Does family's Social Capital Affects Parental Involvement in the Schooling of Left-behind Children? Empirical Evidence from Niger State, Nigeria

Bala Muktar[1], Mohd Razani B. Mohd Jali[2] & Nor Azam Abdul Razak[3]

Abstract

Recently, empirical studies have reported mixed findings on the impacts of parental migration on the academic performance of left-behind children. Although most of the studies suggested variation in parental involvement as the potential explanation for their findings, little is known about why parental involvement may differ among different left-behind households. Using a survey data collected from 401 caregivers of the left-behind children in rural areas of Niger State, Nigeria, we investigated the effects of family's social capital on parental involvement in the schooling of the left-behind children. We also explore how these effects differ among different caregivers using Logistic regression model. We find that left-behind children in families with high social capital are more likely to have high parental involvement compared to their peers in households with low family's social capital. Also, left-behind children under the care of mothers or non-parent caregivers are less likely to have high parental involvement compared to their peers under the care of fathers. We suggest that when migrating, parents should entrust the guardianship of their children in the households with high family's social capital.

Key words: Family's social capital, Parental involvement, Left-behind children, Logistic Regression Model

1. Introduction

Left-behind children, whose one or both parents migrated, constitute over 21% of the Nigerian children (NDHS, 2008). These types of children are considered as one of the vulnerable groups of children whose academic performance suffers perhaps due to low parental involvement. Most of the studies that found a negative relationship between parental migration and academic performance of the left-behind children suggested poor parental involvement in the absence of parents as the culprit (Liang *et al.*, 2008; Luecke & Stoehr, 2013; Zhang *et al.*, 2014; Zhou *et al.*, 2014). Whereas parental involvement in the schooling of the left-behind children may diminish in the family contexts where family's social capital is low, it might not be the case in environments where the family norm provides support for high family's social capital (Crosnoe, 2004). In Nigeria, the characteristics of the family system portend a norm of social parenthood where children are taken care of not only by their biological parents but also by relatives (Goody, 1982). This type of family practice is strongly upheld among the three major ethnic groups (Nupe, Gbagyi and Hausa) in Niger State. For instance, in the Nupe ethnic tradition, children may be fostered by relatives, who may enroll them in school and take care of their needs. These children, when grown up, often attend to their fostered parents before even attending to their biological parents (Encyclopedia of World Cultures Supplement, 2002). Communities are also organized as family clusters in the Gbagyi culture and each cluster is headed by a patriarchal head who ensures family cohesion and assistance, including the mutual pattern of child kinship (Shekwo, 1988). Similarly, within the Hausa folk, child fostering is commonly practiced. Infertile women among the relatives and grandparents are normally comforted with foster children.

---

[1] Ph.D Scholar, School of Economics, Finance and Banking, University Utara, Malaysia
[2] Senior Lecturer, School of Economics, Finance and Banking, University Utara, Malaysia
[3] Associate Professor, School of Economics, Finance and Banking, University Utara, Malaysia

The children grow up under their care, sometimes with little assistance from the parents (Abubakar *et al.*, 2013). Consequently, in the event of parents' migration, left-behind children in this cultural milieu may benefit from the custodial families' social capital. Family's social capital is defined as the resources embedded in the family's social capital network (Lin, 2001). Family's social capital network is the connectedness or interaction which individual family members establish. According to Coleman (1990), family's social capital is invested through the interaction between the adults and the children. The extent of the family's social capital is determined by the opportunity for the interaction, the frequency of the interaction and the duration of such interaction (Smith *et al.*, 1995). However, according to McNeal (1999), it is only the family interactions, which relate to schooling, that benefit parental involvement.

Parental involvement is the set of all parental behaviors that enhance children's school success (Fantuzzo *et al.*, 1995). Such behaviors include assisting children in doing homework, communicating with school about child academic progress, participating in children's school events, monitoring the child's time usage as well as praise and reward given to the children on behaviors fundamental to varied aspects of school success (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995; Sigel, 1990). Therefore, family's social capital may affect parental involvement in the education of the children if the family members engage the children in interaction related to school activities. Under no-migration setting, empirical evidence has shown that family's social capital has positive impacts on parental involvement in the schooling of the children (Israel *et al.*, 2001; Von Otter & Stenberg, 2015). However, in the case of left-behind children, the impact of family's social capital on parental involvement may depend on a number of factors in the custodial family, which determine the nature of the family's social capital.

