

Saniya G. Abirin, 2022

Volume 3, pp. 53-70

Received: 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2022

Revised: 17<sup>th</sup> June 2022, 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022

Accepted: 08<sup>th</sup> July 2022

Date of Publication: 17<sup>th</sup> June 2022

DOI-<https://doi.org/10.20319/dv3.5370>

This paper can be cited as: Abirin., S. G. (2022). *Social Support and Students' Attitude toward Home-Based Education*. *Docens Series in Education*, 3, 53-70.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

## **SOCIAL SUPPORT AND STUDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD HOME-BASED EDUCATION**

**Saniya G. Abirin**

*Integrated Laboratory High School, Western Mindanao State University Zamboanga City,  
Philippines*  
[saniya.abirin@wmsu.edu.ph](mailto:saniya.abirin@wmsu.edu.ph)

---

### **Abstract**

*This study investigated the extent of Social Support (SS) received by junior high school (JHS) students relative to Students' Attitude (SA) towards Home-Based Education (HBE) during the Covid-19 pandemic. A descriptive - survey approach was used employing a stratified random sampling to determine samples from N= 75,542 JHS students enrolled in 42 public secondary schools in Zamboanga City Division for SY 2020-2021. The stratification and post-stratification were conducted across gender/grade level, and age/SES respectively. Data collection was done via online and offline, and data obtained were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Based on the results obtained, teachers provide the most Emotional, Informational & Appraisal Support while parents provide the most Instrumental Support; the overall students' attitude towards HBE is High; SS has a significant moderate relationship with students' attitude; and SS varies significantly across grade level, and age.*

**Keywords:** Home-Based Education, Learning Attitudes, Parent and Teacher's Support, Engagement

---

## **1. Introduction**

The public health emergency crisis brought about by the Covid-19 pandemic in March 2020 has caused all schools worldwide to close to contain the spread of the virus. In April 2020, schools were suspended nationwide in 188 countries including the Philippines (UNESCO, 2020). The Philippines, one of the less economically developed countries with limited resources to combat Covid-19, has been severely affected by the crisis (UNICEF, 2020) with 28,451,212 students affected by the pandemic (Pitagan, 2021). With the current state of the Philippine government, a notable impact on the economy and education has been observed. The crisis brought upon by Covid-19 has exacerbated education by further reducing the opportunities especially for the most vulnerable ones like students.

With the sudden shift to (HBE), concerns were raised about students' learning as well as mental health, with fears that HBE would widen the attainment gap between children from poor homes and those from more affluent backgrounds, and that students may be deprived of social interaction which is vital for better learning. These negative notions against HBE or homeschooling are often due to perceptions that homeschooled children will be negatively affected both academically and socially (Knowles, 1989 as cited by Adams & Purdy, 1996).

In the Covid-19 Regional Recovery Program 2020-2022 of Zamboanga Peninsula, the Regional Development Council Regional Disaster Risk Reduction Council IX (2020) reported on June 15, 2020 that HBE has been considered as an alternative educational system in response to the Covid-19 pandemic. However, it stated that the majority of the students are not ready to use home learning programs due to a lack of preparation, facilities, and infrastructure, especially those in less fortunate conditions who lacked the devices and internet access to participate in online learning platforms. Thus, research about HBE is deemed necessary in order to help ensure that every student is receiving an appropriate quality education. Murphy (2014) in Kerns (2016) noted that there have been a few researches that focus on studying HBE setup since the outbreak of this pandemic, hence this study

## **2. Review of Literature**

The related literature encompassed the established facts, concepts, and information on Home-Based Education, Social Support, and Students' Attitude both locally and abroad.

Gottlieb (2000) as cited in China (2015) defines social support as the process of social interaction that leads to coping, improved esteem, belongingness, and competence through perceived or exchanges of available psychosocial or physical resources. This social interaction plays a central role in providing several forms of support such as informational, instrumental, appraisal and emotional support (Zhou, 2014).

Many scholars differ concerning the definition and specific functions served by social support. However, there is agreement among scholars that functions served by social support include emotional sustenance, self-esteem building, provision of information and feedback, and tangible assistance (Cohen, 1988; Cohen, Mermelstein, & Hoberman, 1985 as cited by Sims, Hosey, Levy, Whitfield, Katzel, & Waldstein, 2014).

## **2.1. Types of Social Support**

Social Support is a broad construct that describes the network of social resources that an individual perceives. This social network is rooted in the concepts of mutual assistance, guidance, and validation about life experiences and situations. This social system plays a role in providing several forms of support, including informational, instrumental, and emotional support (Zhou, 2014).

### **2.1.1. Emotional Support**

Emotional support refers to the intangible support that individuals receive from external sources such as love and care that improve one's sense of self-worth (Seeman, 2008). It refers to the actions people take to make someone else feel cared for (PHC, 2017).

