

Study Interest, Parental Support and Learning Environment of Senior High School Learners in Relation to Academic Performance

Karla Jane G. Villanueva¹, Doreen R. Bandiez²

La Carlota City College, La Carlota City, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100601375>

Received: 06 July 2026; Accepted: 11 July 2026; Published: 21 July 2026

ABSTRACT

This study, entitled “Study Interest, Parental Support, and Learning Environment of Senior High School Learners in Relation to Academic Performance”, utilized a descriptive quantitative research design with standardized questionnaires to assess Grade 11 students’ study interest, parental support, and learning environment. The study involved 304 respondents from various tracks and strands at Doña Hortencia Salas Benedicto National High School–Senior High School. Results revealed that most respondents were female (169 or 55.59 percent) and primarily from the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) strand (135 or 44.41 percent). Overall, students exhibited high levels of study interest (mean = 2.83), parental support (mean = 2.81), and learning environment (mean = 3.17). No significant differences were observed in study interest, parental support, and learning environment across sex, parents’ educational attainment, and family income. However, parental support significantly differed when grouped according to senior high school track and strand (p -value = 0.009). Despite students achieving an outstanding academic performance (mean = 91.55), no significant relationships were found between their academic performance and study interest, parental support, and learning environment. These findings provide valuable insights for developing programs that strengthen student support systems and learning environments.

Keywords: Study Interest, Parental Support, Learning Environment, Academic Performance

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Around the world, the K to 12 program is implemented in different countries such as the USA, Australia, Canada, China, Japan, and Singapore (Department of Education, n.d.). This program aimed to create a more competitive education system by adding two years to the basic education system. In 2013, the Philippines shifted from a 10-year preuniversity cycle into a 13-year program, which includes two years of senior high at the same level as the rest of the world (De Leon, 2023).

Learners can choose their tracks and strands in these two years according to their interests. These tracks are classified into Academic and Technical Vocational and Livelihood tracks (TVL). The strands under the academic track are classified into the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), Accountancy, Business, and Management (ABM), the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS), and the General Academic Strand (GAS) (Department of Education, n.d.). The Technical Vocational and Livelihood (TVL) track is classified into the Agri- agri-fishery arts (AFA) Strand, Home Economics (HE) Strand, Industrial Arts (IA) Strand, and the Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Strand (Department of Education, n.d.). Through this, students can choose which strand they belong to prepare them for higher education.

According to the study of Badilla & Dioso (2023), the choice of learners is influenced by several factors that could influence their academic achievement. These factors include their interest, parent's support or involvement, and the institutional learning environment of learners (Siddiky & Haque, 2024). These factors must be taken into

consideration, especially since these factors could positively or negatively affect the academic performance of learners in school.

Currently, in the Division of La Carlota City, Doña Hortencia Salas Benedicto National High School offers different Senior High School strands and tracks. Therefore, the researcher would like to determine the study interests, parental support, and learning environment of students and how it affects their academic performance in school. Through this, it can be determined what factors student are lacking that could potentially hinder their success in school.

However, while existing literature highlights these factors individually, there is a lack of local research that holistically explores their combined effect on academic performance, particularly within the specific context of public schools. There remains an evident gap in identifying whether significant differences exist in these variables when grouped according to the students' demographic profiles. Thus, this study seeks to address this gap by examining the interplay of study interests, parental support, and learning environment as predictors of academic performance across varying student backgrounds.

METHODOLOGY

A research design is a blueprint to help the researcher answer a research question. It is used to manage strategies, components, and methods that is used to collect data (Sanders et al.,2012, as cited by Bouchrika, 2024). This study used a descriptive correlational research design to guide the research process. The researcher thought that this design was well suited to determine students' study interests, parental support, and learning environment because this design aims to identify the relationship between variables.

According to Walinga (2019), a descriptive correlational research design aims to examine current affairs and assess the relationship between the present variables. This study has been accomplished through this design.

Population and Sample

The researcher utilized a sample size of 304 Grade 11 out of the 1267 Senior High School Students of Dona Hortencia Salas Benedicto National High School—Senior High School S.Y. 2023-2024 from the Academic and Technical Vocational Livelihood (TVL) track. This sample size came from their respective population and has been extracted using Yamane's formula.

The following has been the respondents of this study:

Table 1. Respondents of the Study from Different Tracks and Strands.

Track	Strand	N	n
Academic Track	Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)	194	47
	Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS)	566	136
	Accounting and Business Management (ABM)	149	36
	Industrial Arts (IA)	87	21
TVL Track	Information and Communications Technology (ICT)	151	36
	Home Economics (HE)	120	28
Total		1267	304

Based on the table presented above, using the Yamane's formula, a total of 304 respondents were extracted from the 1267 population. In the academic track, 47 of the respondents were from the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), 136 were from the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS), and 36 were from the Accounting and Business Management (ABM). In the TVL track, 21 of the respondents were from

the Industrial Arts (IA), 36 were from the Information and Communication Technology (ICT), and the remaining 28 respondents were from the Home Economics (HE).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

The table 2 presented below shows the demographic profile of the respondents.

Table 2. Demographic Profile of the Respondents.

Profile	Classification	f	%
Sex	Male	135	44.41
	Female	169	55.59
	Total	304	100.00
Senior High School Track and Strand	STEM	48	15.79
	HUMSS	135	44.41
	ABM	36	11.84
	IA	21	6.91
	ICT	36	11.84
	HE	28	9.21
	Total	304	100.00
Parents' Educational Attainment	Primary Level	3	0.99
	Elementary Graduate	11	3.62
	High School Level	37	12.17
	High School Graduate	59	19.41
	College Level	65	21.38
	College Graduate	129	42.43
	Total	304	100.00
Average Family Monthly Income	Less than Php 9,520	109	35.86
	Between Php 9,521 to Php 19,040	98	32.24
	Between Php 19,041 to Php 38,080	51	16.78
	Between Php 38,081 to Php 66,640	28	9.21
	Between Php 66,641 to Php 114,240	10	3.29
	Between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400	3	0.99
	At least Php 190,401	5	1.64
	Total	304	100.00

Table 2 shows the profile of the respondents in terms of gender, senior high school track and strand, parents' educational attainment, and average monthly family income. Out of 304 respondents, results showed that a majority are female with a frequency of 169 (55.59%), while there were 135 (44.41%) male respondents.

In terms of their senior high school track and strand, 135 or 44.41% of the respondents are from the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) strand. This is followed by STEM with 48 (15.79%), while both ICT and ABM represent 36 (11.84%) each. The remaining population consists of HE with 28 (9.21%) and IA with 21 (6.91%).

Regarding their parents' educational attainment, the highest frequency consists of college graduates with 129 or 42.43%, followed by those at the college level with 65 (21.38%), and high school graduates with 59 (19.41%).

A smaller portion of the population reported parents at the high school level (37 or 12.17%), elementary graduates (11 or 3.62%), and primary level (3 or 0.99%).

In terms of average family income, the results indicate that a plurality of the respondents' families earn less than Php 9,520, totaling 109 or 35.86%. This is closely followed by 98 (32.24%) earning between Php 9,521 to Php 19,040, and 51 (16.78%) ranging from Php 19,041 to Php 38,080. Higher income brackets represented a smaller percentage of the total, with only three respondents (0.99%) earning between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400.

As a whole, the data reveals that most of the Grade 11 students who responded to this study are females, belong to the HUMSS track, come from households where parents are degree holders, yet belong to the lower-income bracket (less than Php 9,520).