First, the educational benefits of living with a guardian or caregiver may vary depending on the caregivers' level of education (Zeng & Xie, 2014). Second, migration increases the family role of the guardians and the left-behind children themselves, particularly the left-behind girls (Chang *et al.*, 2011), which may affect the time for academic interactions at home. Third, the commitment to invest in the children's education and the academic resources of other members in the custodial family may determine the social capital utility of the children (Serra, 2009; Von Otter & Stenberg, 2015). Therefore, whether family's social capital can affect parental involvement in the schooling of the left-behind children remains an empirical question. This study seeks to investigate the impacts of family's social capital on parental involvement in the schooling of the left-behind children, with special reference to Niger state. The article is presented in seven sections. The first section is the introduction; the second section is the review of the literature while the third section provides the theoretical framework. The methodology of the study is presented in the fourth section and the result of the study is presented in the fifth section. Discussion of the result is put in the sixth section while conclusion and policy implications are presented in the seventh section.

2. Review of the Literature

When parents migrate in search of economic opportunities in the cities, children are often left-behind under the care of non-migrant parent or relatives. Empirical evidence has shown that parental involvement in the schooling of these children suffers, as indicated by the decrease in the study time at home, lack of parental affection and reduced tutoring and supervision of child's school work (Jingzhong & Lu, 2011). However, whereas the presence of parents may symbolize the availability of academic resources, the flow of such resources to parental involvement depends on the family's social capital (Ream & Palardy, 2008). Therefore, absence of the parents might not be the cause of the decrease in parental involvement of the left-behind children, but rather, the nature of the family's social capital in the left-behind households. Coleman (1988) and Bourdie (1986) theorized that there are relationships between human and social capital. According to Coleman, social capital is a necessary precondition for the utilization of human capital. On the other hand Bourdie conceptualized that the benefit of social capital to the parental involvement is higher in a network with higher human capital. The findings of McNeal (2001) as well as Ream and Palardy (2008) have supported the Bourdie's conceptualization of social capital.

However, the finding of Domina (2005) reported different view, that social capital is more beneficial to children whose parents have low human capital. Similarly, Von Otter and Stenberg (2015) found that social capital is more available in families with higher human capital, but the utility of the social capital to parental involvement does not depend on the parents' human capital, rather, it depends on the quality of the parent-child interaction. Conversely, a recent study by Bol and Kalmijn (2016) has found that social capital in the grandparent-grandchild interactions has no effect on the parental involvement in the schooling of the grand children.

However, they suspect that the findings might be influenced by the nuclear family system of the Netherland, where the study was conducted. In such an environment, grandparents are rare substitute of parents. In environments with extended family norm, social capital embodied in the grandparent-grandchild interactions may affect the parental involvement in the schooling of the children. In extended family contexts, grandparents serve as substitutes of parents in the event of parental migration or death (Dunifon & Kowaleski-Jones, 2007; DeLeire & Kalil, 2002). In China, for instance, Zeng and Xie (2014) reported that living with educated grandparents has more impacts on parental involvement of the children than living with less educated grandparents. Also the education of non-co resident grandparents has no impacts on parental involvement of the grand children. Therefore, co-residence might be necessary for the existence of social capital between the grandparent and grandchildren. Based on the empirical evidence reviewed above, the nature of the social capital in the custodial family of the left-behind children may affect parental involvement in the schooling of the children.

3. Theoretical Model of Family's Social Capital and Parental Involvement in the Schooling of the Left-behind Children

In the absence of one or both parents, family's social capital may provide a substitute for the involvement of parents (Coleman, 1988; Putman, 2000). Following Glaeser *et al.* (2002), parental involvement in the absence of parents can be demonstrated by assuming that child, *i*, interacts with family members, *U*, such that the child's stock of social capital resulting from interaction with each family member, *j*, is the sum of *j* (all the family members within the child's social capital network), represented in Equation (1) below:

$$S_i^U = \sum j \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(1)$$

Since the literature on social capital argues that there are positive complementarities to the accumulation of social capital across individuals in the social capital network (Coleman, 1988), $S_i^U > 0$. That is, every child is assumed to benefit from the interaction with other family members.

The value of social capital is also assumed to fall over time due to depreciation. Depreciation of social capital may occur due to mortality, physical or mental inability of other members in the child's social capital network as well as migration (Glaeser *et al.*, 2002). When the family members migrate out of their community, the child's social capital (the child's interaction with the family members) depreciates, falling to a level, *λ < 1* of its previous value. This means that social capital investment is community specific. The Lamda, *λ,* is the measure of stock of social capital of the child at a particular time. Assuming the depreciation rate in the child's social capital is represented by *ϕ,* then *ϕ* can be expressed by Equation (2) below:

$$\phi = 1 - \lambda \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(2)$$

0 < λ < 1

Hence, social capital follows a dynamic budget constraint and the evolution of the child's social capital utility flow is shown by the Equation (3) below:

$$S_{it+1}^U = \phi S_{it}^U + I_{t+1}^U \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(3)$$

Where:

S_{it+1}^U: is the flow of social capital utility to child *i* for interacting with family members *U* at time *t* + 1.