### **2.1.2. Instrumental Support**

Instrumental support refers to the provision of necessary things and services to recipients (Ko, Wang, & Xu, 2013), such as financial, material, or physical assistance (Kent de Grey, Uchino, Trettevik, Cronan, & Hogan, 2018).

In school settings, instrumental support is characterized as the provisions of tangible resources such as time or enrichment activities in order to facilitate students' learning (Perry, VandeKamp, Mercer & Nordby, 2002 & Suldo, Friedrich, White, Farmer, Minch, Michalowski, 2009 in Wong, Tao, Konishi, 2018).

### **2.1.3. Informational Support**

Informational Support refers to information, or messages that include knowledge or facts such as advice on actions (Ko, Wang, Xu, 2013, and Fleury, Keller, & Perez, 2009).

#### **2.1.4. Appraisal Support**

Malecki & Demaray (2003) as cited by Wong, Tao, Konishi (2018) defined appraisal support as the provisions of feedback such as suggestions, constructive criticisms, or self-evaluations for improvements.

### **2.2. Students' Attitude towards Learning**

Attitude is defined as a tendency that is attributed to individuals which creates ideas, feelings, as well as behaviors about a psychological object in an orderly manner (Çetin, 2006 as cited by Sen, 2013). According to Stake (2006) and Strayhorn (2010) as cited by Bofah & Ntow (2017), students' perceived social support provided by parents and teachers can influence academic self-beliefs and attitudes towards Mathematics. In a study conducted by Kara (2009), findings revealed that students who have better grasp of the learning process are better at perceiving the nature of learning, more open to learning, and at the same time have higher expectations but less anxiety about learning. Moreover, Hamurcu (2018), found out that students manifest positive attitude in their academics in terms of the nature of learning, expectations from learning, openness to learning, and anxiety of learning.

### **2.3. Relationship of Social Support & Attitude towards Learning**

The studies of Yasin & Dzulkifli (2009) and Iglesia, Stover, & Liporace (2014) revealed that students who are provided with higher social support have better academic performance than those students with low social support received. Moreover, according to the study of China (2015), results revealed no significant difference between social support and the academic performance of students. On the other hand, Kaur & Beri (2020) likewise conducted a study and findings revealed that a significant and moderate correlation among social support and attitude.

Dzulkifli and Yasin (2011) examined social support and academic achievement, and results obtained from the study indicated a significant positive relationship between social support and academic achievement of students which can be concluded that the higher the perceived social support received, the higher the students' academic achievement.

### **2.4. Social Support across Gender, Grade Level, Age, and SES**

Malecki and Demaray (2006) as cited by Kaur & Beri (2020) stated in their study that no significant associations between the students of high socioeconomic status and social support as

measured by grade point average. Tayfur & Ulupinar (2014), found a significant difference between gender. However, in a study conducted by Blaze (2019), findings indicated that there was no significant difference in the perceived social support across gender (Blaze, 2019). Moreover, according to Boudreault-Bouchard, Hains, Vandermeerschen, Laberge, and Perron (2013) as cited by Hadidi & Khateeb (2014), a number of studies have revealed that the levels of emotional support provided by parents differ across age and gender of the adolescents. Social support has been reported to positively differ across socio-economic status (Weyers, Dragano, Mobus, Beck, Stang, Mohlenkamp, Jockel, Erbel, & Siegrist, 2008; Melchiorre, Chiatti, Lamura, Torres-Gonzales, Stankunas, Lindert, Ionnidi-Kapolou, Barros, Macassa, & Soares (2013). Also, Rueger, Malecki, & Demaray (2008) in Kaur & Beri (2020) found that females perceive more support for all sources in comparison to males. This finding is corroborated by Abdullah & Singh (2019), Demir & Leyendecker (2018).

In this research, the theory being considered was the **Social Cognitive Theory (SCT)**. It was used because of its appropriateness to the context of the study, as well as for its wide use in education especially on studies that focus on understanding students' learning, student motivation, and academic achievement (Frey, 2018). Another consideration taken on using SCT as a framework for this study is what Lazaro (2020) pointed out that SCT has three major constructs that interact to influence behavior such as personal factors (age, prior experiences, cognition), aspects of the behavior itself (outcomes achieved as a result of practicing the behavior, competence), and environmental factors (access to resources, support from family/friends/teachers, and safety).

### **3. Research Questions**

The study aims to determine the extent of social support and the attitude of junior high school students toward Home-Based Education. Specifically, it answers the following questions:

1. What is the extent of social support received by JHS students during HBE?
2. What is the level of attitude of JHS students towards HBE?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of social support and attitude towards HBE?
4. Is there a significant difference between the extent of social support measured in terms of Emotions, Instrumental, Informational, and Appraisal Support when the variable is categorized according to gender, grade level, age, and socio-economic status?

