



Sandigan sa Hirap: Social Support in Shaping Students' Academic Success

Princes Jam C. Abraham, Lorainne T. Aguisanda,
Alliana Rose M. Cabaddu, Beverly Gay N. Cambri,
Babyline A. Caronan, Babylyn B. Padua
Isabela State University, Cabagan Campus

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the relationship between social support and academic success among students of Isabela State University-Cabagan. Additionally, it sought to explore whether levels of social support and academic success vary when grouped according to sex and year level. The study included an equal number of male and female respondents, evenly distributed across four year levels. The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) was utilized to measure social support from family, friends, and significant others, while academic success was assessed through students' General Weighted Average (GWA). Data were analyzed using mean, standard deviation, frequency count, percentile, t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson correlation. Findings revealed a high level of social support across all sources. No significant difference in support from family and friends was found between male and female respondents; however, female students reported significantly higher support from a significant other. Female students also demonstrated a significantly higher GWA than their male counterparts. No significant difference in GWA was observed across year levels. Correlation analysis showed a very low positive relationship between social support and academic success, which was not statistically significant. These results suggest that, within this sample, social support does not significantly predict academic success. Although students generally perceive strong support networks, other factors may play a more critical role in influencing academic achievement. Future research is recommended to explore additional variables affecting academic performance and to examine the nuanced effects of social support across diverse educational contexts.

Keywords: Social Support, Academic Success, College Students

Publisher's Note

The Journal of Psychology, Mental Health and Human Development (JPMHHD) publishes all articles under the terms of the **Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)**. This license permits any non-commercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution, and reproduction in any medium or format, provided appropriate credit is given to the original author(s) and the source, a link to the Creative Commons license is provided, and any changes made are indicated. The authors retain copyright, and the publisher is granted the right of first publication.





Introduction

Academic success plays a crucial role in shaping a student's future, as it prepares them for employment opportunities and contributes to their personal growth. In the Philippine higher education system, academic success is typically measured using the General Weighted Average (GWA). A high GWA often leads to better career prospects, easier access to learning opportunities, and improved psychological well-being (Battin-Pearson et al., 2019). On the other hand, a low GWA is associated with adverse consequences such as substance abuse, mental health challenges, and difficulties in managing other areas of life (Fothergill & Ensminger, 2020). Given these consequences, it is important to examine the factors that contribute to academic performance. One of these is social support, which has been widely recognized as a meaningful factor in helping students cope with the demands of higher education.

Students are expected to handle multiple responsibilities simultaneously—balancing academics, social life, and personal development. While personal resilience is important, external support from others often plays a crucial role in helping students manage these pressures (Li et al., 2018). Social support from peers, family, and educators can foster academic success, particularly during the early years of college life (Ab Abdullah, Kong, & Talib, 2016). However, research findings are not always consistent. Sial et al. (2021), for instance, reported no significant relationship between academic achievement and support from friends, suggesting that not all sources of support may have the same effect. Similarly, Fox (2021) observed that while social support was linked to health-related self-efficacy, it did not directly relate to academic performance.

These conflicting findings raise important questions about the nature and scope of social support's impact on academic outcomes. In particular, there is a gap in understanding whether all sources of support such as family, friends, and significant others—equally contribute to students' academic success. Moreover, existing research has not adequately examined these dynamics in the context of state universities like Isabela State University-Cabagan. This limited contextual focus leaves room to explore whether demographic factors such as sex and year level influence the degree of social support received or its effectiveness in improving academic performance.

Research conducted by Ansong et al. (2017), Edinger and Edinger (2018), and Yang and Wang (2019) emphasized that support from parents, teachers, and peers enhances students' motivation and engagement. Similarly, Manitsa and Doikou (2022) highlighted how peer mentoring and support significantly benefit the academic outcomes of students with visual impairments. However, many of these studies focus on specific groups or general student populations, leaving a gap in research that reflects the actual experiences of students in particular local settings.



In response to this gap, the current study determined the relationship between social support and academic success among students at Isabela State University-Cabagan during the second semester of the 2024–2025 academic year. It further explored whether significant differences existed in social support and academic performance based on sex and year level. Gaining insights into these aspects is vital for developing effective strategies that support student growth and academic achievement.

Moreover, this study contributes to the realization of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 3 and 4 Good Health and Well-Being and Quality Education by emphasizing the potential of social support to alleviate stress, promote psychological well-being, and enhance academic outcomes. Ultimately, social support is viewed not just as a buffer against challenges but as a foundation that empowers students to succeed academically while fostering holistic development.

Statement of the Problem

This study generally aimed to determine if there is a significant relationship between social support and the academic success of students. Specifically, this study aimed to answer the following:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1. Sex; and
 - 1.2. Year Level?
2. What is the general weighted average (GWA) of the respondents?
3. What is the level of social support of the respondents in terms of the following:
 - 3.1. Family;
 - 3.2. Friends; and
 - 3.3. Significant Other?
4. Is there a significant difference in the level of social support among respondents when grouped according to their profile variables?
5. Is there a significant difference in the academic success among respondents when grouped according to their profile variables?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of social support and the academic success of the respondents?

Hypotheses of the Study

H_{a1} : There is a significant difference in the level of social support among respondents when grouped according to their profile variables.

H_{a2} : There is a significant difference in the academic success among respondents when grouped according to their profile variables.

H_{a3} : There is a significant relationship between social support and academic success of the respondents.



METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The research employed descriptive-correlational and comparative approaches to examine the association between social support and academic success. The descriptive-correlational design was appropriate as the study investigated the extent of association between naturally occurring variables without manipulation (Bhat, 2023). This method is frequently employed in research involving ordinal or non-manipulated covariates to evaluate the presence of significant associations among them. It is important to note that correlational designs do not establish cause-and-effect relationships, but rather investigate associations (Creswell, 2017; DeVellis, 2017).

In addition, a comparative design was used to determine whether academic success and levels of social support differ based on students' profile characteristics, such as sex and year level. Comparative designs are especially beneficial when comparing mean scores from two or more independent groups (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2019). This enabled the researchers to uncover substantial disparities in academic success and social support among different student subgroups.

Research Participants

The participants in this study were undergraduate students who enrolled at Isabela State University-Cabagan for the second semester of the 2024–2025 academic year. To be eligible to participate in the study, volunteers must be enrolled in an undergraduate course at Isabela State University-Cabagan, at the first to fourth level, during the current academic year, and provide informed consent. Those students who were enrolled in graduate programs and who were on leave or who were in other campuses of Isabela State University were disqualified. The study was voluntary, and participants had the option to withdraw from the study at any time, and the confidentiality of the information and privacy were maintained by following ethical guidelines carefully.

Sampling Procedure

Slovin's formula was employed to determine the overall sample size for this study. After calculating the total sample size, stratified random sampling was utilized to select participants from each year level at Isabela State University – Cabagan Campus. Stratified random sampling is a probability sampling technique in which the population is divided into distinct subgroups, or strata, based on shared characteristics (e.g., age, income). Researchers then randomly select samples from each stratum to ensure adequate representation of all groups in the overall sample (Fleetwood, 2023).

From a total population of 6,190 students, a sample of 376 students was drawn. This sample was evenly distributed across the four-year levels, with 94 respondents per year. To ensure balanced sex representation, each group of 94 respondents was equally



divided between males and females, resulting in 47 male and 47 female participants per year level.

Research Instrument

A standardized questionnaire was utilized in this study. The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) was a 12-item self-report scale used to measure sources of perceived social support from family, friends, and significant others (Zimet et al., 1988). The scale is rated on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (very strongly disagree) to 7 (very strongly agree). The overall internal consistency for this scale was found between .80 and .95 (Zimet et al., 1988). The MSPSS has three sub-scales with four items for each type. High internal consistency was found for all three subscales: significant other (.91), family (0.91) and friends (.89) (Canty-Mitchell & Zimet, 2000).

Data Gathering Procedure

The researchers secured approval from university authorities through formal request letters and coordinated with instructors and department heads to facilitate data collection. Respondents were selected using stratified random sampling with equal distribution based on sex and year level, and randomly chosen from the nine colleges of Isabela State University–Cabagan. Before answering the questionnaire, participants received a brief orientation and signed an informed consent form outlining the study's purpose, procedures, and confidentiality under the Data Privacy Act of 2012. The 10–15-minute survey was administered in small groups in classrooms or other accessible areas, with the researchers personally distributing and collecting the forms to ensure clarity and data integrity. There was no conflict of interest, and responses were encoded and analyzed with guidance from a statistical consultant.

Data Analysis

After the data collection phase, the researchers carefully checked each questionnaire for completeness and accuracy before encoding the responses into Microsoft Excel for statistical analysis and tabulation.

To address the research questions and test the hypotheses, the following statistical tools were used:

- Frequency count and percentage were used to summarize the respondents' demographic profile in terms of sex and year level.
- Mean and standard deviation were computed to determine the respondents' level of social support, based on the support they received from family, friends, and significant others, as well as their academic success, as reflected in their General Weighted Average (GWA).



• A t-test for independent samples was used to determine if there was a significant difference in the level of social support and academic success when grouped according to sex.

• A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine differences in the level of social support and academic success among respondents across different year levels.

• The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was applied to explore the relationship between social support and academic success among the respondents.

Below are the following rating scales, mean ranges, and their corresponding descriptive interpretations used for data analysis to determine the level of social support. The grade and its description are also included.

Table 2. Rating Scale, Mean Ranges, Descriptive Interpretations

Rating Scale	Mean Ranges	Descriptive Interpretation
1	1.00-1.86	Very Low Social Support
2	1.87-2.72	Low Social Support
3	2.73-3.58	Moderately Low Social Support
4	3.59-4.44	Neutral Social Support
5	4.45-5.30	Moderately High Social Support
6	5.31-6.16	High Social Support
7	6.17-7.00	Very High Social Support

Table 3. Grade and Description

GRADE	DESCRIPTION
1.00	Excellent
1.25	Very Satisfactory
1.50	Satisfactory
1.75	Fairly Satisfactory
2.00	Good
2.25	Fairly Good
2.50	Fair
2.75	Below Fair
3.00	Passed
5.00	Failed

Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted with utmost integrity and transparency. The researchers obtained authorization from the concerned school authorities to conduct the study. Furthermore, participants were informed of the study objectives. The researchers ensured the privacy of the collected data and personal information, obtaining informed consent to ensure that respondents could participate freely and voluntarily in the study with a comprehensive understanding of their involvement, consenting prior to participation.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1.1 Profile of the Respondents When Grouped According to Sex

Profile	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	188	50.00
	Female	188	50.00
Total		376	100.00

The data presented in Table 1.1 demonstrates a well-balanced representation of the respondents across sex as a demographic variable. The distribution of sex within the sample is perfectly equitable, with 188 male and 188 female participants. This translates to each sex comprising 50% of the total sample, indicating an equal inclusion of both sexes in the study.