Level of Study Interest of Students When Grouped According to Profile

Table 3 below shows the study interest of Grade 11 students when grouped according to profile.

Table 3. Level of Study Interest of Students in Terms of Profile.

Profile	Classification	Mean	Interpretation
Sex	Male	2.80	High
	Female	2.85	High
Senior High School Track and Strand	STEM	2.78	High
	HUMSS	2.90	High
	ABM	2.82	High
	IA	2.89	High
	ICT	2.72	High
	HE	2.67	High
Parents' Educational Attainment	Primary Level	2.61	High
	Elementary Graduate	2.68	High
	High School Level	2.86	High
	High School Graduate	2.85	High
	College Level	2.82	High
	College Graduate	2.83	High
Average Family Monthly Income	Less than Php 9,520	2.85	High
	Between Php 9,521 to Php 19,040	2.85	High
	Between Php 19,041 to Php 38,080	2.81	High
	Between Php 38,081 to Php 66,640	2.65	High
	Between Php 66,641 to Php 114,240	2.78	High
	Between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400	2.90	High
	At least Php 190,401	3.05	High

Table 3 shows the level of study interest of students when grouped according to their demographic profile. When grouped according to sex, results revealed that female students have a mean of 2.85, while male students have a mean of 2.80. Both scores are interpreted to have a high level of study interest. In terms of their track and strand, all respondents demonstrated a high level of study interest regardless of specialization. HUMSS obtained the highest mean of 2.90, followed by IA (2.89), ABM (2.82), STEM (2.78), ICT (2.72), and HE (2.67).

It implies that the students, regardless of their chosen field of study, maintain a strong engagement and motivation toward their academic responsibilities. It also suggests that the curriculum and instructional strategies across different strands effectively sustain student curiosity and commitment to learning. When grouped according to their parents' educational attainment, students whose parents are high school level had the highest mean of 2.86, followed by high school graduates with 2.85, college graduates (2.83) and college level (2.82). Even those whose parents are elementary graduates (2.68) and reached the primary level (2.61) still reflected a high level of study interest.

This implies that parental educational background does not hinder a student's intrinsic motivation to learn. Meaning, students are driven by their own aspirations and potential as life-long learners, regardless of the academic milestones reached by their parents. Regarding the average family monthly income, all groups reflected a high level of study interest. Families earning at least Php 190,401 had the highest mean of 3.05, followed by those earning between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400 with 2.90, less than Php 9,520 and between Php 9,521 to Php 19,040 both with 2.85, between Php 19,041 to Php 38,080 with 2.81, Php 66,641 to Php 114,240 with 2.78, and Php 38,081 to Php 66,640 with 2.65.

Moneva and Gonzaga (2020), also agrees revealing that senior high school students showed positive interest in their study. They like attending school regularly, gaining a high-test score, and interacting in class discussions. Similar to the findings, Abdelrahman (2020) also revealed that females exhibited a higher level of academic intrinsic and extrinsic motivation compared to male students in schools. Contrary to the studies above, the study of Yurt (2022) states that Data analysis revealed that students exhibited moderate levels of academic motivation.

Same with Fuertes et al. (2023) that revealed that students displayed low levels of academic motivation including interest and engagement. Despite low engagement and motivation, the students' academic performance was rated as satisfactory. As a whole, it is evident that the study interest of students remains high across all demographic variables. This implies that the students possess a positive attitude toward their education.

Level of Study Interest of Students

When Taken as a Whole

The table below shows the level of study interest of students when grouped as a whole and when grouped according to feelings-related valences, values-related valences, and intrinsic orientation.

Table 4. Level of Study Interest of Students When Grouped as a Whole and Individually.

Study Interest	n	Mean	Interpretation
Feelings- related Valences	304	2.70	High
Values-related Valences	304	2.82	High
Intrinsic orientation	304	2.96	High
As a Whole	304	2.83	High

The table above shows that in terms of the level of study interest of Grade 11 students individually, the intrinsic orientation of students recorded the highest mean of 2.96, followed by values-related valences with a mean of 2.82, both interpreted as high. Meanwhile, the feelings-related valences of students had a mean of 2.70, which is also interpreted as high. When taken as a whole, the level of study interest of students remains high, with a mean of 2.83. This indicates that students possess a consistently high level of engagement in their studies, primarily driven by their internal drive and the personal value they place on education.

It implies that students are not merely performing tasks for external rewards but are genuinely motivated by the personal satisfaction and long-term benefits of learning. This high level of intrinsic orientation suggests that students perceive their academic activities as meaningful and self-fulfilling.

The results of this study affirm the findings of Sugiyarto et al. (2024), who emphasized that intrinsic motivation is a primary factor affecting a student's interest in pursuing education, with aspirations acting as a highly influential sub-variable. Similarly, Barbarona & Montejo (2024) reported high overall study interest among students, noting that high value-related valences signify that students deeply value the learning process. Furthermore, the data coincides with Harefa (2023), who stated that interest increases a student's sense of enjoyment and desire to learn because they perceive the process as beneficial. This is supported by Li et al. (2023), who attested that interest plays an important role in influencing behavior and motivating individuals to persevere in their tasks. Regarding the emotional aspect of learning, Tan et al. (2021) identified that positive feelings-related valences promote better learning outcomes. Tus (2020) and Saromines & Villocino (2024) both indicated that students with high levels of determination exhibit strong internal and external motivation to acquire knowledge.

Several recent studies also link these high interest levels to academic success. Gabriel et al. (2024) and Johari et al. (2024) revealed that intrinsic drive and environmental stimulation significantly impact academic performance. This is further validated by Sabanal et al. (2023) and Regidor et al. (2024), whose findings showed that highly motivated students consistently achieve "very satisfactory" performance ratings. Moreover, Yarin et al. (2022) highlighted that intrinsic orientation remains one of the strongest aspects of academic interest that directly affects a student's performance.

Level of Parental Support of Students When Grouped According to Profile

The table below shows the level of parental support of students in terms of their profile.

Table 5. Level of Parental Support of Students in terms of Their Profile.

Profile	Classification	Mean	Interpretation
Sex	Male	2.80	High
	Female	2.81	High
Senior High School Track and Strand	STEM	2.68	High
	HUMSS	2.81	High
	ABM	2.98	High
	IA	3.08	High
	ICT	2.70	High
	HE	2.70	High
Parents' Educational Attainment	Primary Level	2.87	High
	Elementary Graduate	2.88	High
	High School Level	2.84	High
	High School Graduate	2.88	High
	College Level	2.68	High
	College Graduate	2.82	High
Average Family Monthly Income	Less than Php 9,520	2.85	High
	Between Php 9,521 to Php 19,040	2.72	High
	Between Php 19,041 to Php 38,080	2.85	High
	Between Php 38,081 to Php 66,640	2.80	High
	Between Php 66,641 to Php 114,240	2.87	High
	Between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400	2.95	High
	At least Php 190,401	2.80	High

Table 5 demonstrates that the level of parental support, when categorized by respondent profile, is consistently high across all variables, including sex, senior high school track and strand, parents' educational attainment, and average family monthly income. Regarding sex, female students recorded a mean of 2.81, while male students recorded a mean of 2.80. In terms of track and strand, students in the IA strand yielded the highest mean of 3.08, followed by ABM (2.98), HUMSS (2.81), and STEM (2.68). Both ICT and HE recorded a mean of 2.70. All these figures are interpreted as a high level of parental support. In the category of parents' educational attainment, the highest mean was observed among High School and Elementary Graduates (2.88), followed by those with a primary level (2.87), high school level (2.84), college graduate (2.82). Parents with a college-level education recorded the lowest mean in this category at 2.68, though this remains within the high interpretation range.