#### 4. Methodology

The study employed a descriptive - survey approach since it obtains information about the characteristics, actions, or opinions of a large group of people (Glasow, 2005). The study was conducted in 42 public secondary schools in Zamboanga City, Philippines to include all main schools with a total population of  $N = 75,542$ . It was conducted amidst lockdown where face-to-face classes were suspended, and individuals below 21 years old including high school students were not allowed to leave their residence, (Executive Order No. BC 572-2020, 2020). To determine the samples of  $n = 398$ , a slovin's formula was used at 95% confidence interval and 5% margin of error. A proportional stratified sampling was employed considering the 42 schools as strata across demographic variables such as gender, grade level, age, and socio-economic status. However, data for age and socioeconomic status were not available prior to the data collection, thus, a poststratification was conducted to address the issues of underrepresentation or overrepresentation of sample distribution across these two variables.

In selecting samples, only those students who were consented to by their parents and who met the criteria were permitted to participate in the study due to the Covid-19 situation. All the names of these consenting students were randomized using less stringent criteria to ensure the safety of students. This, according to Kelly, Clark, Brown, Sitzia (2003) as cited by AlQotba, Al Nuaimi, Al Mujalli, Zaine, Khudadad, Marji, Veetil, & Syed (2021), a pandemic like Covid-19 may serve as an excuse for using less stringent criteria in choosing samples without assessing the extent of bias introduced during the survey process.

**Table 1:** *Distribution of Respondents per School*

SCHOOL S	Actual Responden ts (n = 383)		Grade Level				Gender		Age		SES	
									≤14 y/o	≥15 y/o	<P10,00 0	≥P10,00 0
	Freq.	%	7	8	9	10	M	F				
S1	9	2.35	3	2	1	3	6	3	4	5	7	2
S2	24	6.27	7	6	6	5	12	12	14	10	16	8
S3	6	1.57	2	3	1	1	3	3	2	4	2	4
S4	16	4.18	1	4	3	8	9	7	6	10	11	5
S5	26	6.79	10	3	7	6	10	16	13	13	19	7

S6	13	3.39	4	1	2	6	9	4	5	8	9	4	
S7	26	6.79	11	8	6	1	15	11	16	10	22	4	
S8	10	2.61	3	1	6	0	5	5	9	1	7	3	
S9	11	2.87	0	3	7	1	6	5	8	3	10	1	
S10	4	1.04	0	4	0	0	2	2	3	1	1	3	
S11	5	1.31	4	1	0	0	3	2	5	0	3	2	
S12	14	3.66	4	4	2	4	5	9	7	7	7	7	
S13	25	6.53	7	4	8	6	13	12	10	15	15	10	
S14	4	1.04	0	1	0	3	2	2	0	4	4	0	
S15	8	2.09	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	6	8	0	
S16	39	10.2	11	12	0	1	6	20	19	23	16	27	12
S17	34	8.88	1	15	8	0	1	10	24	13	21	21	13
S18	2	0.52	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	2	2	0
S19	3	0.78	0	1	0	2	2	1	1	2	3	3	0
S20	5	1.31	3	1	1	0	3	2	4	1	5	5	0
S21	4	1.04	0	4	0	0	2	2	1	3	3	3	1
S22	2	0.52	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	0
S23	10	2.61	5	1	2	2	3	7	5	5	10	10	0
S24	4	1.04	1	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	4	4	0
S25	2	0.52	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	2	2	0
S26	4	1.04	2	1	1	0	0	4	3	1	3	3	1
S27	3	0.78	1	0	2	0	3	0	1	2	2	2	1
S28	5	1.31	2	1	2	0	2	3	3	2	5	5	0
S29	2	0.52	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	0
S30	4	1.04	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	1
S31	10	2.61	2	4	3	1	6	4	4	6	10	10	0
S32	7	1.83	3	1	3	0	4	3	5	2	5	5	2
S33	10	2.61	1	4	3	2	4	6	3	7	9	9	1
S34	3	0.78	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	2
S35	1	0.26	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
S36	2	0.52	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	1
S37	6	1.57	3	1	1	1	5	1	4	2	3	3	3
S38	3	0.78	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	0
S39	6	1.57	2	4	0	0	1	5	6	0	6	6	0
S40	3	0.78	0	0	3	0	2	1	0	3	3	3	0
S41	3	0.78	1	0	2	0	3	0	1	2	3	3	0
S42	5	1.31	0	2	2	1	2	3	2	3	5	5	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10</b> <b>2</b>	<b>10</b> <b>1</b>	<b>9</b> <b>9</b>	<b>8</b> <b>1</b>	<b>18</b> <b>7</b>	<b>19</b> <b>6</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>98</b>	