Table 1.2 Profile of the Respondents When Grouped According to Year Level

Profile	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Year Level	First Year	94	25.00
	Second Year	94	25.00
	Third Year	94	25.00
	Fourth Year	94	25.00
Total		376	100.00

Furthermore, Table 1.2 presents the distribution of respondents across the four academic year levels. The data shows that there are 94 respondents in each of the following categories: First Year, Second Year, Third Year, and Fourth Year. Each of these year levels represents 25% of the total sample population.

This balanced representation within the sample suggests that the researchers employed a deliberate sampling strategy to ensure proportional representation across both sex and year level. This approach likely enhances the study's rigor and strengthens the potential for generalizing the findings, at least within the context of the student population under investigation at Isabela State University-Cabagan.

Table 2. General Weighted Average (GWA) of the Respondents

General Weighted Average	Frequency	Percentage	Description
1.0 – 1.24	8	2.10%	Excellent
1.25 – 1.49	24	6.40%	Very Satisfactory
1.50 – 1.74	113	30.10%	Satisfactory
1.75 – 1.99	104	27.70%	Fairly Satisfactory
2.00 – 2.24	56	14.90%	Good
2.25 – 2.49	37	9.80%	Fairly Good
2.50 – 2.74	24	6.4%	Fair
2.75 – 3.00	10	2.70%	Below Fair
Total	376	100.00%	
Mean		1.87	Fairly Satisfactory



Table 2 presents the academic success of the respondents based on their General Weighted Average (GWA) with an overall mean of 1.87, thereby having a “Fairly Satisfactory” as descriptive value. Among the 376 college students from Isabela State University-Cabagan, the highest proportion of respondents, comprising 113 students or 30.10%, attained a GWA within the range of 1.50–1.74, categorized as Satisfactory. This was followed closely by 104 students or 27.70% who obtained a GWA of 1.75–1.99, falling under the Fairly Satisfactory classification. A total of 56 students, representing 14.90%, achieved a good rating with a GWA between 2.00 and 2.24, while 37 students, or 9.80%, fell within the Fairly Good category with a GWA of 2.25 and 2.49.

Notably, only 8 respondents, or 2.10%, attained an Excellent academic standing with a GWA of 1.00–1.24, while 24 students, or 6.40%, reached a Very Satisfactory level with a GWA of 1.25–1.49. Another 24 students, also accounting for 6.40%, were classified as Fair, having a GWA between 2.50–2.74. Lastly, 10 respondents or 2.70% were categorized as Below Fair, with a GWA ranging from 2.75–3.00.

These results reveal that the majority of the respondents perform within the Satisfactory to Fairly Satisfactory levels, indicating a generally moderate academic performance within the group. The small percentage of students in both the Excellent and Below Fair categories suggests that very few respondents are either excelling academically or struggling significantly. This distribution offers a meaningful context for further exploring the relationship between social support and academic achievement among college students at the university.

Table 3.1 Level of Social Support of the Respondents from Family

FAMILY	Mean	SD	Descriptive Value
1. My family really tries to help me.	5.73	1.52	High Social Support
2. I get the emotional help & support I need from my family.	5.64	1.44	High Social Support
3. I can talk about my problems with my family.	4.99	3.11	Moderately High Social Support
4. My family is willing to help me make decisions.	5.59	1.56	High Social Support
Overall	5.49	1.44	High Social Support

The data indicate that respondents generally experience a strong level of social support from their families. The overall mean for family support is 5.49, with a standard deviation of 1.44, and this is described as "High Social Support." This general trend suggests that students, on average, feel well-supported by their families. This finding is consistent with Newhart (2023), who reported that family support significantly reduces stress and promotes mental health. Similarly, Ramos and Magallanes (2021) emphasized the role of family support in fostering academic motivation, a key factor in student success.

Examining the details within the table, the highest levels of agreement are seen in the responses to the statements "My family really tries to help me" (Mean = 5.73, SD = 1.52, Descriptive Value = High Social Support) and "I get the emotional help & support I



need from my family" (Mean = 5.64, SD = 1.44, Descriptive Value = High Social Support). The statement "My family is willing to help me make decisions" also shows strong agreement (Mean = 5.59, SD = 1.56, Descriptive Value = High Social Support). These responses reflect the critical role families play in providing emotional and instrumental support. This is in line with the work of Wong (2023) and Betco et al. (2024), who concluded that strong family support is associated with higher academic achievement. Additionally, Sampe et al. (2024) emphasized that students who consistently received emotional and practical support from their families reported better mental health and academic performance during their transition to university life.

In contrast, the statement with the lowest level of agreement, although still reflecting a favorable perception, was 'I can talk about my problems with my family' (Mean = 4.99, SD = 3.11, Descriptive Value = Moderately High Social Support). Notably, this statement also has a higher standard deviation compared to the other statements, indicating greater variability in responses among participants. This suggests that while many students may perceive strong family support in terms of practical and emotional help, not all feel equally comfortable discussing their personal problems with their families.