Analysis of average family monthly income reveals that students from families earning between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400 reported the highest mean of 2.95. Notably, students from the lowest income bracket (less than Php 9,520) and the mid-range bracket (Php 19,041 to Php 38,080) recorded identical means of 2.85. All income levels resulted in a high level of parental support. The data indicates that the level of parental support does not significantly fluctuate based on the respondents' socio-economic or academic background. It implies that parents prioritize the academic development of their children and perceive their involvement as a fundamental component of the learning process. This high level of support suggests a domestic environment conducive to academic motivation, which is essential for students to maximize their potential as life-long learners.

The findings align with the study of Careemdeen et al. (2020), which established that parents provide significant support for the academic endeavors of their children. Similarly, Kong & Wang (2021) and Ely et al. (2023) noted that when parents perceive their role as useful, they effectively enhance student motivation. Ramasamy and Deepika (2019) further observed that students across diverse income levels receive adequate parental involvement. Conversely, certain studies present differing results. Dizon et al. (2023) reported that in specific lower-income households, instructional support was restricted by limited household participation and time constraints.

This is supported by Donkor et al. (2024), who identified a lack of essential communication between parents and school administrators in certain senior high school contexts. Furthermore, Choe (2020) documented inconsistent perceptions between parents and adolescents, with students often reporting lower levels of support than their parents perceived. Despite these external variations, the results of this study suggest a unified and high level of parental support, reinforcing the conclusion that parents are actively engaged in the educational progress of the students.

Level of Parental Support of Students When Grouped as a Whole

The table below shows the level of parental support of Grade 11 students when taken as a whole and in terms of parental expectations, parent-child communication, homework support, and school- based involvement.

Table 6. Level of Parental Support of Students individually and when taken as a whole.

Parental Support	Mean	Interpretation
Parental Expectations	3.39	Very High
Parent-child Communication	2.58	High
Homework Support	2.51	High
School-based Involvement	2.74	High
As a Whole	2.81	High

Table 6 reveals that, when taken as a whole, the level of parental support received by Grade 11 students is high. Individually, parental expectations recorded the highest mean of 3.39, which is interpreted as very high. This is followed by school-based involvement with a mean of 2.74, parent-child communication with 2.58, and homework support with 2.51, all of which are interpreted as high.

The findings suggest that the parents of Grade 11 students demonstrate significant engagement and support for their children's academic endeavors. The very high mean for parental expectations implies that parents maintain a clear vision for their children's success, which serves as a foundational motivation for the students. Furthermore, the high levels of communication and school-based involvement imply that parents are not merely passive observers but are active participants in the educational environment, ensuring that the students feel supported both at home and within the institution.

The findings of this study are affirmed by Moneva and Gonzaga (2020), who stated that students receive a high level of parental support which fosters a sense of belongingness and intrinsic motivation. Similarly, Erdem and Kaya (2020) observed that very high parental expectations often exert one of the most significant effects on a student's educational trajectory. This is further supported by Shadhzad et al. (2020), who identified high parental support as one of the strongest predictors of a student's academic success.

Moreover, the high level of parental school involvement coincides with the findings of Flores and Perez (2022), who noted that such support is critical in reinforcing academic performance. This engagement is linked to favorable outcomes, as Gabriel et al. (2024) emphasized that students receiving such support often achieve very satisfactory and outstanding academic results. Finally, the overall high level of involvement reported in this study aligns with the observations of Guzman and Banaag (2023), reinforcing the conclusion that active parental participation remains a dominant characteristic in the students' learning environment.

Level of Learning Environment of Students when Grouped According to Profile and as a whole

The table below shows the level of learning environment of students when grouped according to profile and when taken as a whole.

Table 7. Level of Learning Environment of Students when Grouped According to Profile and when Taken as a Whole.

Profile	Classification	Mean	Interpretation
Sex	Male	3.17	High
	Female	3.17	High
Senior High School Track and Strand	STEM	3.20	High
	HUMSS	3.17	High
	ABM	3.34	High
	IA	3.08	High
	ICT	3.02	High
	HE	3.12	High

Parents' Educational Attainment	Primary Level	3.55	Very High
	Elementary Graduate	3.02	High
	High School Level	3.19	High
	High School Graduate	3.12	High
	College Level	3.18	High
	College Graduate	3.18	High
Average Family Monthly Income	Less than Php 9,520	3.15	High
	Between Php 9,521 to Php 19,040	3.14	High
	Between Php 19,041 to Php 38,080	3.04	High
	Between Php 38,081 to Php 66,640	3.42	Very High
	Between Php 66,641 to Php 114,240	3.26	Very High

	Between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400	3.70	Very High
	At least Php 190,401	3.55	Very High
As a Whole		3.17	High

Table 7 illustrates that the level of the learning environment, when categorized by respondent profile, is consistently high to very high. Regarding sex, both male and female students recorded an equal mean of 3.17, interpreted as a high level. In terms of track and strand, ABM students recorded the highest level with a mean of 3.34, followed by STEM (3.20), HUMSS (3.17), HE (3.12), IA (3.08), and ICT (3.02). All strands are interpreted as having a high level of learning environment. Analysis of parents' highest educational attainment reveals that students whose parents completed the primary level recorded the highest mean of 3.55, which is interpreted as very high. This is followed by students whose parents attained a high school level (3.19), college graduate (3.18), college level (3.18), high school graduate (3.12), and elementary graduate (3.02) education. Furthermore, the average family monthly income significantly influences the perception of the learning environment; families earning between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400 obtained the highest mean of 3.70, followed by those earning at least Php 190,401 (3.55) and those earning between Php 38,081 to Php 66,640 (3.42). These three brackets are interpreted as very high, while the remaining income brackets fall within the high category. When taken as a whole, the level of learning environment of Grade 11 students is high, with an overall mean of 3.17.

This suggests that regardless of their demographic background, students generally perceive their educational surroundings as conducive to academic growth. The consistently high scores across various strands and income levels imply that the institution provides equitable access to necessary facilities and a supportive atmosphere. This perception is vital as a positive learning environment serves as a key factor in developing student skills and maximizing their potential as life-long learners.

The findings of this study align with Regidor et al. (2024), who stated that students generally experience high levels of supportive learning environments. While Munir et al. (2021) observed that female students often perceive a better learning environment than their male counterparts, the current data suggests gender parity in this specific context. Furthermore, Cruz and Vargas (2021) noted that demographic profiles and the community environment significantly correlate with academic performance, which supports the comprehensive high levels observed across the diverse respondent profiles in this study.

Conversely, certain findings in the literature present a different perspective. Vidavel et al. (2023) argued that only families with higher socioeconomic status could provide a superior learning environment, yet the current results show high levels even among lower-income brackets. Similarly, the study disagrees with Gonzales and Digo (2021), who found that perceptions of the learning environment varied significantly based on the chosen track or strand. The results contradict the findings of Ullah and Almani (2022), who reported insufficient infrastructure and untrained educators in other settings. In contrast, the high mean scores in this study indicate that the current respondents feel well-supported by their teachers and the institutional infrastructure.

Level of Academic Performance of Students

The table presented below shows the level of academic performance of students.

Table 8. Level of Academic Performance of Students.