Legend: Age: ≤14 y/o (Youth), ≥15 y/o (Young Adult); SES < ₱10,000 (Poor), ≥ ₱10,000 (Low Income to Rich)

(Source: School)

Looking at Table 1, out of 398 respondents, only a total of 383 students were included in the data analysis due to nonresponse and incomplete data provided by other respondents. Since the study was conducted during lockdown, a combined data collection was employed utilizing the Social Support Scale and the Attitude Survey Scale adopted from Malecki & Demaray (2002) as cited by Pappas (2014) and Kara (2009) respectively. These instruments were prepared similarly in print and digital format. According to Dillman, Smyth, & Christian (2014) and Singleton & Straits (2009) as cited by Ponto (2015), using a combination of methods of the survey can provide all individuals an equal chance of inclusion in the sample, therefore, can reduce coverage error. Both of these instruments were pilot tested among 16 high school students to assess their validity and reliability for the current study. According to Fink (1995) as cited by Sang, Mail, Abd Karim, Ulum, Mufli, & Lajuni (2017), the minimum number for a pilot test in most student questionnaires is 10. This claim is supported by Hill (1998) in Tappin (2014) who suggests that 10 to 30 participants are needed for pilot tests in survey research. Based on the result obtained, a high degree of consistency between the given items was observed with Cronbach's alpha of 0.832 obtained for the Students' Attitude Scale, 0.960 for the Social Support – Parents Scale, and 0.958 for the Teacher Scale. These Cronbach's alpha coefficients obtained are supported by Hair, Bush & Ortinau (2003) in Sang, Mail, Karim, Ulum, Mufli, & Lajuni (2017) who state that the widely accepted cut-off for an instrument is that Cronbach's alpha should be higher than 0.70, thus as a result, no further changes were needed, and these instruments were used in the actual study. On the other hand, it was important to ensure that the study was conducted with the highest ethical principles in place (Kerns, 2016). Thus, before the start of data collection, permission to conduct the study and ethics clearance were sought. Upon approval, the survey questionnaires were distributed to the 42 schools. A total of 398 students including 283 for online, and 115 students for offline received the Google link and printed survey questionnaires respectively through the assistance of the class advisers and parents. Out of 398, 15 students failed to complete the survey making the response rate at 96.23%. According to Fincham (2008), response rates approximating 60% for most research should be achieved, and for survey research intended to represent all schools, a response rate of  $\geq 80\%$  is expected and must be achieved as the standard for evaluation for the journal. The data obtained from the 383 respondents were inputted into SPSS for data analysis. Before conducting the data analysis, data assumptions were checked to protect the integrity of inferential statistics to be used (Tabachnick



and Fidell, 2007 as cited by Brookshier & Boyd, n.d.). The results obtained indicated that data were normally distributed with values for skewness and kurtosis less than 2 and 7 respectively (Kim, 2013; Kline, 2010 as cited by Welch & Areepattamannil, 2016) and with a sample size which is greater than 30, data assumed normality irrespective of the shape of the population distribution (Hartmann, Krois, Waske, 2018; Barr, Christopher, & Çetinkaya-Rundel, 2021; Altman & Bland, 1995 as cited by Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012); and no outliers were beyond  $p < 0.001$  (Greene, 2019), thus the parametric procedures can be applied.

## 5. Results and Discussion

The research result refers to the technical results obtained from the implementation of the research projects (Mujazin, Mandiri, & Pratiwi, 2022).

### *Extent of Social Support Received by JHS Students during HBE*

To determine the extent of social support received by high school students during Home-Based Education when the variable is measured in terms of Emotional, Instrumental, Informational, and Appraisal Support, the data set was treated with descriptive statistics. The analysis result is presented in Table 2. Included in the presentation are the Mean scores and interpretation 1.00 – 1.79 (Very Low), 1.80 – 2.59 (Low), 2.60 – 3.39 (Moderate), 3.40 – 4.19 (High), 4.20 – 5.00 (Very High) as cited by EPRD (2006) in Zakaria, Salleh, Ismail, & Ghavifekr, 2017, & Kitjaroonchai, 2012). Social Support for parents and teachers was obtained by summing up separately the total frequency obtained across the four dimensions.