ϕS_{it}^U: is the stock of social capital utility of child *i* at time *t*.

I_{it+1}^U: is the level of investment in social capital utility by child *i* (establishment of new network) at time *t* + 1.

Therefore, parental involvement (**PI**) in the schooling of the left-behind children may depend on the family's social capital as well as other factors that may determine the extent of the family's social capital impacts on parental involvement. The family's social capital (***FSC_i***), which is the child's interaction ($\varphi S_{it}^U + I_{it+1}^U$), with the caregiver and other family members determine the flow of the family's academic resources and other aspects of parental involvement to the left-behind children (Ren & Hu, 2013).

Other factors that may affect the impacts of family's social capital on parental involvement include the education of the caregiver (ECG_i). The Educational level of the caregivers may affect the caregiver's academic input to the children (Chen *et al.*, 2009), while the caregiver (CG_i), may provide academic motivation and encouragement to the children (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995). The number of siblings (NSL_i), may benefit the children by giving them room for mutual academic assistance at home (Brown & Park, 2002; Chen *et al.*, 2009). Remittances sent by the migrant parents (RsP_i), or family income($Ficm_i$), may determine the left-behind children's access to learning materials and extra paid tutoring at home (Hu, 2013; Princiotta *et al.*, 2006). Age (Age_i), and gender ($Gder_i$), may be important control variables, as gender may affect the children's academic time at home because girls are often more preoccupied with domestic responsibilities at home than boys (Glick & Sahn, 2000). The mathematical function derivable from this formulation is therefore depicted in Equation (4) below:

$$PI_i = PI(FSC_i, ECG_i, CG_i, NSL_i, RsP_i, Ficm_i, Age_i, Gder_i)\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots (4)$$

Hypotheses

H₁: Left-behind children in families with high social capital are more likely to have high parental involvement than those living in families with low social capital.

H₂: Education of the caregiver is expected to have no impact on parental involvement in the schooling of the left-behind children if it is not complemented with family's social capital.

4. Methodology

4.1 Data Source and Measurement

This study uses primary data collected from the rural areas of Niger State, Nigeria, where the incidence of rural-urban migration has led to many children being left-behind (NPC, 2009). The data were gathered through the administration of survey questionnaires on the caregivers of the left-behind children in the three senatorial districts of the state, which comprise of zone A, zone B and zone C. Data on social capital indicators were obtained from the responses to the social capital questionnaire adapted from Von Otter and Stenberg (2015). The questionnaire comprises of three questions on whether family members discuss schoolwork with the child, read the child's schoolbooks and attend parent-teacher meetings of the child's school. If at least one or more of the family members satisfy the three conditions, then family's social capital exists and is denoted as 1, while 0 otherwise. Data on parental involvement on the other hand were responses to parental involvement questionnaire developed by Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2005) and revised by Walker *et al.* (2005). The questionnaire has sixty-six items, with responses anchored based on 6-point Likert's Scale. A higher total score in each questionnaire represents higher involvement and a lower total score represents lower involvement. Thus, a questionnaire scores ≥198=1, while 0 otherwise, denote high and low parental involvements respectively.

Data on control variables such as the education of the caregiver, the caregiver status, number of siblings living with left-behind child, remittances sent by migrant parents, non-remittance family income as well as age and gender of the children were also sourced from the caregivers. Education of the caregiver is a continuous variable for the number of completed years of study of the caregiver. The caregiver status is equal to 1, if it is the mother's caregiver; 2, if it is the father's caregiver and 3, if it is the non-parent caregiver. Number of siblings is a continuous variable for the siblings living with left-behind child. Other variables that are continuous include the remittances sent by the migrant parents, non-remittance family income and age. Gender is a dichotomous variable with male equal to 1 and female equal to 0.