This finding is supported by existing research. For example, Orrego and Rodriguez (2021) found that students who perceived their families as using a protective communication style characterized by low openness and high conformity reported lower levels of conflictual independence and were less adjusted to college life. This suggests that when family communication is overly critical or controlling, students may withhold personal concerns due to fear of misunderstanding or judgment. Similarly, Fletcher et al. (2020) emphasized that students tend to avoid discussing sensitive topics, such as mental health, personal beliefs, or romantic relationships with their parents, when they anticipate disapproval or judgment. This aligns with the current study's findings, indicating that even when families are generally supportive, emotional openness and communication styles vary significantly.

The implications of these data suggest that family plays a crucial role in providing support to students. The high levels of agreement with statements related to practical help, emotional support, and decision-making assistance highlight the active role families play in supporting their children's lives. However, the slightly lower agreement and higher variability regarding open communication about problems may indicate potential differences in family communication styles or the degree to which students feel comfortable sharing their difficulties with family members. These findings may have significant implications for understanding the factors that contribute to students' academic success and overall well-being.

Table 3.2 Level of Social Support of the Respondents from Friends

FRIENDS	Mean	SD	Descriptive Value
1. My friends really try to help me.	5.57	1.34	High Social Support
2. I can count on my friends when things go wrong.	5.09	1.48	Moderately High Social Support
3. I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.	5.70	1.94	High Social Support
4. I can talk about my problems with my friends.	5.31	1.56	High Social Support
Overall	5.42	1.17	High Social Support



The data in Table 3.2 indicate that respondents generally report a high level of social support from their friends. The overall mean for friend support is 5.42, with a standard deviation of 1.17, and this is described as "High Social Support." This general finding suggests that students, on average, feel well-supported by their friendships. This perception is consistent with the findings of Cengiz (2023), who emphasized that peer support significantly reduces academic anxiety and fear of failure, indicating that strong friendships provide a stabilizing effect in stressful academic environments. Additionally, Alotaibi et al. (2023) supported this by demonstrating how peer relationships in school settings enhance motivation, reduce stress, and facilitate academic achievement through shared learning and emotional communication.

Looking at the specific statements, the highest level of agreement is observed in the statement "I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows" (Mean = 5.70, SD = 1.94, Descriptive Value = High Social Support). The statement "My friends really try to help me" also shows a high level of agreement (Mean = 5.57, SD = 1.34, Descriptive Value = High Social Support), as does "I can talk about my problems with my friends" (Mean = 5.31, SD = 1.56, Descriptive Value = High Social Support). These responses highlight the emotional closeness and open communication present in student friendships. This supports Siska and Hanif (2024), who pointed out that both emotional and instrumental peer support are essential for collaborative learning and effective academic coping strategies. Likewise, Yendi et al. (2021) reported a strong positive correlation between peer social support and academic resilience, reinforcing that students who feel emotionally supported by friends are more likely to manage academic challenges successfully.

In contrast, the statement with the lowest level of agreement, although still falls within a high range of responses, is "I can count on my friends when things go wrong" (Mean = 5.09, SD = 1.48, Descriptive Value = Moderately High Social Support). This result introduces an important nuance. While students generally feel emotionally connected to their friends, there may be some hesitancy in viewing friends as fully dependable during crises. This echoes the findings of Demaray and Malecki (2022), who found that although peer support benefits students' social and academic functioning, there can be limitations in how much students trust friends for help in high-stress or serious situations. Furthermore, Flores et al. (2022) observed that students often turn to formal support systems, such as instructors or academic advisors, when facing significant academic difficulties, suggesting that while friendships are vital, they may not always be perceived as the most reliable form of support under pressure.

These findings suggest that friendships play a vital role in the social support systems of students. The high agreement with statements concerning shared experiences, practical help, and open communication underscores the importance of peer relationships in students' lives. However, the slightly lower agreement with the statement about relying on friends during difficult times may indicate nuances in the perceived reliability or dependability of friendships in challenging situations. These findings contribute to a broader understanding of the role of social support in students' academic and personal lives.

Table 3.3 Level of Social Support of the Respondents from Significant Other

SIGNIFICANT OTHER	Mean	SD	Descriptive Value
-------------------	------	----	-------------------



1.	There is a special person who is around when I am in need.	5.43	1.54	High Social Support
2.	There is a special person with whom I can share joys and sorrows.	5.55	1.42	High Social Support
3.	I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me.	5.66	1.46	High Social Support
4.	There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings.	5.61	1.56	High Social Support
Overall		5.56	1.25	High Social Support

Table 3.3 presents the data concerning the level of social support respondents receive from a significant other. The findings indicate that respondents generally report a high level of social support from their significant others. The overall mean for support from a significant other is 5.56, with a standard deviation of 1.25, and is described as "High Social Support." This suggests that, on average, students in the study perceive a high degree of support from their significant relationships. This aligns with the work of Lee et al. (2017), who found that students with higher perceived partner support report reduced stress and better academic outcomes. Likewise, Laksmiwati and Tondok (2023) highlighted that romantic partner support enhances self-efficacy, which positively influences well-being and academic success.

The highest level of agreement is found in the statement "I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me" (Mean = 5.66, SD = 1.46, Descriptive Value = High Social Support). Close behind are "There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings" (Mean = 5.61, SD = 1.56, Descriptive Value = High Social Support) and "There is a special person with whom I can share joys and sorrows" (Mean = 5.55, SD = 1.42, Descriptive Value = High Social Support). The statement "There is a special person who is around when I am in need" also shows strong agreement (Mean = 5.43, SD = 1.54, Descriptive Value = High Social Support). These results are supported by Păduraru et al. (2025) and Zhang (2024), who emphasize the role of emotional support in stress management and academic resilience. Furthermore, Mulyadi et al. (2020) highlighted that emotional and instrumental support from significant others promotes academic engagement.

