents actively communicate with teachers and support learning at home. Similarly, Jeynes (2012), in a meta-analysis, revealed a positive moderate relationship between parental involvement and student academic outcomes, including engagement and participation in school activities. In addition, Fan and Chen (2001) also reported that parental involvement shows a moderate positive correlation with student achievement and engagement. These findings support the present study, which also revealed a positive moderate relationship ($r = 0.48$) between parental school involvement and student engagement, indicating that while parental involvement is important, it is not the sole factor influencing engagement.

Similarly, humor styles and student engagement also reveals a significant positive relationship which is moderate ($r = .38$, $p < .05$). It means that as humor styles increases, the student engagement also significantly increases. Since the relationship is only moderate humor, it means that it is just one of the factors influencing engagement. While it helps, it does not solely determine how engage are in the class.

Moreover, the present findings on humor styles are supported by the study of Martin et al. (2003), who found that positive humor styles are significantly and positively related to psychological well-being and social engagement, which are linked to academic engagement. Likewise, Banas et al. (2011) reported a positive relationship between instructional humor and student engagement, showing that humor enhances attention, motivation, and participation in learning activities. Furthermore, Wanzer et al. (2010) found a moderate positive relationship between appropriate classroom humor and student engagement behaviors. These findings support the present study, which revealed a significant positive relationship between humor styles and student engagement, suggesting that humor contributes to engagement but works alongside other influencing factors.

The findings are supported by the work of Rod Martin et al. (2003), who identified different humor styles and found that positive humor, such as affiliative and self-enhancing humor, is associated with better psychological well-being and social interaction. In an educational context, Banas et al. (2011) reported that the use of appropriate humor in the classroom enhances students' attention, motivation, and engagement. Likewise, Wanzer et al. (2010) found that humor contributes to a positive classroom climate, which fosters increased student participation and interest in learning. These studies support the present finding that humor styles are significantly related to student engagement.

On the other hand, not all humor styles yield positive outcomes. According to Rod Martin (2003), negative humor styles, such as aggressive and self-defeating humor, may lead to negative social and emotional effects. Supporting this, Saroglou (2010) noted that inappropriate humor can create discomfort and reduce the quality of social interactions. In the classroom setting, such forms of humor may hinder student engagement rather than enhance it. This further explains why the relationship found in this study is moderate, as the effectiveness of humor depends on how it is used and perceived within the learning environment.

Overall, the findings of this study indicate that both parental school involvement and humor styles are significantly related to student engagement, although their relationships are only moderate. This suggests that student engagement is a multifaceted construct influenced by both external factors, such as parental support, and interpersonal or behavioral factors, such as humor. The results align with existing literature emphasizing that engagement is shaped by a combination of environmental, social, and individual influences. In particular, recent studies support that parental involvement

continues to play a meaningful but not exclusive role in students' academic engagement, as its impact interacts with other contextual and personal variables (Fan & Williams, 2018; Wilder, 2015). Likewise, humor in educational settings has been shown to positively influence engagement when it is used appropriately, reinforcing student participation and emotional connection to learning environments (Banas et al., 2017).

Therefore, while parental school involvement and humor styles both play meaningful roles in enhancing student engagement, they do not fully account for students' level of engagement in academic tasks. The moderate relationships observed in this study highlight the need to consider other contributing variables that may further explain student engagement. These findings underscore the importance of a holistic approach in promoting engagement, where parental support, positive social behaviors, and other contextual factors work together to foster active and meaningful participation in learning.

Significance of the Influence of Parental School Involvement and Humor Styles on Student Engagement

The results of the multiple regression analysis shows that in singular capacity, the independent variable, parental school involvement shows a p-value of .00 which is less than .05 level of significance (2-tailed) with a positive standardized beta value of .39. It means that for every unit increase in the value of the level of parental school involvement, there is a corresponding significant increase of .39 in the level of student engagement.

Singular Influence of the Predictors	**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**p-value**	**Remarks**
Parental School Involvement	.39	6.10	.00	Significant
Humor Styles	.24	3.80	.00	Significant
Combined Influence of the Predictors				
R	.53			
R^2	.28			
F	38.75			
p	**.00**			**Significant**

Table 5. Significance of the Influence of Parental School Involvement and Humor Styles on Student Engagement

Likewise, in singular capacity the humor styles of the teachers revealed a significant influence on student engagement (β= .24,p= .00). It means that for unit increase in the level of humor styles of the teachers there is a corresponding .24 unit increase in the level of student engagement.