Level of Academic Performance	f	Mean	Interpretation
Outstanding	239	91.55	Outstanding
Very Satisfactory	45		
Satisfactory	16		
Fairly Satisfactory	4		
Did not meet Expectation	0		
Total	304		

The table presented above illustrates the academic distribution of the 304 respondents. Results show that a significant majority of 239 respondents achieved an outstanding academic performance. This is followed by 45 students with a very satisfactory rating, 16 students with a satisfactory rating, and the remaining four students with a fairly satisfactory performance. When taken as a whole, the level of academic performance of Grade 11 students is outstanding, with a total mean of 91.55.

The data indicates that the vast majority of Grade 11 students are performing at an exceptional level. This implies that the students have successfully mastered the required competencies and are effectively utilizing the instructional resources provided to them. Such high academic results further suggest that the students possess strong study habits and the necessary discipline to excel. Furthermore, this outstanding performance implies that the current teaching strategies and the learning environment are conducive to academic excellence, allowing students to maximize their potential as they prepare for higher education.

The findings of this study are consistent with the results of Catipay (2023), who emphasized that learners' academic performance can reach an excellent level under the right conditions. This is further supported by Garces (2024), who noted that outstanding academic performance is achievable when students maintain an optimal mental health state that fosters concentration and adaptability. Similarly, Dancillo et al. (2024) revealed that student performance often exceeds the very satisfactory threshold, aligning with the high mean observed in this study.

Moreover, the importance of these results is highlighted by Brew et al. (2021) and Tadase et al. (2022), who both asserted that high academic results are essential in determining a student's future success and professional trajectory. However, the results of this study differ from the findings of Taylor et al. (2023), which revealed low academic performance in contexts characterized by inadequate facilities, general disturbances, and ineffective teaching.

The contrast between these studies suggests that the respondents in this current study benefit from sufficient institutional support and an effective instructional framework, which are critical in maintaining their outstanding academic standing.

Difference in the Study Interest, Parental Support, and Learning Environment of Students when Grouped According to Sex

The tables presented below shows the difference in the study interest, parental support, and learning environment of students in terms of sex.

Table 9. Difference Between Students' Study Interest in Terms of Sex.

Sex	n	Mean Rank
Male	35	147.00
Female	72	156.89

Computed value (U) : 10665.50

p-value : .330

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not significant at 0.05 level of significance

Based on the p-value of 0.330, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance, the findings of the study reveal that there is no significant difference in the sex of the students and their study interest. This indicates that students' study interest does not vary according to their sex.

The results imply that both male and female students possess a comparable drive and enthusiasm for their academic pursuits. This lack of significant difference suggests that the motivational factors influencing student interest such as personal goals, instructional quality, and curriculum relevance are applied and received equitably across genders.

The findings of this study coincide with Hu and Luo (2021), who stated that their research revealed no significant difference in students' academic interest in terms of gender, noting that academic scores were similar regardless of specific interest levels. This is further supported by Abdulrahman (2023), who found that students, regardless of gender, were able to maintain high levels of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Similarly, Corpuz et al. (2022) found no significant difference between gender and academic interest or motivation.

Conversely, some literature presents a differing perspective. The study disagrees with Tron (2021), whose research identified a significant difference in academic interests, specifically noting that male students exhibited higher interest levels than female students.

This also contradicts the findings of Kingsley and Anamezie (2022), who argued that gender has a significant implication on academic interest and achievement.

Furthermore, the results differ from Shah et al. (2020), who reported that female students significantly outperformed male students in both achievement scores and interest.

Despite these contradictions in other academic settings, the current data remains consistent with the conclusion that sex is not a determining factor in the study interest of the current respondents.

Table 9.1 Difference Between Students' Parental Support in Terms of Sex.

Sex	n	Mean Rank
Male	35	151.38
Female	72	153.39

Computed value (U) : 11256.50

p-value : 0.843

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not significant at 0.05 level of significance

The table above shows that there is no significant difference between the parental support received by students and their sex. This is supported by the p-value of 0.843, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Consequently, the null hypothesis is accepted. The findings suggest that parental engagement and support are provided equitably to both male and female. This implies that parents do not base their level of academic supervision, communication, or support on gender-related factors, but rather on the general needs of the learner.

The results of this study align with the findings of Kansara and Makwana (2020), whose research similarly revealed that gender has no significant impact on the level of parental involvement. This suggests that in various academic contexts, the commitment of parents to their children's education remains uniform across sexes. Conversely, several studies present contrasting evidence regarding gender and support.

Careemdeen et al. (2020) investigated parental support in secondary high school and revealed a significant difference, specifically noting that female students received more support than their male counterparts.

This is supported by Catipay (2023), who observed that significant differences in parental involvement and style were indeed present when categorized by students' sex, age, and family income.

Furthermore, Ogunkuade and Kenku (2022) found a significant gender difference concerning parental supervision and its subsequent impact on academic performance.

Finally, Rozas et al. (2022) emphasized that personal characteristics can lead to significant differences in student motivation, which serves as a crucial predictor of academic achievement.

While these external studies suggest that gender-based differences in support exist in other environments, the current data reinforces the conclusion that for this specific group of Grade 11 students, parental support remains consistent regardless of the student's sex.

Table 9.2. Difference in Students' Learning Environment in Terms of Sex.

Sex	n	Mean Rank
Male	35	152.45
Female	72	152.54

Computed value (U) : 11400.50

p-value : 0.993

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not significant at 0.05 level of significance

Based on the table presented, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between students' learning environment and their sex. This conclusion is supported by the p-value of 0.888, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance.

Consequently, the results indicate that the learning environment of students does not vary according to their sex. The finding implies that both male and female students perceive and experience their educational surroundings in a consistent and equitable manner. It suggests that the institution maintains a standardized quality of facilities, instructional support, and classroom atmosphere that transcends gender boundaries.

Furthermore, this implies that the school's physical and social structures are successfully designed to be inclusive, allowing every learner to engage with their studies in a conducive atmosphere that supports their development as life-long learners. The findings of this study align with the research of Kunwar (2020), which revealed that demographic profiles, including gender and parental education, have a minimal impact or demonstrate no significant relationship with students' academic interests and performance.

This suggest that environmental factors often weigh more heavily than individual demographic characteristics in certain academic settings. Similarly, the study of Cruz and Vargas (2021) supports these results, stating that both genders experience comparable positive and negative factors within their learning environment.

This further reinforces the conclusion that the educational landscape remains a shared experience for all students, providing a consistent foundation for their academic growth regardless of sex.

Difference in Study Interest, Parental Support, and Learning Environment of Students when Grouped According to Senior High School Track and Strand

The tables presented below shows the difference of students' study interest, parental support, and learning environment when grouped according to Senior High School Track and Strand

Table 10. Difference in Students' Study Interest in terms of Senior High School Track and strand.

Senior High School Track and Strand	n	Mean Rank
STEM	48	138.05
HUMSS	135	169.26
ABM	36	157.28
IA	21	165.31
ICT	36	128.32
HE	28	111.80

Computed value (H) : 15.486

p-value : 0.008

Decision : Reject Ho

Interpretation : Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Based on the table presented, when grouped according to their track and strand, it is evident that there is a significant difference between students' study interest and their chosen specialization in senior high school. This is confirmed by a p-value of 0.008, which is lower than the 0.05 level of significance. These findings suggest that students' study interest varies across different tracks and strands; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

The results imply that the academic focus and nature of a specific track or strand play a decisive role in shaping a student's engagement and enthusiasm. This variation suggests that some strands may naturally align more closely with the students' intrinsic motivations or career aspirations than others. Furthermore, it implies that the specific instructional methods, subject matter, and career relevance associated with different strands influence how deeply a student becomes invested in their studies.