4.2 Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The population of this study comprised of left-behind children who are within the age brackets of 6-10 years in rural areas of Niger State. Given that the number of children within the study population is 321,481 (NPC, 2009; NSBS, 2012), and following the Saunders *et al* (2007) sample selection criteria, a sample size of 383 caregivers of the left-behind children was selected. In addition, 153 samples, representing 40% of the sample size were added, making a total of 536 sample size, in order to correct for non-response bias (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). Due to the possible uniqueness of the different zones in the state (zone A; zone B and zone C), stratified sampling method was used (Needham *et al.*, 2008). In each zone or stratum, 1/3 of the total sample size representing 178 samples was administered randomly using the sampling frame collected from the Niger State Bureau of Statistics. However, only a total of 401 samples from the three zones were recovered which represent the study sample.

4.3 Method of Data Analysis and Model Specification

The Logistic regression model was used to estimate the regression equation of this study since the dependent variable is dichotomous in nature (Cameron & Trivedi, 2005), with a value of 1 and 0 for high and low involvement respectively. Hence, the functional form in Equation (4), was used to estimate the effect of family's social capital on the parental involvement of the left-behind children, which is specified in Equation (5) below:

$$\ln\left(\frac{PI_i}{1-PI_i}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Fsc_i + \beta_2 Cgvr_i + \beta_3 Ecgv_i + \beta_4 NSl_i + \beta_5 Rem_i + \beta_6 Ficm_i + \beta_7 Age_i + \beta_8 Gder_i + \mu_i \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(5)$$

Where: PI_i, is parental involvement in the schooling of child i; β_0, **is** the constant parameter of the equation; β_s, are the coefficients of the independent variables. The Fsc_i, is the family's social capital of child i; $Cgvr_i$, is the child i's caregiver while $Ecgv_i$ is the education of the child i's caregiver. The NSL_i represents the number of siblings living with child i; Rem_i, is the remittance received by child i's household; $Ficm_i$ is the non-remittance family income of child i's household and Age_i is the age of child i. The $Gder_i$ is gender of child i and μ_i, is the error term.

5. Results

5.1 Descriptive Result

The descriptive result is presented in two tables, with the description of continuous variables being presented in Table1 while those of the dummy and categorical variables presented in Table 2. From Table 1, the average age of the left-behind children in the sample is eight years, with minimum age of six and maximum age of ten years respectively. The average monthly remittance received by the left-behind household is seventeen thousand nine hundred and eighty seven Naira (N17, 987 or $50)[4], with minimum monthly amount of N7, 501($20.1) and a maximum monthly amount of N27, 501($76). The average years of education of the caregivers is approximately 12 years, with minimum years of education of one year and maximum years of education of 17 years. The average number of siblings living with left-behind child is approximately three siblings, with a minimum of zero or no sibling and a maximum of 17 siblings. The average monthly amount of non-remittance family income is N9, 772 ($27), with a minimum monthly amount of N2, 500 ($7) and a maximum monthly amount of N42,501($118).

Table: 1 Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Variables in the Data					
Variables	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age	401	8.189	1.180	6	10
rem	401	17,987	4,574	7,501	27,501
ecgv	401	12.20	3.261	1	17
nsbl	401	3.259	2.686	0	23
ficm	401	9,772	5,383	2,500	42,501
age, is the age; rem, remittances; ecgv, is the education of the caregiver; nsbl, number of siblings living with left-behind child; Ficm, non-remittance family income and SD, is the standard deviation.					

The Block (1) of Table 2 is a cross tabulation of caregiver and parental involvement. From the first column of the block, only an approximately 9.4% of all mother caregivers in the sample provide low parental involvement, while approximately 90.6% of them provide high parental involvement. Similarly, in the second column of block (1), no father's caregiver (0%) in the sample that provides low parental involvement to his left-behind child, while 100% of them provide high parental involvement to their children. The third column of block (1) shows that approximately 17.4% of non-parent caregivers provide low parental involvement to their left-behind children, while approximately 82.6% of them provide high parental involvement to their left-behind children.

The cross tabulation of family's social capital (fsc) and caregiver is shown in Block (2) of Table 2. The first column of the block shows that approximately 29.8% of the mother caregivers' families in the sample have low family's social capital (LF), while approximately 70.2% of these families have high family social capital (HF).