Further, the combined influence of parental school involvement and humor styles on student engagement is significant (F = 38.75, p< .05). Meanwhile, the model explains 28 percent of the variance of student engagement based on the independent variables included in this study as indicated by R2= .28. Although parental school involvement and humor styles significantly predict student engagement, the remaining unexplained variance suggests that engagement is influenced by additional personal, instructional, and contextual factors such as peer relationships, intrinsic motivation, and classroom climate. This reinforces the multidimensional nature of student engagement emphasized in contemporary educational research. This means that 72 percent of the variance in student engagement can be attributed to other factors aside from parental school involvement and humor styles such as learner motivation, peer influence, classroom climate, and individual learning differences. Findings suggest that student engagement is a multidimensional construct shaped by both familial support systems and instructional practices. This finding is in support with Hattie (2017) emphasizing that both teacher practices and parental involvement are among the most influential factors contributing to student learning outcomes and engagement.

Nonetheless, the results of the study affirm the Parental Involvement Theory by Epstein (2001), which emphasizes the significant role of parents in shaping students' academic behaviors and outcomes. The findings revealed that parental school involvement significantly predicts student engagement, indicating that students who receive consistent support, guidance, and encouragement from their parents are more likely to be actively involved in their academic tasks. This supports the idea that when parents participate in their children's schooling, they help create a learning environment that promotes responsibility, motivation, and sustained engagement.

In addition, the influence of humor styles on student engagement can be explained through Social Learning Theory by Bandura (1977), which posits that individuals learn behaviors through observation, imitation, and interaction within their social environment. Students are likely to adopt positive humor styles through their interactions with peers, teachers, and significant others, which in turn shapes their attitudes toward learning. When humor is used constructively, it creates a supportive and engaging classroom atmosphere, encouraging participation and reducing anxiety. This suggests that humor styles, as socially learned behaviors, contribute to increased student engagement by making learning experiences more interactive and meaningful.

Notably, the study findings confirm that parental school involvement and humor styles significantly predict student engagement, explaining 28 percent of the variance in engagement levels. These results support the combined perspectives of Parental Involvement Theory and Social Learning Theory, highlighting that both environmental support and learned social behaviors play crucial roles in fostering student engagement. When students are supported by actively involved parents and are exposed to positive social behaviors such as constructive humor, they are more likely to engage meaningfully in their academic tasks. Therefore, the findings provide strong evidence that both parental influence and social interaction are essential in understanding and enhancing student engagement.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the interpretations of the data, the significant findings were presented as follows:

1. The findings revealed a high level of parental school involvement (M = 4.07), indicating that parents frequently engage in the educational and moral development of their children. This supports Epstein's (2001) Parental Involvement Theory, which emphasizes that active parental participation through expectations, communication, homework support, and school involvement strengthens the motivation and sense of responsibility of the students. The relatively higher mean in parental expectations (M = 4.54) suggests that clear standards set at home contribute to shaping the attitudes and engagement of the students in school, particularly in values education.
2. The results showed that humor styles of teachers (M = 3.43) are frequently manifested in classroom instruction, with higher means in affiliative (M = 4.14) and self-enhancing humor (M = 4.13) compared to aggressive (M = 2.63) and self-defeating humor (M = 3.01). This aligns with Bandura's (1977) Social Learning Theory, which posits that students learn through observation and imitation of the behaviors of the teachers. The predominance of positive humor indicates that teachers model constructive interaction, which students are likely to internalize, thereby supporting engagement and positive classroom behavior.
3. Student engagement obtained a high overall mean (M = 4.29), indicating strong involvement across affective (M = 4.19), behavioral (M = 4.23), and cognitive (M = 4.44) dimensions. This supports both Epstein's Parental Involvement Theory and Bandura's Social Learning Theory, as engagement is influenced by both home and school environments. The findings suggest that the active participation and deep learning of the students are outcomes of consistent parental support and positive teacher modeling, reinforcing the idea that engagement is shaped by multiple external influences.
4. There is a significant relationship between parental school involvement and student engagement ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.05$), as well as between humor styles of teachers and student engagement ($r = 0.38$, $p < 0.05$). These results indicate that both independent variables are positively associated with the dependent variable, confirming that increased parental involvement and constructive teacher humor correspond to higher levels of student engagement.
5. Both parental school involvement and humor styles of teachers significantly influence student engagement, as shown by their regression values ($\beta = 0.39$, $p = 0.00$ and $\beta = 0.24$, $p = 0.00$, respectively). The model explains 28% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.28$), indicating that while these factors are important predictors, other variables may also contribute to student engagement. This supports the conceptual framework that engagement is a product of both home-based and school-based influences working together.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the colleagues and institutions who provided guidance, feedback, and support throughout the conduct of this research and the preparation of this manuscript. Any remaining errors or omissions are the sole responsibility of the authors.