The findings of this study align with the research of Malaguial et al. (2022), whose work established that a significant difference exists in students' study interest when categorized by their strand. The relationship indicates that a student's choice of track and strand is fundamentally linked to their personal interests and professional goals.

Table 10.1. Difference in Students' Parental Support in terms of Senior High School Track and strand.

Senior High School Track and Strand	n	Mean Rank
STEM	48	131.73
HUMSS	135	153.11
ABM	36	182.82
IA	21	198.29
ICT	36	135.74
HE	28	133.39

Computed value (H) : 15.32

p-value : 0.009

Decision : Reject Ho

Interpretation : Significant at 0.05 level of significance

The table presented above demonstrates that there is a significant difference in the parental support received by students when grouped according to their track and strand. This is substantiated by a p-value of 0.009, which is below the 0.05 level of significance; consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected.

This indicates that the level and nature of support provided by parents are not uniform across all academic specializations. The findings imply that parents may adjust their involvement, expectations, and supervision based on the perceived difficulty, technical requirements, or career prospects of a specific track or strand. This variation suggests that certain academic paths may elicit more intensive parental guidance or resource allocation than others.

The findings of this study align with the research of Sara (2021), which established that the level of parental support received by students can differ significantly based on their chosen track and strand. The study further noted that parental influence often extends beyond support to the initial decision-making process, as many parents actively guide or influence their children in selecting their senior high school specialization.

This suggests that the relationship between a student's academic path and parental involvement is deeply intertwined, with the specific nature of the strand serving as a primary factor in determining how parents navigate and provide for their child's educational needs.

Table 10.2. Difference Between Students' Learning Environment in terms of Senior High School Track and Strand.

Senior High School Track and Strand	n	Mean Rank
STEM	48	158.20
HUMSS	135	154.77
ABM	36	188.31
IA	21	136.52
ICT	36	117.42
HE	28	142.84

Computed value (H) : 13.09

p-value : 0.23

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not Significant at 0.05 level of significance

The table on the previous page shows that there is no significant difference between students' track and strand and their learning environment. This conclusion is supported by the p-value of 0.23, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance. These findings indicate that the learning environment of students does not vary according to their chosen track and strand in senior high school.

The results imply that the quality of the learning environment is maintained consistently across all academic specializations within the institution.

This suggest that the school provides equitable access to facilities, classroom resources, and instructional support, ensuring that no specific track is prioritized or neglected in terms of environmental conducive factors.

On the contrary, the study of Gonzales and Digo (2024) states that the learning environment of students differs in terms of their field of education. Their research discovered that students in specific discipline such as the arts, audio-visual technology, communication, human services, law, and public safety are more significantly affected by environmental factors compared to those in other fields.

Despite these external findings, the current data reinforces the conclusion that the learning environment remains a stable and non-varying factor across all senior high school tracks and strands.

Difference in Study Interest, Parental Support, and Learning Environment of Students when Grouped According to Parents' Educational Attainment

The tables presented below shows the difference in students' study interest, parental support, and learning environment according to their parents' educational attainment.

Table 11. Difference in the Students Study Interest According to Their Parents' Educational Attainment.

Parents' Educational Attainment	n	Mean Rank
Primary Level	3	84.17
Elementary Graduate	11	123.23
High School Level	37	158.19
High School Graduate	59	151.42
College Level	65	158.73
College Graduate	129	152.31

Computed value (H) : 3.53

p-value : 0.620

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not significant at 0.05 level of significance

Based on the table presented above, the computed p-value of 0.620 exceeds the 0.05 level of significance. This result indicates that there is no significant difference between the parents' highest educational attainment and their children's study interest. Consequently, the null hypothesis is accepted, suggesting that a student's drive and interest in their studies are not determined by the academic background of their parents. The findings imply that study interest is an intrinsic quality or a result of external factors other than parental academic history. This suggests that students whose parents have limited formal education are just as likely to demonstrate high levels of academic engagement as those whose parents are college graduates

The results of this study align with the findings of Ariya and Kofi (2021), who stated that a parent's education does not necessarily affect a student's performance or academic outlook. Similarly, Hu and Luo (2021) revealed that parental education levels were not significant factors in academic motivation or performance, suggesting that interest is a distinct variable independent of family background.

Conversely, several studies present a differing perspective on this relationship. The role of parents' educational level was found to be significant by Kalender and Berberoglu (2009, as cited by Bhandari and Timsina, 2024), who argued that parental qualifications can serve as significant predictors of academic ability and interest.

This is supported by Suman and Sinha (2022), whose research indicated that students with highly educated parents tend to exhibit higher academic interest compared to those from lower educational backgrounds.

Furthermore, Yurt (2022) documented a significant difference in academic interests when categorized by parental education levels. Despite these conflicting academic views, the current data reinforces the conclusion that for this specific group of Grade 11 students, study interest remains consistent regardless of their parents' highest educational attainment.

Table 11.1. Difference in Students Parental Support According to Their Parents' Educational Attainment.

Parents' Educational Attainment	n	Mean Rank
Primary Level	3	169.17
Elementary Graduate	11	166.77
High School Level	37	158.09
High School Graduate	59	166.58
College Level	65	130.99
College Graduate	129	153.69

Computed value (H) : 5.98

p-value : 0.308

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not significant at 0.05 level of significance

Based on the table presented above, there is no significant difference in students' parental support when grouped according to their parents' educational attainment. This is supported by the p-value of 0.308, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating that the degree of support parents provide to their children remains consistent regardless of their own academic background. The results imply that the commitment of parents to their children's education is driven by a shared value for academic success rather than their own formal schooling.

The findings of this study align with Bhandari and Timsana (2024), who noted that irrespective of their own educational backgrounds, parents who are engaged in the educational process actively support their children's academic plans and pursuits.

However, the study of Naite (2021) does not align with these results, asserting that educational level, employment status, and age have a substantial impact on academic performance and parental involvement.

Similarly, Suleiman (2023) stated that a low level of parental education and support can negatively influence academic success compared to students from higher academic backgrounds, emphasizing the critical role parents play.

Furthermore, the findings of Shah et al. (2020) provide a contrasting view by stating that parental educational qualifications, particularly those of the mother, significantly influence student achievement and that higher education levels generally contribute to better academic performance.

Despite these varied perspectives in literature, the current data suggests that for this specific group, parental support remains a non-varying factor across different educational backgrounds.

Table 11.2. Difference in Students Learning Environment According to Their Parents' Educational Attainment

Parents' Educational Attainment	n	Mean Rank
Primary Level	3	217.00
Elementary Graduate	11	129.27
High School Level	37	156.11
High School Graduate	59	142.16
College Level	65	154.91
College Graduate	129	155.46

Computed value (H) : 3.47

p-value : 0.628

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not significant at 0.05 level of significance

Based on the table presented above, the p-value of 0.628 is higher than the 0.05 level of significance. This result indicates that there is no significant difference in the students' learning environment when grouped according to their parents' educational attainment. Consequently, the null hypothesis is accepted, suggesting that the perceived quality of the educational setting is not influenced by the academic background of the students' parents.

The findings imply that the school provides a standardized and equitable learning environment that effectively serves all students regardless of their family's educational history. This suggests that the institution's facilities, classroom management, and instructional support are consistently accessible and perceived as favorable by the entire student population.