---

[4] At the exchange rate of $1= N360

The second column shows that 40% of the father's caregiver families have low family's social capital, while 60% of such families have high family's social capital. The third column of block 2 shows that approximately 47.8% of the non-parent caregiver's families have low family's social capital while approximately 52.2% of these families have high family's social capital. Block 3 of Table 2 is the frequencies of the different caregivers. From the block, approximately 93% of all the caregivers in the sample are mother caregivers, 1.2% of them are father caregivers, while approximately 5.8% of them are non-parent caregivers. In Block 4 of Table 2, the frequencies of the gender of the left-behind children were presented. It shows that, approximately 50.2% of the children were male, while approximately 49.8% of them were female.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Dummy and Categorical Variables with Cross Tabulation											
(1)				(2)				(3)		(4)	
	Mother Cgv	Father C	Non-P Cg		Mother C	Father C	Non-P C		Freq (%)		Freq (%)
PI	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	**Fsc**	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	**Cgvr**		**Gder**	
LowP	35 (9.4)	-- --	4 (17.4)	**LF**	111 (29.8)	2 (40)	11 (47.8)	**Mother**	373 (93)	**Male**	201 (50.2)
High	338 (90.6)	5 (100)	19 (82.6)	**HF**	262 (70.2)	3 (60)	12 (52.2)	**Father**	5 (1.2)	**Female**	200 (49.8)
								Non-P	23 (5.8)		
Total	**373**	**5**	**23**		**373**	**5**	**23**		**401**		**401**

Cgvr, is the caregiver; Non-P, non-parent caregiver; LowP, stands for low parental involvement; HighP, stands for high paren

5.2 Logistic Regression Result

To further understand the relationship between family's social capital and parental involvement in the schooling of the left-behind children, hypotheses set in section three are tested using the Logistic regression results in Table 3. The column (1) of the table presents the Logit coefficients of the full model, which is the model that includes the covariates for the family's social capital and education of the caregiver. The beta coefficient of the family's social capital was positive and statistically significant at the 99% level. This means that Left-behind children in families with high social capital are more likely to have high parental involvement than those living in families with low social capital (reference category). Hypothesis H_1 is therefore supported. However, the beta coefficient for mother caregiver was negative and statistically significant at the 99% level, which implies that compared to the left-behind children under the care of fathers (reference category), those under the care of mothers are less likely to have high parental involvement. Also, the beta coefficient of the non-parent caregiver was negative and statistically significant at the 99% level, meaning that compared to the left-behind children under the care of fathers, those under the care of non-parent caregivers are less likely to have high parental involvement. The relationship between years of education of the caregiver and parental involvement was positive and statistically significant at the 99% level, implying that a one year increase in the education of the caregiver increases the probability that the left-behind child would have high parental involvement.

Moreover, non-remittance family income was negative and statistically significant at the 99% level. This means that a one Naira increase in the non-remittance family income reduces the probability that the left-behind children would have a high parental involvement. The beta coefficient for age is positive and statistically significant at the 99% level, which means that a one year increase in the age of the left-behind children increases the probability that they would have high parental involvement. Column (2) of Table 3 presents the Logit coefficients of the second model, which is the model in which the social capital variable was dropped. The beta coefficient of education of the caregiver was not statistically significant in this model. This implies that education of the caregiver would have no impact on parental involvement in the schooling of the left-behind children if it is not complemented with family's social capital, therefore supporting hypothesis H_2.

Other variables in the model, such as mother caregiver, non-parent caregiver, and family income were negative and statistically significant at the 99%, 99% and 95%, respectively, while remittance and age, were positive and both statistically significant at the 99% .Column 3 of Table 3 shows the Logit coefficients of the third model, which is the model in which there is family's social capital as a covariate, but no covariate for the education of the caregiver. The beta coefficient of the family's social capital in this model is positive and statistically significant at the 99% level. This means that even in the absence of caregivers' education, left-behind children in families with high social capital are more likely to have higher parental involvement than their peers in families with low social capital. Therefore, education of the caregivers is not a precondition for the utilization of family's social capital. This further confirms hypothesis H_1.

Column 4 of Table 3 presents the results for the marginal effects. The results show that, left-behind children who live in households with high social capital have 29.6% more probability of having a high parental involvement compared to their peers who live in families with low social capital. Also, left-behind children under the care of mothers have 74.9% lower probability of having high parental involvement compared to their peers who are under the care of their fathers. Similarly, left-behind children under the care of non-parent caregivers have 77.8% less chance of having high parental involvement compared to their peers who are under the care of their fathers. A one year increase in the education of the caregiver also increases the probability that the left-behind children would have a high parental involvement by 1.5%. Moreover, an additional non-remittance family's income reduces the probability that the left-behind children may have a high parental involvement by about 1%, while a one year increase in the age of the left-behind children increases the probability that they would have high parental involvement by 3.1%.