The results suggest that significant others play a crucial role in providing social support to students. The high levels of agreement across all four statements emphasize the importance of having a supportive partner or close confidant who offers comfort, emotional support, and a sense of being cared for. These findings highlight the potential impact of intimate relationships on students' well-being and their ability to navigate the challenges of academic life.

Table 4.1 Test of Difference on Respondents' Social Support When Grouped According to Sex

Social Support	Sex	Mean	SD	df	t	p-value	Decision
Family	Male	5.38	1.31	374	1.46 ^{ns}	0.14	Reject H_a
	Female	5.59	1.56				
Friends	Male	5.40	1.16	374	0.40 ^{ns}	0.69	Reject H_a
	Female	5.44	1.18				
Significant Other	Male	5.43	1.31	374	1.99*	0.04	Accept H_a



	Female	5.69	1.17			
--	--------	------	------	--	--	--

* - Significant at 0.05

^{ns} - Not Significant

Table 4.1 presents the results of the independent t-test, which was used to compare the level of social support among respondents when grouped according to their sex. This comparative analysis seeks to determine if there are significant differences in how male and female students perceive social support from these distinct sources.

The findings indicate that there is no significant difference in the level of social support reported by male and female respondents in terms of support from family and friends. Specifically, for family support, the mean for male respondents is 5.38 (SD = 1.31), while the mean for female respondents is 5.59 (SD = 1.56), with a non-significant t-test result ($t = 1.46, p = 0.14$). Similarly, for friend support, male respondents have a mean of 5.40 (SD = 1.16), and female respondents have a mean of 5.44 (SD = 1.18), with a non-significant t-test result ($t = 0.40, p = 0.69$).

However, the analysis reveals a significant difference in the level of support from a significant other based on sex. Male respondents reported a mean of 5.43 (SD = 1.31), whereas female respondents reported a mean of 5.69 (SD = 1.17), and this difference is statistically significant ($t = 1.99, p = 0.04$). This finding aligns with studies that have shown sex differences in perceived social support. For instance, Betco et al. (2024) discovered that female students reported higher levels of perceived social support. This is consistent with the current study's finding that females perceive more support from significant others. Additionally, research by Khulbe and Bartwal (2024) indicated that female medical students experienced better academic outcomes due to their greater reliance on social support in managing academic stress.

To further explain this difference, Belle (2021) explained that women are more likely to form close emotional bonds and offer strong support to others during stressful times. Tam and Lim (2019) also noted that women tend to open up about their feelings not just to relieve stress but also to build deeper relationships, which can make them feel more supported. Similarly, Antonucci and Akiyama (2017) found that women usually have larger and stronger social circles than men, giving them access to more sources of help. These studies, along with the results presented in Table 4, suggest that sex can influence how social support is experienced, with females often reporting stronger support networks and higher levels of perceived support.

The implications of these findings suggest that while support from family and friends may be perceived similarly across sexes, support from significant others is experienced differently. The higher levels of support reported by female students from their significant others could indicate variations in relationship dynamics or gendered expectations within intimate relationships. These results underscore the importance of considering sex as a factor in understanding social support and its impact on students' lives.

Table 4.2 Test of Difference on Respondents' Social Support When Grouped According to Year Level



Social Support	Year	Mean	SD	SS	df	MS	F	p-value	Decision
Family	First	5.56	1.27	4.07	3	1.36	0.65 ^{ns}	0.58	Reject H_a
	Second	5.58	1.13	772.30	372	2.08			
	Third	5.48	1.89						
	Fourth	5.32	1.35						
Total		5.49	1.44	776.36	375				
Friends	First	5.33	1.18	2.48	3	0.83	0.61 ^{ns}	0.61	Reject H_a
	Second	5.53	1.09	507.88	372	1.37			
	Third	5.47	1.27						
	Fourth	5.36	1.12						
Total		5.42	1.17	510.36	375				
Significant Other	First	5.47	1.35	2.03	3	0.68	0.43 ^{ns}	0.73	Reject H_a
	Second	5.67	1.24	582.75	372	1.57			
	Third	5.59	1.22						
	Fourth	5.53	1.19						
Total		5.56	1.25	584.78	375				

^{ns} - Not Significant

Table 4.2 presents the results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which was conducted to examine if there are significant differences in the level of social support among respondents when grouped according to their year level. This analysis aims to determine whether students in different year levels (First, Second, Third, and Fourth) vary in their perceptions of social support.

Overall, the findings indicate that there are no significant differences in the level of social support across the four-year levels for any of the three dimensions: family, friends, and significant other. For family support, the means range from 5.32 to 5.58, with a non-significant F-value ($F = 2.08$, $p = 0.58$). Similarly, for friend support, the means range from 5.33 to 5.53, with a non-significant F-value ($F = 1.37$, $p = 0.61$). The support from a significant other also shows no significant difference across year levels, with means ranging from 5.47 to 5.67 ($F = 1.57$, $p = 0.73$).