The findings of this study align with the research of Rivera et al. (2024), which noted that no significant difference exists in students' learning environments when categorized by parental educational attainment. Their research highlights that, regardless of the parents' profile, they remain supportive of their children's education while maintaining a healthy boundary that allows for academic independence.

This reinforces the idea that the quality of the learning environment is primarily a function of the institutional framework and general parental support rather than a byproduct of the parents' formal academic qualifications.

Difference in Study Interest, Parental Support, and Learning Environment of Students when Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

The table presented in the below shows the difference between students' study interest, parental support, and learning environment when grouped according to their average family monthly income.

Table 12. Difference in Students Study Interest in Terms of Average Family Monthly Income.

Average Family Monthly Income	n	Mean Rank
Less than Php 9,520	109	154.33
Between Php 9,521 to Php 19,040	98	159.99
Between Php 19,041 to Php 38,080	51	150.40
Between Php 38,081 to Php 66,640	28	116.57
Between Php 66,641 to Php 114,240	10	138.45
Between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400	3	161.83
At least Php 190,401	5	210.80

Computed value (H) : 7.96

p-value : 0.241

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not significant at 0.05 level of significance

In terms of the difference in students' study interest and their average family monthly income, the p-value of 0.241 is higher than the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that there is no significant difference in students' study interest when grouped according to their family's average monthly income. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, suggesting that a student's academic drive and interest are not dictated by their economic background. The findings imply that academic motivation is a universal trait among the respondents that transcends financial status. This suggests that students from lower-income brackets possess the same level of enthusiasm and dedication to their studies as those from more affluent families.

The results disagree with Kilag et al. (2023), whose research revealed that students' choices, interests, and career paths are heavily influenced by their family's financial condition. Similarly, Malaguial et al. (2022) asserted that socioeconomic status significantly affects academic interest, performance, and career selection.

This is further supported by Yurt (2022), who found that academic interests varied based on income levels, suggesting that motivation is highly influenced by demographic factors. Furthermore, the study of Liu and Lou (2020) does not align with these results, stating that students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds are better supported and perform more effectively. Finally, the findings contrast with Suna et al. (2020), who argued that students from higher socioeconomic statuses consistently outperform their peers in subjects like math and science due to their socioeconomic advantages. Despite these external findings, the current data remains consistent in showing that for this specific group, family income does not create a significant disparity in study interest.

Table 12.1. Difference in Students Parental Support According to Average Family Monthly Income.

Average Family Monthly Income	n	Mean Rank
Less than Php 9,520	109	163.46
Between Php 9,521 to Php 19,040	98	137.88
Between Php 19,041 to Php 38,080	51	156.24
Between Php 38,081 to Php 66,640	28	146.8
Between Php 66,641 to Php 114,240	10	164.00
Between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400	3	188.83
At least Php 190,401	5	149.00

Computed value (H) : 5.31

p-value : 0.504

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Based on the table presented above shows that there is no significant difference between students' parental support when grouped according to their average family monthly income. This is substantiated by a p-value of 0.504, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance; consequently, the null hypothesis is accepted. The results indicate that regardless of the parents' income level, the support received by the students does not vary significantly. The findings imply that the commitment of parents to support their children's education is a priority that transcends financial capacity. This suggests that parents in lower-income brackets are just as involved and supportive as those in higher-income brackets, demonstrating that emotional and instructional support are not exclusively tied to economic resources.

The findings of this study align with the research of Rivera et al. (2024), which stated that the household income of parents and the broader family do not significantly affect the students or the level of support they receive. This perspective suggests that parental involvement is an independent variable driven by factors other than financial status. Conversely, the results do not align with the study of Kilag et al. (2023), who discovered that the support students receive to pursue their education or career often differs based on salary or socioeconomic status. Similarly, the study of Azmer et al. (2021) presents a contradiction, stating that a significant difference exists between economic status and received support, with students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds tending to perform better academically.

Azmer et al. further noted that while family size and residence influence performance, these correlations were less significant than the impact of socioeconomic factors. Despite these differing views in broader literature, the current data reinforces the conclusion that for these respondents, parental support remains a stable factor regardless of family income.

Table 12.2. Difference Between Students Learning Environment According to Their Average Family Monthly Income.

Average Family Monthly Income	n	Mean Rank
Less than Php 9,520	109	158.20
Between Php 9,521 to Php 19,040	98	154.77
Between Php 19,041 to Php 38,080	51	188.31
Between Php 38,081 to Php 66,640	28	136.52
Between Php 66,641 to Php 114,240	10	117.42
Between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400	3	142.84
At least Php 190,401	5	158.20

Computed value (H) : 13.09

p-value : 0.023

Decision : Reject Ho

Interpretation : Significant at 0.05 level of significance

The table presented above demonstrates that there is a significant difference in the learning environment of students when grouped according to their average family monthly income. This is supported by the p-value of 0.023, which is lower than the 0.05 level of significance; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This indicates that the perceived quality and conduciveness of the students' learning environment vary based on their family's economic status.

The findings imply that socioeconomic factors play a critical role in shaping the physical and psychological space where learning occurs. Students from higher-income families may have access to better educational resources, quieter study spaces, and more advanced technology at home, which enhances their perception of the learning environment. Conversely, students from lower-income backgrounds may face environmental challenges that could potentially hinder their academic focus.

The findings of this study align with the research of Vadivel et al. (2023), which established a significant difference in the learning environments of students based on their socioeconomic standing. Their study revealed that a high-quality learning environment is a fundamental requirement for academic success; however, households with low socioeconomic status often struggle to offer a suitable or optimized learning atmosphere for their children. This suggests that the disparity in family income directly translates into a disparity in educational comfort and resource accessibility, reinforcing the conclusion that economic background is a primary determinant of the quality of a student's total learning environment.

Relationship Between Students' Study Interest and Their Academic Performance

The table presented below shows the relationship between students' study interest and their academic performance.

Table 13. Relationship Between Students' Study Interest and Their Academic Performance.

Level of Study Interest	Level of Academic Performance					Total
	Outstanding	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fairly Satisfactory	Did not Meet Expectation	
Very High	31	7	1	0	0	39
High	164	26	12	4	0	206
Low	43	12	3	0	0	58
Very Low	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	239	45	16	4	0	304

Computed value (G) : 0.082

p-value : 0.513

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not Significant at 0.05 level of significance

The table presented above illustrates the distribution of the 304 respondents regarding their study interest and academic outcomes. Out of these, 39 respondents exhibit a very high level of study interest, with 31 achieving outstanding performance, seven rated as very satisfactory, and one as satisfactory. Among the 206 respondents with a high level of study interest, 164 reached an outstanding level, 26 were very satisfactory, 12 were satisfactory, and four were fairly satisfactory. Notably, 58 respondents reported a low level of study interest, yet 43 still achieved outstanding performance, 12 were very satisfactory, and three were satisfactory. Finally, one respondent with a very low level of study interest still managed to achieve outstanding academic performance.

Based on the p-value of 0.513, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is accepted. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between students' study interest and their academic performance.

The findings imply that academic performance is a multifaceted outcome that is not exclusively driven by a student's level of interest. This indicates that interest alone is not a reliable predictor of success in the current academic setting.

The results of this study align with Tron (2021), who also found no significant relationship between academic interest and school performance. Similarly, Saromines and Villocino (2024) observed that while students may be highly motivated, their achievement can remain low, suggesting that interest does not inherently predict success.