**Table 2:** *Students' Self-Reported Extent of Social Support from Parents and Teachers during HBE N=383*

	<b>Sources of Social Support (SS)</b>							Extent of Social Support
	N	Parents		Teachers		Overall SS		
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<b>Emotional</b>	383	4.140	0.945	4.315	0.889	4.228	0.527	Very High
<b>Instrumental</b>	383	3.877	0.992	3.839	1.038	3.858	0.687	High
<b>Informational</b>	383	3.658	1.175	4.003	1.070	3.830	0.630	High
<b>Appraisal</b>	383	3.846	1.118	3.934	1.102	3.890	0.741	High

*(Source: Students)*

From the data presented above, it can be noted that the extent of the *Overall Social Support* is observed to be Very High in terms of Emotional Support and High in terms of *Instrumental, Informational, and Appraisal Support*. Data also reveal that **Emotional Support** (ES) emerges as the most perceived type of social support frequently received by high school

students from parents and teachers; while **Informational support** is the least type of social support received by high school students from parents and teachers. Based on these findings, Demaray and Malecki (2002) suggest that teachers and parents should be aware of the type of support they provide and seek to find a balance between those types of support for students.

### **5.1. Level of Attitude of JHS towards HBE**

To determine the respondents' attitude towards HBE, a descriptive statistic was employed in treating the data. Presented in Table 3 are the Mean scores and interpretation 1.00 – 1.79 (Very Low), 1.80 – 2.59 (Low), 2.60 – 3.39 (Moderate), 3.40 – 4.19 (High), 4.20 – 5.00 (Very High) (Kuntiyawichai, Dau, Inthavong, 2017& Kitjaroonchai, 2012).

Students' Attitude is measured using a five-point Likert Scale across seven items for Nature of Learning, 13 items for Anxiety of Learning, nine items for Expectations of Learning, and 11 items for Openness to Learning.

**Table 3:** *Self-Reported Students' Attitude towards Home-Based Education*

	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Students' Attitude</i>
Nature of Learning	383	3.076	0.527	Moderate
Anxiety of Learning	383	3.309	0.687	Moderate
Expectations of Learning	383	3.979	0.630	High
Openness to Learning	383	3.843	0.741	High
<b>Overall Students' Attitude</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>3.552</b>	<b>0.491</b>	<b>High</b>

*(Source: Students)*

Based on **Table 3**, it can be seen that the Expectations of Learning and Openness to Learning toward Home-Based Education are the Highest self-reported students' attitude among high school students. However, in terms of Nature and Anxiety of Learning, it can be observed that the mean scores indicate a moderate level of attitude towards HBE. These findings imply that high school students have an **overall high positive attitude** toward Home-Based Education, and it outweighs their unacceptance or disagreement on the adoption of HBE as an alternative learning modality during the Covid-19 pandemic. This indicates that high school students have seen the potential of HBE as a viable learning option in the new normal where they can equally learn a lot of things just like in face-to-face classes.

### **5.2. Relationship between the Extent of Social Support and Students' Level of Attitude toward HBE**

To determine the extent of social support and students' level of attitude toward HBE as well as to test Hypothesis 1, the data set was treated using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. Presented in Table 3 are the r-values as well as the Interpretation using <0.10 (No Relationship), 0.10 – 0.2 (Weak), 0.21- 0.5 (Moderate), and >0.5 (Strong Relationship) adopted from Knapp (2020) in Carvalho, Loireau, Fargette, Filho, Abdoulaye (2017).

**Table 4:** *Relationship between Social Support and Students' Attitude*

Variable	n	r	Correlation	p	Interpretation
Parents' Support	383	0.207	Moderate	0.00	Significant
Teachers' Support	383	0.310	Moderate	0.00	Significant
Overall Social Support	383	0.291	Moderate	0.00	Significant

*(Source: Knapp (2020) as cited by Carvalho, Loireau, Fargette, Filho, Abdoulaye,2017)*

In table 4, it can be noted that there is a significant moderate positive relationship between parents' support and students' level of attitude ( $r = 0.207$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ); teacher support and students' level of attitude ( $r = 0.310$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ); and the Overall Social support and students' level of attitude ( $r = 0.291$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), therefore *Hypothesis 1* is rejected. The above findings imply that students' attitude towards learning has a bearing on the kind and extent of social support provided for them by parents and teachers.

### 5.3. Extent of Social Support Measured Across Gender, Grade Level, Age, and SES

To test hypothesis 2 which states that there is no significant difference in the extent of Social Support received by students measured in terms of Emotional, Instrumental, Informational, and Appraisal Support when the variable is categorized according to gender, grade level, age, and socio-economic status (SES), a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used. Presented in Table 5 below are the Mean, Standard deviation, p-values, F-values, and the decision's interpretation.