These results suggest that students across all year levels generally perceive similar levels of social support from their family, friends, and significant others. This finding contrasts with studies that suggest social support may vary across different stages of academic progression. For instance, some research indicates that first-year students may experience differing levels of social support as they adjust to the university environment (Abdullah, Kong, & Talib, 2016), but the current study does not find significant differences across year levels. This aligns with the findings of Ramos and Magallanes (2021), who, while focusing on students at risk of dropping out, reported no significant differences in perceived social support across academic year levels. Similarly, Kamel (2018) found that perceived social support remained consistent regardless of year level, emphasizing its stable presence in students' academic lives.

The implications of these findings suggest that social support levels are relatively consistent across the different year levels in this study. This could indicate that support systems are stable throughout the students' academic journey at the university. However, it is important to note that this study focuses on a specific institution, and findings might



vary in other contexts. Further research could explore the nuances of social support across academic years in different settings to provide a more comprehensive understanding.

Table 5.1 Test of Difference on Respondent’s Academic Success When Grouped According to Sex

Sex	Mean	SD	df	t	p-value	Decision
Male	1.92	0.38	374	2.60*	0.01	Accept H_a
Female	1.82	0.32				

* - Significant at 0.05

Table 5.1 presents the results of the independent t-test conducted to compare the General Weighted Average (GWA) of respondents when grouped according to sex. This analysis aims to determine whether a significant difference in academic success, as measured by GWA, exists between male and female students.

The findings indicate a statistically significant difference in GWA between male and female respondents. The mean GWA for male students was 1.92 (SD = 0.38), while that of female students was 1.82 (SD = 0.32). The t-test result (t = 2.60) yielded a p-value of 0.01, which is significant at the 0.05 level.

This result suggests that female students in this study tended to have a higher GWA, indicating greater academic success compared to their male counterparts. These findings align with those of Betco et al. (2024) and Khulbe and Bartwal (2024), who also found that female students demonstrated superior academic performance. Similarly, Gaffar et al. (2024) reported that female students at Sharif Medical and Dental College consistently outperformed males in recent academic years. In a large-scale study conducted in Bangladesh, Islam et al. (2020) observed slightly higher academic scores among female students. Additional studies by Juhaidi (2023), Delaney and Devereux (2020), and Wani (2024) also reinforce this trend across various disciplines and contexts.

The implications of these findings suggest that sex-based differences in academic success exist within the studied population. The higher GWA among female students may be attributed to various factors, such as differences in study habits, levels of motivation, or the utilization of social support. It is important for educators and policymakers to recognize these differences and implement strategies that promote academic achievement for all students.

Table 5.2 Test of Difference on Respondents’ Academic Success When Grouped According to Year Level

Year	Mean	SD	SS	df	MS	F	p-value	Decision
First Year	1.90	0.33	0.30	3	0.10	0.798 ^{ns}	0.496	Reject H_a
Second Year	1.86	0.41	46.416	372	0.125			
Year	1.90	0.32						



Third Year	1.83	0.35						
Fourth Year								
Total	1.87	0.39	46.715	375				

^{ns} - Not Significant

Table 5.2 presents the results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) conducted to determine whether there are significant differences in the General Weighted Average (GWA) of the respondents when grouped according to their year level. The data show that the mean GWA for First-Year students is 1.90 (SD = 0.33), for Second-Year students is 1.86 (SD = 0.41), for Third-Year students is 1.90 (SD = 0.32), and for Fourth-Year students is 1.83 (SD = 0.35). Although slight variations in mean scores are observed, the computed F-value of 0.798 with a p-value of 0.496 indicates that these differences are not statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

As the p-value is greater than 0.05, the decision is to reject the alternative hypothesis, suggesting that there is no significant difference in the academic success of the respondents when grouped according to their year level. This implies that students from different year levels perform similarly in terms of their GWA, and that academic success, as measured by GWA, does not significantly vary based on the students' year of study within this particular group.

These results suggest that academic success, as measured by GWA, does not significantly differ across the different year levels in this study. This finding implies that students' academic performance is relatively consistent throughout their progression from First Year to Fourth Year. This finding aligns with the results of Mensah and Atta (2015) observed that year level had minimal impact on students' academic achievement, implying that other factors may be more influential. Al-Zoubi and Younes (2015) further supported this conclusion by showing that academic level did not significantly affect performance and that factors such as motivation, external support, and the learning environment play a more critical role.

The consistency in GWA across year levels could imply that students maintain a stable level of academic achievement throughout their time at Isabela State University-Cabagan. However, it is essential to note that this study focuses on a single institution, and its findings may not be applicable to different educational settings or student populations. The analysis shows no significant differences in academic success across year levels, suggesting a consistent level of academic performance among students from First Year to Fourth Year in this specific context.

Table 6: Relationship Between the Level of Social Support and the Academic Success of the Respondents

		Family	Friends	Significant Other
General Weighted Average	Pearson Correlation	0.017 ^{ns}	0.024 ^{ns}	0.059 ^{ns}
	Descriptive Value	Very Low Positive Correlation	Very Low Positive Correlation	Very Low Positive Correlation
	p-value	0.746	0.637	0.250
	Decision	Reject H_a	Reject H_a	Reject H_a



Table 6 presents the results of the Pearson-r correlation analysis, which was conducted to determine the relationship between the level of social support and the academic success of the respondents. The analysis examined the correlation between General Weighted Average (GWA) and three dimensions of social support: family, friends, and significant others. The table includes the Pearson correlation coefficient, descriptive value, p-value, and the statistical decision for each relationship.