These findings are further supported by Tus (2020), who noted that self-efficacy and interest did not significantly affect performance, and Dancillo et al. (2024), who found no significant link between performance and engagement. The data also aligns with Okigbo and Odiri (2023) wherein the results of the study revealed that there is no significant relationship between students' academic interests or motivation and their academic performance. While most of the students indicated a high level of motivation, his motivation did not significantly correlate with their performance. The results of the study also agree with Fuertes (2023) that there was no significant relationship between students' academic motivation and engagement to their academic performance.

Yarin et al. (2022) also stated that the motivation including the interests of students have no correlation to their academic performance. The findings are contrary to Kwarikunda et al. (2020) revealed that the interests of students in their study can significantly predict their efficacy and determination in learning a subject. The study of Li et al. (2023) also stated that the interests of individuals can significantly affect their behavior. Their interests are partially mediated by the topic being discussed which also contradicted the results of the study.

Zhigang (2023) also stated that positive significant correlation between the different factors including students learning motivation and effort and their academic success. The study also aligns with Corpuz et al. (2022) that motivation including students' interest has no correlation with academic performance which was an unusual finding as many studies indicate a positive relationship between achievement motivation and performance. Same with the study of Wu et al. (2019) also revealed that students' academic interests have a statistically significant impact on their academic achievement. The efforts and perseverance in the learning of students greatly affect their achievement.

The results also contradicted Hafera (2023) findings, wherein a significant relationship was discovered between students' study interest and their academic performance. Wherein when students are interested, they are able to understand the learning objectives efficiently which can lead to a greater understanding of their lessons. Contrary to the results, Nappadang et al. (2020) states that that students' academic interests greatly influence the course or strand they will take in school. Moreover, it was also revealed that higher academic interest can help optimize students' academic performance. Thus, students' academic interests must be maintained. The results also disagree with Ndim (2021) with the findings stating that students' academic interest can significantly influence their academic performance wherein 43 of the students who had a high academic interest performed better in class than their counterparts.

Findings of the study does not align with Arhin and Yanney (2020) wherein they stated that a strong relationship exists between students' interests and academic performance results, if students' academic interest is high, their academic performance will also increase.

Arhin & Yanney (2020) stated that a strong relationship exists between students' interests and academic performance. If students' academic interest is high, their academic performance will also increase. On the contrary, if the academic interest of students is low, then the academic performance of the students will also be low as well which the study's findings disagree.

The results also do not agree with the study of Kingsley and Anamezie (2022) wherein they revealed that students' academic interest is relatively and significantly contributed to their academic success. It was also revealed that every time students' academic interest increases, their academic performance increases as well. The study of Wong & Wong (2019) does not align with the results because their findings revealed that there is a significant relationship between the interest of students and their academic performance.

Advincula et al. (2023) also It was also revealed that there is a significant relationship between students' academic interest or motivation to their academic performance. This suggests that higher levels of academic motivation are associated with better academic outcomes. Sabanal et al. (2023) also stated that a positive relationship was found between students' motivation and their academic performance.

The findings underscore the importance of fostering high levels of student motivation to achieve strong academic performance. Same with Genie (2024) wherein the results of the study revealed that a strong positive relationship exists between students intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and their academic performance. Students were more intrinsically motivated, meaning they performed well due to interest or curiosity rather than external rewards.

The findings of the study also do not align with Liu et al. (2022) wherein he stated that regardless of age group, Intrinsic motivation consistently correlates positively with academic performance. It was also revealed that the academic performance of students benefits from both types of motivation especially when accompanied by active engagement and effort.

Galarpe et al. (2019) also stated that with positive attitude or interest in learning is linked to higher academic achievement. The findings also do not align with Abdelrahman (2020) wherein they stated that in terms of its relationship with students' academic performance, it was revealed that the academic motivation has a strong positive correlation with academic achievement. Moreover, significant correlations were also found between the academic achievement of students and their intrinsic motivation as well as their extrinsic motivation.

Despite these contradictory perspectives, the current data remains clear in its conclusion that interest and performance are not significantly related for this specific respondent group.

Relationship Between Students' Parental Support and Their Academic Performance

The table presented below shows the relationship between students' parental support and their academic performance.

Table 14. Relationship between Students Parental Support and their Academic Performance

Level of Parental Support	Level of Academic Performance					Total
	Outstanding	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fairly Satisfactory	Did not Meet Expectation	
Very High	38	7	7	3	0	55
High	132	24	5	1	0	162
Low	64	13	4	0	0	81
Very Low	5	1	0	0	0	6
Total	239	45	16	4	0	304

Computed value (G) : -0.156

p-value : 0.192

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Table 14. shows that out of the 304 respondents, 55 has a very high level of parental support, in which 38 has an outstanding level of academic performance, seven has a very satisfactory performance, there is also seven who has a satisfactory performance, and three with a fairly satisfactory level of academic performance. 162 of the respondents have a high level of parental support, 132 of them have an outstanding academic performance, 24 are very satisfactory, five are satisfactory, and one is fairly satisfactory. On the other hand, 81 of the respondents have a low level of parental support yet 64 has an outstanding level of academic performance, 13 are very satisfactory, and four are satisfactory. The remaining six has a very low level of parental support yet five of them have an outstanding academic performance and one is very satisfactory.

Overall, based on the value of 0.192 which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance, therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant relationship between students' parental support and their academic performance implying that the parental support that students receive does not affect their academic performance.

The findings imply that students, academic success is not contingent upon the level of support received from parents. This indicates that the students are capable of navigating their academic responsibilities effectively regardless of the domestic support structure available to them.

The results of the study agree with Valencia and Roberto (2020) wherein they also revealed that there is no relationship present between parental support and students' performance in terms of academics. According to them, parental involvement is not a factor that could affect students' academic performance. This means that the students could achieve academic success regardless of the level at which their parents involved themselves in their education. Catipay (2023) also found that there was no correlation or relationship between parents' involvement or style on the academic performance of students.

The findings of the study also agree with Naite (2021) that by analyzing the data, focusing on understanding the impact of parental involvement to students, the results of the study revealed that the parental income has no significant impact or relationship with the children's academic performance. The results do not agree with Darmayanti and Sadriani (2023) stating that Parental involvement has a significant impact on the desire of students to learn. Through parental involvement, the educational environment of students is improved. This shows that parental support plays an important role in the academic success and social development of students especially in high school. Same with the study of Widayati et al. (2022) wherein they stated that the parental support that student receive can impact their learning motivation or achievement of students. It is important that students receive parental support because it directly affects their academic performance.

The findings also do not agree with Ely et al. (2023) because a significant relationship was found in their study between students' parental support and their academic achievement. The results do not agree with Werang et al. (2024) as well. They revealed that the support students receive has a significant impact on their achievement. Moreover, according to this study's findings, students with supportive parents tend to become more determined to succeed. Same with, Bektiarso et al. (2024) also stated that there is a strong relationship between parental support and academic achievement. Parents' support can strengthen students' motivation to study.

The study also disagrees with Yieng et al. (2019). Their results of their study suggested that parental involvement can significantly influence the academic performance of students. It is evident that the parental support students receive has a positive influence on their education. Moreover, the respondents say most can communicate well with their parents about their academic lives. This also contributed to the positive relationship between the parental involvement of students concerning their academic performance with the same findings, the study of Shadhazad et al. (2020) stated that the support students receive from their parents is one of the strongest factors that could predict students' academic success. The results also revealed a significant association between the parental support students receive in relation to their academic performance which also contradicts the data presented in this study.