**Table 5:** *Test-of-Between Subjects: Social Support across Gender, Grade Level, Age, & SES*

IVs	DVs	Groups	n	Mean	SD	df	F	p	Interpretation
Gender	Emotional	Male	187	4.181	0.850	1	1.182	.278	Not Significant
		Female	196	4.272	0.791				
	Instrumental	Male	187	3.900	0.891	1	.838	.360	Not Significant
		Female	196	3.818	0.865				
	Informational	Male	187	3.832	0.974	1	.001	.980	Not Significant
		Female	196	3.829	0.912				
	Appraisal	Male	187	3.892	0.983	1	.002	.964	Not Significant

Grade Level	Emotional	Female	196	3.888	0.945	3	1.080	.357	Not Significant	
		Grade 7	102	4.343	0.753					
		Grade 8	101	4.191	0.869					
		Grade 9	99	4.221	0.779					
	Instrumental	Grade 7	102	4.090	0.860	3	4.052	.007	Significant	
		Grade 8	101	3.860	0.893					
		Grade 9	99	3.774	0.844					
	Informational	Grade 7	102	4.136	0.869	3	6.580	.000	Significant	
		Grade 8	101	3.835	0.959					
		Grade 9	99	3.742	0.927					
	Appraisal	Grade 7	102	4.047	0.902	3	1.446	.229	Not Significant	
		Grade 8	101	3.888	0.999					
Grade 9		99	3.783	1.024						
Grade 10		81	3.825	0.902						
Age	Emotional	≤14 y/o	193	4.305	0.761	1	3.470	.063	Not Significant	
		15 – 24 y/o	190	4.149	0.872					
	Appraisal	≤14 y/o	193	3.975	0.952	1	3.055	.081	Not Significant	
		15 – 24 y/o	190	3.804	0.968					
	Instrumental	≤14 y/o	193	3.975	0.861	1	7.004	.008	Significant	
		15 – 24 y/o	190	3.739	0.880					
	Informational	≤14 y/o	193	3.985	0.906	1	10.821	.001	Significant	
		15 – 24 y/o	190	3.673	0.953					
	SES	Emotional	< ₱10,000	285	4.162	0.855	1	7.234	.007	Significant
			≥ ₱10,000	98	4.418	0.680				
		Instrumental	< ₱10,000	285	3.843	0.909	1	.319	.573	Not Significant
			≥ ₱10,000	98	3.901	0.781				
Informational		< ₱10,000	285	3.812	0.967	1	.434	.511	Not Significant	
		≥ ₱10,000	98	3.884	0.864					
Appraisal		< ₱10,000	285	3.862	0.991	1	.937	.334	Not Significant	
		≥ ₱10,000	98	3.971	0.874					

Legend: Age: ≤14 y/o (Youth), 15-24 y/o (Young Adult); SES < ₱10,000 (Poor), ≥ ₱10,000 (Low Income to Rich)

(Source: Students)

As can be gleaned from **Table 5**, Social Support in terms of Emotional, Instrumental, Informational, and Appraisal Support shows **no significant difference across gender** for Emotional,  $F(1,381)=.838, p>0.05$ ) for Instrumental,  $F(1,381)=.001, p>0.05$ ) for Informational, and  $F(1, 381)=.002, p>0.05$ ) for Appraisal, therefore accepting the null hypothesis in this case. This finding implies that the four dimensions of social support namely Emotional, Instrumental, Informational, and Appraisal Support must be provided equitably for all students regardless of

gender. An equitable provision of social support is needed so that those students who are in dire need of particular social support can be provided more than those who need less. Thus, teachers and parents must know the kind and extent of social needed by students so that they will be able to adequately provide such.

## 6. Conclusions

Social Support based on two constructs *Parents and Teachers* is found to be Very High in terms of Emotional Support, and High in terms of the other dimensions, indicating that parents provide the most Instrumental Support while teachers provide the most Emotional Support, Informational Support Appraisal Support. It is also found to have a significant moderate positive relationship with Students' Attitude. It does not significantly differ across gender, but significantly differs across grade level, age, and socio-economic status indicating that students 14 years old and below (Youth) received higher social support as compared to older students (Young Adults); Grade 7 students received higher social support from parents and teachers as compared with other higher grade levels; and high school students whose family has a better income (Low Income to Rich) received better social support as compared to students whose family earns less (Poor). On the other hand, Students' Attitude towards HBE is found to be moderate in terms of Nature and Anxiety of Learning, and High in terms of Expectations and Openness to Learning indicating that despite the learning difficulty experienced by junior high school students, still, they manifest high regard towards HBE as a viable learning modality in the new normal.