Table 3: Logistic Regression Results for the Effect of Family's Social Capital on Parental Involvement				
Variables		Logit Coefficients.		Marginal Effects
	(1) Full Model	(2) Without Fsc	(3) Without Ecgv	(4)
Family's soc. cap.	5.769***		5.547***	0.296***
	(1.255)		(1.343)	(0.0482)
Mother cgv	-14.59***	-12.78***	-12.50***	-0.749***
	(1.070)	(0.607)	(0.789)	(0.109)
Non-parent. cgv	-15.15***	-13.80***	-12.85***	-0.778***
	(1.353)	(0.795)	(1.077)	(0.126)
Education of cgv	-0.297***	-0.0909		-0.0152***
	(0.115)	(0.0725)		(0.00562)
Number of sib.	-0.0705	-0.0687	-0.0692	-0.00362
	(0.0939)	(0.0759)	(0.0804)	(0.00476)
Remittances	9.73e-05	0.000201***	-2.60e-05	5.00e-06
	(8.28e-05)	(5.36e-05)	(6.10e-05)	(4.29e-06)
Non-rem fam. Inc	-0.000153***	-8.44e-05**	-0.000182***	-7.85e-06***
	(5.02e-05)	(3.59e-05)	(4.91e-05)	(2.51e-06)
Age	0.606***	0.633***	0.512**	0.0311***
	(0.209)	(0.149)	(0.216)	(0.00935)
Gender	0.0122	-0.249	0.0426	0.000627
	(0.442)	(0.352)	(0.411)	(0.0227)
Observations	401	401	401	401
Robust standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Soc. Cap., means social capital, cgv, means caregiver, sib. means siblings, Non-rem farm. Inc, means non-remittance family income.				

5.3 Post Estimation Diagnostics

Table 4 in the appendix provides the results for the different post estimation test. Link test was used to test for the model specification error. The p-value (0.361) of the _hatsquare was not statistically significant, thereby supporting the null hypothesis that the model is correctly specified. Another test conducted was the test for the goodness-of-fit.

The percentage of correct prediction was used for the goodness-of-fit and the area under the Receiver Operator Characteristics (ROC) curve is 0.9443. Since the area under the ROC curve is 94.43%, then the model has high discriminating ability. Therefore, the values of the dependent variable are correctly predicted. Moreover, multicollinearity test was conducted using VIF and Tolerance value. The VIF values of all the variables in the model were less than 10, and their Tolerance values were all greater than 0.1, which implies that multicolinearity does not exist among the covariates in the model (Pregibon, 1981).

6. Discussion of the Results

The study has found that left-behind children in families where social capital is high and with educated caregivers are more likely to have high parental involvement. However, in families where the caregivers are educated, but there is no social capital, left-behind children are less likely to have high parental involvement. This finding confirms the Coleman (1988)'s conceptualization of social capital as a necessary precondition for the utilization of human capital (education). It also corroborates with the previous empirical evidence that confirms the Coleman's theorization (McNeal, 2001; Ream & Palardy, 2008). The result also shows that in the model where the education of the caregiver was not captured, family's social capital was statistically significant, thereby concurring with the empirical findings of Von Otter and Stenberg (2015), that the utilization of social capital on parental involvement does not depend on the parents' human capital (in this case caregivers education).

However, what is nuance about the findings of this study is that, previous studies investigated the impact of family's social capital on parental involvement of children with non-migrant parents, while the current study concerns with left-behind children whose one or both parents have migrated and parental involvement in their schooling depends on the social capital provided by the left-behind household. Second, left-behind children under the care of their fathers were found to have a higher probability of having high parental involvement than those under the care of mothers or non-parent caregivers. This might be because father caregivers interact with the children in a way that is more positive to their schooling than mother or non-parent caregivers (McWayne et al., 2013). Third, contrary to prior findings that family income improves parental involvement (Brown & Park, 2002), this study shows that a one Naira increase in the non-remittance family income of the left-behind household is associated with low parental involvement. This might be that increase in the non-remittance family income was accompanied by investment in home luxuries, which was reported to have a negative effect on schooling of the children (Zhao et al., 2014). Fourth, a one year increase in the age of the left-behind children increases the probability that the children have a high parental involvement. This could be because elderly left-behind children might be more serious about school and invite members of the family's social capital network for academic assistance, since the child's invitation for involvement affects parental involvement (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995).

7. Conclusion and Policy Implications

Based on the results of this study, it could be concluded that when the caregivers of the left-behind children are educated and family's social capital is high, left-behind children are more likely to have high parental involvement than when the caregivers are less educated and family's social capital is low. Secondly, when the caregivers of left-behind children are educated but family's social capital is low, left-behind children are less likely to have high parental involvement than when the caregivers are less educated but family's social capital is high. Thirdly, left-behind children under the care of father caregivers are more likely to have high parental involvement than those under the care of mothers or non-parent caregivers. Fifthly, left-behind children living in wealthy families are less likely to have high parental involvement than those living in less wealthy families. Finally, older left-behind children are more likely to have high parental involvement than younger left-behind children. Therefore, it is recommended that, when migrating, parents should entrust the guardianship of their children in families with high social capital.