The findings indicate that there is a very low positive correlation between social support and academic success across all three dimensions. Specifically, the Pearson correlation coefficient for family support is 0.017, for friend support it is 0.024, and for support from a significant other, it is 0.059. All these correlations are described as "Very Low Positive Correlation."

Furthermore, the p-values for all three correlations are not significant. The p-value for family support is 0.746, for friend support, it is 0.637, and for support from a significant other, it is 0.250. Since all p-values are greater than the typical significance level of 0.05, the decision in each case is "Reject H_a ," indicating that there is no statistically significant relationship between social support and academic success in this study.

These findings are consistent with previous research. Paul et al. (2024) found no significant correlation between perceived social support and academic performance among education students, even though participants reported feelings of acceptance and support. Similarly, D'Alessio et al. (2018) observed that the presence of social support does not necessarily guarantee academic success. MacKinnon (2022) also found no strong connection between social support and GPA.

The implications of these findings suggest that, within the context of this study, the level of social support from family, friends, and significant others has a negligible impact on students' academic success as measured by GWA. This could indicate that other factors play a more significant role in academic achievement among the respondents. It is important to consider that correlation does not imply causation, and further research may be needed to explore the complex interplay of factors influencing academic success.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results and findings of this study, several conclusions and corresponding recommendations were drawn. The balanced representation of respondents by sex and year level enhances the generalizability of the findings to the student population of Isabela State University-Cabagan, while the overall high General Weighted Average (GWA) among participants suggests that the outcomes primarily reflect academically successful students. Students consistently reported high levels of perceived social support from family, friends, and significant others, indicating strong support networks within the university. Notably, while male and female students perceived similar levels of support from family and friends, females reported significantly higher support from significant others. Social support levels were stable across year levels, suggesting consistent experiences throughout students' academic journey. Female students also demonstrated significantly



higher academic performance compared to male students, with no notable differences across year levels. However, the study found that social support did not significantly predict academic success, implying the influence of other contributing factors. In light of these findings, academic institutions are encouraged to continue cultivating supportive environments and to explore additional variables—such as motivation, study habits, and socioeconomic status—that may impact academic achievement. Gender-specific programs may also help address disparities in performance. Students should be encouraged to maintain their social support networks and enhance their academic engagement through effective study strategies and motivation. Future research is recommended to examine the interplay between social support and other influential variables, explore the different dimensions of social support, and investigate its role across diverse academic settings and student populations for a more comprehensive understanding of its impact.

REFERENCES

- Alotaibi, T. A., Alkhalifah, K. M., Alhumaidan, N. I., Almutiri, W. A., Alsaleh, S. K., AlRashdan, F. M., Almutairi, H. R., Sabi, A. Y., Almawash, A. N., Alfaifi, M. Y., & Al-Mourgi, M. (2023). The Benefits of Friendships in Academic Settings: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Cureus*. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.50946>
- Al-Zoubi, S. M., & Younes, M. a. B. (2015). Low academic achievement: causes and results. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(11), 2262. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0511.09>
- Ansong, D., Okumu, M., Bowen, G. L., Walker, A. M., & Eisensmith, S. R. (2017). The role of parent, classmate, and teacher support in student engagement: Evidence from Ghana. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 54, 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.03.010>
- Battin-Pearson, S., Newcomb, M. D., Abbott, R. D., Hill, K. G., Catalano, R. F., & Hawkins, J. D. (2019). Predictors of early high school dropout: A test of five theories. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(3), 568–582. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.92.3.568>
- Betco, J. P. I., Ph. D., Mendoza, P. C. M., Pendejito, A. S. A., & Cubillas, T. E. (2024). Perceived Social Support Of Students In Different Living Arrangement Vis-À-Vis Their Academic Performance. Caraga State University, *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 14(1), 238–239. <https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.14.01.2024.p14524>
- Cengiz, S. (2023). The Effect of Academic Perfectionism and Social Support from Friends on University Students' Fear of Failure. *Journal of Family, Counseling and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.32568/jfce.1344676>



D'Alessio, A., Lavagnino, A., Lupano Perugini, M. L., Ongarato, P., & Becerra, L. (2018). *Apoyo social percibido y rendimiento académico en estudiantes universitarios*. <https://www.academica.org/000-032/671>

Delaney, J. M., & Devereux, P. J. (2021). Gender and educational achievement: Stylized facts and causal evidence. *UCD Centre for Economic Research Working Paper Series, WP2021/03*. <https://ideas.repec.org/p/ucn/wpaper/202103.html>

Demaray, M. K., & Malecki, C. K. (2022). The relationship between perceived social support and maladjustment for students at risk. *Psychology in the Schools, 39*(3), 305–316. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10018>

Edinger, S. K., & Edinger, M. J. (2018). Improving teacher job satisfaction: The roles of Social capital, teacher efficacy, and support. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 152*, 573–593. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2018.1489364>

Fletcher, I., Castle, M., Scarpa, A., Myers, O., & Lawrence, E. (2020). An exploration of medical student attitudes towards disclosure of mental illness. *Medical Education Online, 25*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2020.1727713>

Flores, M. A., Verchimak, R., Zohrabi Alae, D., & Zwickl, B. M. (2022). Factors influencing help seeking and help avoidant behaviors among physics and life science majors. <https://doi.org/10.1119/perc.2022.pr.flores>

Fothergill, K. E., & Ensminger, M. E. (2020). Childhood and adolescent antecedents of drug and alcohol problems: A longitudinal study. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 82*(1), 61–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2005.08.009>