## 7. Recommendations

This study recommends that the **Department of Education** (DepEd) should continually collaborate with the **Local Government Unit** to streamline the delivery of Home-Based instruction by developing social support programs and services that focus on promoting students' academic well-being, and also shall continue the adoption of Home-Based Education among public schools even upon the resumption of face-to-face classes. Future research utilizing mixed-method or qualitative approach is recommended.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, B. & Singh, K. (2019). *Social Support as Predictor of Student Engagement among Secondary School Students*
- Adams, D. & Purdy, S. (1996). *Children's Perception of their Home Schooling Experience*.
- AlQotba, H. , Al Nuaimi, A., Mujalli, H., Zainel, A., Khudadad, H., Marji, T., Veettil, S., & Syed, M. (2021). *COVID-19 Surveillance In The Primary Health Care Population Of Qatar: Experience Of Prioritizing Timeliness Over Representativeness When Sampling The Population*.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.654734>
- Barr, D. D., Christopher, & Çetinkaya-Rundel, M. (2021). *Examining the Central Limit Theorem*. *OpenIntro Statistics*. <https://stats.libretexts.org/@go/page/281>
- Blaze, P. (2019). *The Effects of Social Support and Self-Efficacy on Academic Performance*. University of Adelaide
- Brookshier, A., & Boyd, R.(n.d.) *SPSS Data Screening*. Northern Arizona University.
- Carvalho, Waldir & Loireau, Maud & Fargette, Mireille & Calderano Filho, Braz & Wélé, A. (2017) . *Correlation between soil erosion and satellite data on areas of current desertification: a case study in Senegal*. *Revista Ciencia&Trópico*. 41. 51-66.
- China, F. (2015). *The relationship between social support, social adjustment, academic adjustment, and academic performance among college students in tanzania*. Open university of tanzania
- Demir, M., & Leyendecker, B. (2018). *School-Related Social Support Is Associated With School Engagement, Self-Competence and Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQoL) in Turkish Immigrant Students*  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00083>
- Executive Order No. BC 572-2020. (2020). *Amended Guidelines for the Implementation of General Community Quarantine in Zamboanga City*.
- Fincham J. E. (2008). *Response rates and responsiveness for surveys, standards, and the Journal*. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, 72(2), 43.  
<https://doi.org/10.5688/aj720243>

- Frey, B. (2018). *The sage encyclopedia of educational research, measurement, and evaluation* (Vols. 1-4). Thousand Oaks,, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506326139>
- Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). *Normality tests for statistical analysis: a guide for non-statisticians. International journal of endocrinology and metabolism, 10*(2), 486–489.  
<https://doi.org/10.5812/ijem.3505>
- Glasow, Priscilla. (2005). *Fundamentals of Survey Research Methodology*. Mitre, Washington C3 Center McLean, Virginia
- Greene, L.C. (2019). *Assessing the Effects of Communication Media Affordances and the Awareness of Media Security on Knowledge Sharing Behavior*. Doctoral dissertation. Nova Southeastern University. Retrieved from NSUWorks, College of Computing and Engineering. (1086) [https://nsuworks.nova.edu/gscis\\_etd/1086](https://nsuworks.nova.edu/gscis_etd/1086).
- Hadidi, M. S., & Al Khateeb, J.M. (2014). *A Comparison of Social Support among Adolescents with and Without Visual Impairments in Jordan: A Case Study from the Arab Region*  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X1410800506>
- Hamurcu, H. (2018). *Examination of attitudes to learning and educational stress in prospective primary school teachers Elementary Education Department, Buca Faculty of Education, Primary Teacher Education, Buca; Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir, Turkey*
- Hartmann, K., Krois, J., Waske, B. (2018). *E-Learning Project SOGA: Statistics and Geospatial Data Analysis. Department of Earth Sciences, Freie Universitaet Berlin.*
- Iglesia, G., Stover, J. , Liporace, M. (2014). *Perceived Social Support and Academic Achievement in Argentinean College Students*
- Kara, A. (2009). *The Effect of a 'Learning Theories' Unit on Students' Attitudes Toward Learning*. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3).  
<https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2009v34n3.5>
- Kaur, K., & Beri, N. (2020). *Social Support and Academic Success: A Correlational Study. Journal of Critical Reviews, 7* (19), 1925-1929. doi:10.31838/jcr.07.19.234
- Kerns, J.D. (2016). *Learning At Home: A Phenomenology Examining The Perceptions Of Homeschooling Parents Regarding The Social, Emotional, And Cognitive Development Of Their Children.*