References

Abubakar, S., Lawan, U. M., & Yasir, J. N. (2013). Knowledge and attitudes toward child adoption and fostering among infertile women in northern Nigeria. *Sahel Medical Journal, 16*(1), 19.

Bol, T., & Kalmijn, M. (2016). Grandparents' resources and grandchildren's schooling: Does grandparental involvement moderate the grandparent effect?. *Social science research, 55*, 155-170.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education. Edited by: Richardson J.

Brown, P. H., & Park, A. (2002). Education and poverty in rural China. *Economics of education review, 21*(6), 523-541.

Cameron, A. C., & Trivedi, P. K. (2005). *Microeconometrics: methods and applications.* Cambridge university press.

Chang, H., Dong, X. Y., & MacPhail, F. (2011). Labor migration and time use patterns of the left-behind children and elderly in rural China. *World Development, 39*(12), 2199-2210.

Chen, X., Huang, Q., Rozelle, S., Shi, Y., & Zhang, L. (2009). Effect of migration on children's educational performance in rural China. *Comparative Economic Studies, 51*(3), 323-343.

Coleman, J. (1993). S. 1990. Foundations of social theory. *Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press. Deutsch, 3,* 1991-1993.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American journal of sociology,* S95-S120.

Crosnoe, R. (2004). Social capital and the interplay of families and schools. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*(2), 267-280.

DeLeire, T., & Kalil, A. (2002). Good things come in threes: Single-parent multigenerational family structure and adolescent adjustment. *Demography, 39*(2), 393-413.

Domina, T. (2005). Leveling the home advantage: Assessing the effectiveness of parental involvement in elementary school. *Sociology of education, 78*(3), 233-249.

Dunifon, R., & Kowaleski-Jones, L. (2007). The Influence of Grandparents in Single-Mother Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69*(2), 465-481.

Encyclopedia of World Cultures Supplement (2002): http://www.encyclopedia.com/places/africa/nigeria-political-geography/nupe

Fantuzzo, J. W., Davis, G. Y., & Ginsburg, M. D. (1995). Effects of parent involvement in isolation or in combination with peer tutoring on student self-concept and mathematics achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*(2), 272.

Glaeser, E. L., Laibson, D., & Sacerdote, B. (2002). An economic approach to social capital. *The Economic Journal, 112*(483), F437-F458.

Glick, P., & Sahn, D. E. (2000). Schooling of girls and boys in a West African country: the effects of parental education, income, and household structure. *Economics of education review, 19*(1), 63-87

Goody, E. (1982). Parenthood and Social Reproduction: Fostering and Occupational Roles in West-Africa. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (2005). The social context of parental involvement: A path to enhanced achievement (No. R305T010673). *Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, 71*(6).

Hoover-Dempsey, K., & Sander, H. (1995). Parental involvement in children's education: Why does it make a difference. *The Teachers College Record, 97*(2), 310-331.

Hu, F. (2013). Does migration benefit the schooling of children left behind?: Evidence from rural northwest China. *Demographic Research, 29,* 33-70.

Israel, G. D., Beaulieu, L. J., & Hartless, G. (2001). The influence of family and community social capital on educational achievement. *Rural sociology, 66*(1), 43-68.

Jingzhong, Y., & Lu, P. (2011). Differentiated childhoods: impacts of rural labor migration on left-behind children in China. *The Journal of peasant studies, 38*(2), 355-377.

Liang, W., Hou, L., & Chen, W. (2008). Left-behind children in rural primary schools: the case of Sichuan Province. *Chinese Education & Society, 41*(5), 84-99.

Lin, N. (2002). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action* (Vol. 19). Cambridge university press.

Luecke, M. and Stoehr, T. (2013). The effects of migration in Moldova and Georgia on children left-behind. *EuropeAid Project:* DCI-MIGR/210/229-604

McNeal Jr, R. B. (2014). Parent Involvement, Academic Achievement and the Role of Student Attitudes and Behaviors as Mediators. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 2*(8), 564-576.

McNeal, R. B. (1999). Parental involvement as social capital: Differential effectiveness on science achievement, truancy, and dropping out. *Social forces, 78*(1), 117-144.