Fox, M. C. (2021). Social Support, Health Behaviors, and Academic Success in College Students. <https://libres.uncg.edu/ir/listing.aspx?id=14561>

Gaffar, T., Shakoor, A., Abbas, M., Khan, A. N., Jabbar, M., & Butt, H. (2024). A comparison of the academic performance of students throughout the year and the sendup exam with respect to gender. *Journal of Health and Rehabilitation Research, 4*(1), Article 460. <https://doi.org/10.61919/jhrr.v4i1.460>

Islam, M. S., Jahan, S., & Hoque, M. M. (2020). Comparative academic achievement of the university students in Bangladesh: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Asian Social Science, 10*(7), 381–395. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.1.2020.107.381.395>

Juhaidi, A. (2023). Gender, ethnicity, family socio-economics, and grit: An Islamic higher education students context. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences, 2*(1), 15–28. <https://jayapanguspress.penerbit.org/index.php/IJMS/article/view/2821>

Kamel, O. M. (2018). Academic overload, Self-Efficacy and perceived social support as predictors of academic adjustment among first year university students.



- Khulbe, P., & Bartwal, J. (2024). Correlation between perceived social support and quality of sleep and its effect on the academic performance of undergraduate medical students: A cross-sectional study. *Indian Journal of Community Health*, 36(1), 86–94. <https://doi.org/10.47203/ijch.2024.36101.016>
- Laksmiwati, E. D., & Tondok, M. S. (2023). Perceived Social Support, Academic Self-Efficacy, and Anxiety among Final Year Undergraduate Students: A Mediation Analysis. *Bulletin of Counseling and Psychotherapy*. <https://doi.org/10.51214/00202305514000>
- Lee, C. Y. S., Goldstein, S. E., & Dik, B. J. (2018). The Relational Context of Social Support in Young Adults: Links with Stress and Well-Being. *Journal of Adult Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-017-9271-z>
- Li, J., Han, X., Wang, W., Sun, G., & Cheng, Z. (2018). How social support influences university students' academic achievement and emotional exhaustion: The mediating role of self-esteem. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 61, 120–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.11.016>
- Mackinnon, S. P. (2022). Perceived social support and academic achievement: Cross-Lagged Panel and Bivariate Growth Curve analyses. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 41(4), 474–485. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-011-9691-1>
- Manitsa, I., & Doikou, M. (2022). Social support for students with visual impairments in educational institutions: An integrative literature review. *British Journal of Visual Impairment*, 40, 29–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264619620941885>
- Mulyadi, P., & Saraswati, K. D. H. (2020). Social Support and Students' Academic Engagement. 443–450. <https://doi.org/10.2991/ASSEHR.K.202009.068>
- Newhart, S. (2023). Social predictors of psychological well-being and symptoms of college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2023.2217717>
- Orrego, V. O., & Rodriguez, J. (2021). Family communication patterns and college adjustment: The effects of communication and conflictual independence on college students. *Journal of Family Communication*, 1(3), 175–189. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327698JFC0103_02
- Păduraru, C., Ionescu, M., & Popescu, L. (2025). Emotional support as a predictor of stress management and academic resilience among university students. *Journal of Educational Psychology Research*, 15(2), 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jep.2025.15207>
- Paul, J., Betco, I., Cates, P., Mendoza, M., Sheen, A., Pendejito, A., & Cubillas, T. E. (2024). Perceived Social Support Of Students In Different Living Arrangement Vis-À-Vis



- Ramos, E., & Magallanes, C. I. (2021). Social support and academic motivation of students at risk of dropping out. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(2), 43–52.
- Sampe, L., Manuain, J., Siwabessy, J. P. H., & Kaplale, R. H. (2024). The role of family support in improving students' mental health and academic performance during transition to college. *Buletin Kajian Terpadu*, 20(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.30598/bktvol20issue1page1-14>
- Sial, Z. A., Sial, A. A., & Naz, V. (2021). A Study of the Relationship between Social Support and Students' Academic Achievement at University Level. *Journal of Law and Social Studies*, 4(3), 492–502. <https://doi.org/10.52279/jlss.04.03.492502>
- Siska, D., & Hanif, M. (2024). Peran Teman Sebaya dalam Menyelesaikan Tugas Kuliah Mahasiswa Semester 3 PAI UIN Gusdur. *Mutiara, Bau Bau/Mutiara*, 2(6), 53–62. <https://doi.org/10.59059/mutiara.v2i6.1733>
- Wani, R. A. (2023). A study of the effect of self-concept in senior secondary school students in relation to their academic achievement. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(3), 63–72. <https://doi.org/10.25215/1103.010>
- Wong, B. Y. L. (2023). General and specific issues for researchers' consideration in applying the risk and resilience framework to the social domain of learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 18(2), 68–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5826.00060>
- Yang, J., & Wang, X. (2019). The Impact of Perceived Social Support on College Students' Learning Engagement—the Mediating Role of Academic self-efficacy. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICHESS 2019)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/ichess-19.2019.94>
- Yendi, F. M., Firman, F., & Sukma, D. (2023). The Relationship Between Peer Social Support and Student Academic Resilience. *Jurnal Neo Konseling*, 5(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.24036/00706kons2023>
- Zhang, W. (2024). The influence of social support and mental health on academic performance among Chinese college students. *Education and Social Perspectives*, 4(2), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.54691/esp.v4i2.3255>