- Kent de Grey, R.G., Uchino, B.N., Trettevik, R., Cronan, S., Hogan, J. (2018). *Social Support. obo* in Psychology.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199828340-0204>
- Kim H. Y. (2013). *Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. Restorative dentistry & endodontics*, 38(1), 52–54.  
<https://doi.org/10.5395/rde.2013.38.1.52>
- Kitjaroonchai, Nakhon. (2012). *Motivation Toward English Language Learning of Thai Students Majoring in English at Asia-Pacific International University*.
- Ko, H. C., Wang, L. L., & Xu, Y. T. (2013). *Understanding the different types of social support offered by audience to A-list diary-like and informative bloggers. Cyberpsychology, behavior and social networking*, 16(3), 194–199.  
<https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2012.0297>
- Kuntiyawichai K., Dau Q.V., Inthavong S. (2017). *Community engagement for irrigation water management in Lao PDR. Journal of Water and Land Development*. No. 35 p. 121–128.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/jwld-2017-0075>
- Lazaro, R. T. (2020). *Integrating health promotion and wellness into neurorehabilitation in Umphred's Neurological Rehabilitation*
- Malecki, C., & Demaray, M.K. (2002). *The relationship between perceived social support and maladjustment for students at risk*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10018>
- Melchiorre, M. G., Chiatti, C., Lamura, G., Torres-Gonzales, F., Stankunas, M., Lindert, J., Ioannidi-Kapolou, E., Barros, H., Macassa, G., & Soares, J. F. (2013). *Social support, socio-economic status, health and abuse among older people in seven European countries*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0054856>
- Mujazin, Mandiri, A. S., & Pratiwi, U. S. (2022). Note-Taking Drilling to Improve Academic Listening Skill of Third Semester, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. PUPIL: International Journal of Teaching, Education and Learning, 6(1), 303-321  
<https://doi.org/10.20319/pijtel.2022.61.303321>
- Ntow, F.D. & Bofah, E.A. (2017). *Perceived social support from parents and teachers' influence on students' mathematics-related self-beliefs*



- Pappas, C. J. (2014). *Assessing Middle School Students' Perceptions of Social Support Provided by Teachers and Other School Professionals*. Eastern Illinois University.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2268&context=theses>
- Pitagan, F.B. (2021). *Continuity of Education in the Philippines Amidst COVID-19 Pandemic*. <https://www.jamco.or.jp/en/symposium/29/6/>
- Ponto J. (2015). *Understanding and Evaluating Survey Research* .Journal of the advanced practitioner in oncology, 6(2), 168–171.  
<https://doi.org/10.6004/jadpro.2015.6.2.9>
- Primary Health Care (PHC). (2017). *The Importance of Social Support*
- Regional Development Council Regional Disaster Risk Reduction Council (RDCRDRRC) IX. (2020). *Zamboanga Peninsula Covid-19 Regional Recovery Program 2020-2022*.
- Sang, L, Mail, R. , Abd Karim, M., Ulum, Z, Mifli, M., Lajuni, N. (2017). *Pretesting and Piloting the Research Instrument to Examine the Central Roles of Risk Perception and Attitude Towards Financial Investments Behavioral Intention among Malaysians*. University of Malaysia. Journal of the Asian Academy of Applied Business . ISSN 1675-9869
- Seeman, T. (2008). *Support & Social Conflict: Section One - Social Support*
- Sen, H.S. (2013). *The attitudes of university students towards learning*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.177>
- Sims, R. C., Hosey, M., Levy, S. A., Whitfield, K. E., Katzel, L. I., & Waldstein, S. R. (2014). *Distinct functions of social support and cognitive function among older adults*. Experimental aging research, 40(1), 40–59.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0361073X.2014.857551>
- Tappin, R. (2014). *How to figure out an appropriate sample for the pilot study?*
- Tayfur, C., & Ulupinar, S. (2014). *The Effect of Perceived Social Support on the Academic Achievement of Health College Students Sağlık Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Algıladıkları Sosyal Desteğin Akademik Başarılarına Etkisi*
- UNESCO. (2020). *Covid-19 Report*. <https://en.unesco.org/news/13-billion-learners-are-still-affected-school-university-closures-educational-institutions>
- UNICEF. (2020). *The Impact of the COVID-19 Crisis on Households in the National Capital Region of the Philippines*.

- Welch, A.G. & Arrepatmannil, S. (2016). *Disposition in Teacher Education: A global Perspective*
- Weyers, S., Dragano, N., Möbus, S. (2008). *Low socio-economic position is associated with poor social networks and social support: results from the Heinz Nixdorf Recall Study. Int J Equity Health .*  
<https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-9276-7-13>
- Wong, T.K.Y., Tao, X., Konishi, C. (2018). *Teacher support in learning: Instrumental and appraisal support in relation to math achievement* McGill University, Canada
- Yasin, S.M. & Dzulkifli, M. A. (2011). *The Relationship between Social Support and Academic Achievement Md Aris Safree Md Yasin Universiti Malaysia Terengganu Malaysia.*  
International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 1 No. 5;  
[http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol.\\_1\\_No.\\_5;\\_May\\_2011/31.pdf](http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol._1_No._5;_May_2011/31.pdf)
- Zakaria, Ashfahani & Salleh, Amla & Ismail, Mohd & Ghavifekr, Simin. (2017). *Promoting Meaningful Learning Via an Online Project-based Module.* 6. 71-95.
- Zhou E.S. (2014) *Social Support.* In: Michalos A.C. E ncyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research. Springer, Dordrecht.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5\\_2789](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2789)