McNeal, R. B. (2001). Differential effects of parental involvement on cognitive and behavioral outcomes by socioeconomic status. *The Journal of Socio-Economics, 30*(2), 171-179.

McWayne, C., Downer, J. T., Campos, R., & Harris, R. D. (2013). Father involvement during early childhood and its association with children's early learning: A meta-analysis. *Early Education & Development, 24*(6), 898-922.

National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria] and ICF Macro. (2009). *Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2008.* Abuja, Nigeria: National Population Commission and ICF Macro.

NDHS. (2008). Nigeria demographic and health survey 2008. Retrieved from http://www.dhsprogram.com/

Needham, M., Vaske, J. J., & Vaske, J. (2008). Survey implementation, sampling, and weighting data. *Survey Research and Analysis: Applications in Parks, Recreation, and Human Dimensions'.(Ed. JJ Vaske)(Venture Publishing: State College, PA).*

Niger State Bureau of Statistics [NSBS] (2012). Facts and figures about Niger State. http://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng/information/details/Niger

Pregibon, D. (1981). Logistic regression diagnostics. *The Annals of Statistics*, 705-724.

Princiotta, D., & Germino Hausken, E. (2006). Fifth Grade: Findings From the Fifth Grade Follow-up of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 1998-99 (ECLS-K). ED TAB. NCES 2006-038. *National Center for Education Statistics.*

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* Simon and Schuster.

Ream, R. K., & Palardy, G. J. (2008). Reexamining social class differences in the availability and the educational utility of parental social capital. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(2), 238-273.

Ren, L., & Hu, G. (2013). A comparative study of family social capital and literacy practices in Singapore. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 13*(1), 98-130.

Sauders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research Methods for Business Students.* Harlow, Essex: Prentice Hall.

Sekaran, U., &Bougie, R. (2010). Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach (5th edition). New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons.

Serra, R. (2009). Child fostering in Africa: When labor and schooling motives may coexist. *Journal of Development Economics, 88*(1), 157-170.

Shekwo, J. A. Y. (1988). *Understandng Gbagyi Folktales: Premises for Targeting Salient Electronic Mass Media Programs* (Doctoral dissertation).

Sigel, I. E. (1990). Journeys in serendipity: the development of the distancing model. *Methods of family research: Biographies of research projects, 1,* 87-120.

Smith, M. H., Beaulieu, L. J., & Seraphine, A. (1995). Social Capital, Place of Residence, and College Attendance1. *Rural sociology, 60*(3), 363-380.

Von Otter, C., & Stenberg, S. Å. (2015). Social capital, human capital and parent–child relation quality: interacting for children's educational achievement?. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 36*(7), 996-1016.

Walker, J. M., Wilkins, A. S., Dallaire, J. R., Sandler, H. M., & Hoover-Dempsey, K. V. (2005). Parental involvement: Model revision through scale development. *The Elementary School Journal, 106*(2), 85-104.

Wang, S. X. (2014). The effect of parental migration on the educational attainment of their left-behind children in rural China. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 14*(3), 1037-1080.

Zeng, Z., & Xie, Y. (2014). The effects of grandparents on children's schooling: Evidence from rural China. *Demography, 51*(2), 599-617.

Zhang, H., Behrman, J. R., Fan, C. S., Wei, X., & Zhang, J. (2014). Does parental absence reduce cognitive achievements? Evidence from rural China. *Journal of Development Economics, 111,* 181-195.

Zhao, Q., Yu, X., Wang, X., & Glauben, T. (2014). The impact of parental migration on children's school performance in rural China. *China Economic Review, 31,* 43-54.

Zhou, M., Murphy, R., & Tao, R. (2014). Effects of parents' migration on the education of children left behind in rural China. *Population and Development Review, 40*(2), 273-292.

Appendix:

Table 4: Model Specification Test, Goodness-of-fit Test and Multicollinearity Test

Tests	Measure
Model Specification Test	
Linktest	*P-value*
_hat	0.000
_hatsq	0.361
Test for Goodness-of-fit	Area under ROC curve
Percentage of Corrected Prediction	= 0.9443
Multicolinearity Test	
Varibles	Tolerance
fsc	0.582
cgv1	0.1831
cgv3	0.1831
ecgv	0.4907
nsbl	0.9742
rem	0.4622
ficm	0.608
age	0.9291
gender	0.981
Varibles	Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)
fsc	1.31
cgv1	2.34
cgv3	2.34
ecgv	1.43
nsbl	1.01
rem	1.47
ficm	1.28
age	1.04
gender	1.01