Funding

This research received no external funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency, and no organization provided financial support for the conduct of the study, authorship, or publication of this article.

Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

Archambault, I., Janosz, M., Olivier, E., & Dupéré, V. (2022). Student engagement and school dropout: Theories, evidence, and future directions. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), Handbook of research on student engagement (pp. 331–355). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14188-7_15

Banas, J. A., Dunbar, N., Rodriguez, D., & Liu, S.-J. (2011). A meta-analysis of research on humor in educational settings. Communication Education, 60(2), 115–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2010.517823

Etikan, & Bala. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal, 5(6), 00149. https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149

Bieg, S., & Dresel, M. (2021). The role of instructional humor in the classroom: A longitudinal analysis of teacher humor and student emotions. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 660811. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660811

DiDonato. (2020). The impact of teacher humor on student perceptions and classroom environment. Teaching and Teacher Education, 87, 102937. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102937

Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. S. (2015). Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter? In S. L. Christenson et al. (Eds.), Handbook of research on student engagement (pp. 97–131). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_5

Fredricks, J. A., Filsecker, M., & Lawson, M. A. (2016). Student engagement, context, and adjustment. Learning and Instruction, 43, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.02.002

Garcia, L. M., & Santos, J. P. (2021). Teacher humor and classroom climate. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 41(3), 345–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1901234

Gomes, S., et al. (2023). Modeling students' behavioral engagement. International Journal of STEM Education, 10, Article 21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-023-00407-w

Isagan, K. I. R., et al. (2023). Humor as a teaching and learning strategy. Teaching and Research in Psychology, 3(2), 1573–1588. https://doi.org/10.53378/trp.12232

Kim, H., & Park, S. (2020). Cross-cultural perspectives on teacher humor. Teaching and Teacher Education, 89, 102990. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.102990

Lam, S.-f., et al. (2014). Understanding student engagement. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 39(3), 228–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.06.002

Lee, J. S. (2020). The role of teacher support in promoting student engagement among secondary school students. Educational Psychology, 40(5), 612–630. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2019.1679365

Metu, A. (2024). A literature review of student engagement in learning experiences (Preprint). https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.17426.98243

Phan, H. P., Ngu, B. H., & Yeung, A. S. (2021). Academic engagement: A conceptual framework and empirical evidence of cognitive engagement among secondary school students. Educational Psychology, 41(3), 321–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2020.1822953

Perry, N. E., Brenner, C. A., & Walker, J. (2024). Supportive classroom environments and student behavioral engagement: Implications for teaching practice. Teaching and Teacher Education, 132, 104261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104261

Quin, D. (2017). Longitudinal and contextual associations between teacher–student relationships and student engagement: A systematic review. Review of Educational Research, 87(2), 345–387. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316669434

Torres, M., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Positive humor and student engagement. International Journal of Educational Psychology, 12(1), 33–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/ijep.2023.1201

Wanzer, M. B., Frymier, A. B., & Irwin, J. (2020). Teacher humor and student learning. Communication Education, 69(2), 193–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2020.1719076

Wilder, S. (2014). Effects of parental involvement on academic achievement: A meta-synthesis. Educational Review, 66(3), 377–397. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.780009

Appendices

No appendices are attached to this study.