The study's results also do not align with the study of Batool (2020). They revealed that positive parenting can greatly affect the level of self-esteem of students as well as their academic achievement. Academic achievement is directly associated with compassionate and supportive parenting. Same with Flores and Perez (2022) wherein they stated that A significant relationship was also found between parents' involvement and their academic performance.

Guzman and Banaag (2023) also stated that parental involvement showed a significant correlation with students' academic performance indicating that the greater parental engagement in various aspects of their child's education can positively impact the student's academic outcome. Ogunkuade and Kenku (2022) also concluded academic achievement of students also varies in terms of the level of parental supervision they receive. Moreover, the demographic factors especially socio-economic status of parents has a significant impact on the academic achievement of students. Ullah and Almani (2022) revealed that a positive correlation between students' intrinsic motivation and their academic performance.

Despite these widespread findings in other contexts, the current data reinforces that for this respondent group, parental support does not significantly affect academic performance.

Relationship Between Students' Learning Environment and Their Academic Performance

The table presented on the next page shows the relationship between students' learning environment and their academic performance.

Table 15. Relationship Between Students Parental Support and their Academic Performance

Level of Learning Environment	Level of Academic Performance					Total
	Outstanding	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fairly Satisfactory	Did not Meet Expectation	
Very High	123	18	6	3	0	150
High	97	23	7	1	0	128
Low	18	4	3	0	0	25
Very Low	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	239	45	16	4	0	304

Computed value (G) : .165

p-value : 0.167

Decision : Accept Ho

Interpretation : Not Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Out of the 304 respondents, 150 reported a very high level of learning environment. Among them, 123 achieved an outstanding level of academic performance, 18 were very satisfactory, six were satisfactory, and three were fairly satisfactory. Meanwhile, 128 respondents reported a high level of learning environment. Of these, 97 achieved an outstanding academic performance, 23 were very satisfactory, seven were satisfactory, and one was fairly satisfactory. In contrast, 25 respondents reported a low level of learning environment; however, 18 still attained an outstanding level of academic performance, four were very satisfactory, and three were satisfactory. Lastly, one respondent reported a very low level of learning environment but still achieved an outstanding academic performance.

Based on the p-value of 0.167, which is higher than the 0.05 level of significance, there is no significant relationship between students' learning environment and their academic performance. The findings imply that the physical and social conditions of the learning environment, while potentially affecting comfort, are not the primary determinants of academic success. This indicates that a conducive environment is a beneficial background factor rather than a mechanical driver of grades.

The results agree with Daminabo and Okafor (2022) stating that the results of the study revealed that the learning environment in terms of infrastructural facilities did not significantly affect their academic performance which means that there was no significant relationship between students' learning environment and their performance in school. The findings disagree with the study of Kate (2023) wherein it was revealed that an adequate learning environment could facilitate good academic performance by giving students an effective place to learn. It has also been revealed that students' learning environment strongly relates to their academic performance.

It also disagrees with the study of Munir et al. (2023) because they revealed that there is a significant relationship between the learning environment of students and their academic performance. The results also showed that when students' learning environment improves, their performance also increases. Suleiman (2023) also revealed that the poor school environment like limited resources, poor infrastructure, and insufficient academic support systems is also one of the factors that negatively influenced the academic performance of students.

Same with Matoy (2021) wherein it was found that there is a significant correlation between students' classroom environments and their academic performance. When students' learning environments improve, their academic performance also increases. The study of Baafi (2020) also does not align with the results because According to his findings, senior high school students performed better academically when they were in a pleasant physical environment compared to the students who were taught in an unconducive learning environment. This shows that it is important that schools develop a positive climate suitable for students' learning.

Aneke (2022) also stated that when provided with adequate resources, students learn easily, resulting in higher academic performance. On the contrary, students will likely have lower academic performance when provided with poor and inadequate facilities and overcrowded rooms which contradicted the findings of the study.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Based on the results of the study, the following findings were made:

1. Based on the results presented, most of the respondents are female, with a frequency of 169 or 55.59 percent. Most of the respondents are from the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) with 135 or 44.41 percent. The data also revealed that in terms of their parents' educational attainment, 129 or 42.43 percent of the respondents' parents have a degree in college. In terms of their average family income, most of the respondents have an income less than Php 9,520 while 98 or 32.24 percent of the respondent's family has an income between Php 9,521 to Php 19,040.
2. The level of study interest of Grade 11 students across different profiles is consistently interpreted as high. Female students have a higher level of study interest with a mean of 2.85 compared to males with 2.80. Among the senior high school tracks, HUMSS students recorded the highest mean of 2.90 while HE students had the lowest mean of 2.67. In terms of parents' educational attainment, students whose parents reached high school level have a mean of 2.86 and high school graduate with a mean of 2.85 reported slightly higher study interest compared to others. For family income, those from families earning at least Php 190,401 per month showed the highest level of study interest with a mean of 3.05, while students from families earning Php 38,081 to Php 66,640 had the lowest mean of 2.65.
3. The level of study interest of Grade 11 students, when analyzed by domains, shows consistently high levels across all domains. Intrinsic orientation recorded the highest mean of 2.96. This is followed by values-related valences with 2.82. Feelings-related valences, with a mean of 2.70 still fall within the high

interpretation. Overall, with a combined mean of 2.83, students exhibit a high level of study interest as a whole.

4. The level of parental support by students when grouped according to profile is high, with females receiving a higher parental support with a mean of 2.81. Among the senior high school tracks, IA students recorded the highest level of parental support with a mean of 3.08 compared to other track and strands. In terms of their parents' educational attainment, students receive a higher parental support on their parents whose educational attainment is an elementary and high school graduate with both having a mean of 2.88. In terms of their family's average monthly income, those who have an income between Php 114,241 to Php 190,400 has the highest mean of 2.95, in which all are interpreted as high.
5. The level of parental support of students when taken as a whole in terms of parental expectations, parent-child communication, homework support, and school-based involvement is high with a total mean of 2.74. Individually, parental expectations have the highest mean of 3.39 interpreted as very high while homework support is the lowest with a mean of 2.58, interpreted as high.
6. In terms of the level of learning environment among Grade 11 students, both male and female students recorded the same mean of 3.17. Among the senior high school tracks, ABM students reported the highest mean of 3.34, while ICT students had the lowest with a mean of 3.02, though all were still interpreted as high. In terms of parents' educational attainment, students whose parents reached only the primary level reported a very high learning environment with a mean of 3.55, while others ranged from high to very high. Regarding average family monthly income, those in the Php 114,241 to Php 190,400 range recorded the highest mean of 3.70. Overall, with an overall mean of 3.17, students have a high-level learning environment.
7. The overall level of academic performance of students are outstanding with a mean of 91.55.
8. There is no significant difference in the level of study interest of students when grouped according to sex, as indicated by the computed p-value of 0.330, which exceeds the 0.05 level of significance. Similarly, there is no significant difference in the level of parental support received by students based on sex, supported by the computed p-value of 0.843. Furthermore, the level of learning environment of students also shows no significant difference when grouped according to sex, as evidenced by the computed p-value of 0.993.
9. There is a significant difference in the level of study interest of students when grouped according to their senior high school track and strand, based on the p-value of 0.008. Similarly, there is a significant difference in the level of parental support received by students based on their track and strand, supported by the computed p-value of 0.009. On the other hand, the level of learning environment of students shows no significant difference when grouped according to their senior high school track and strand, based on the p-value of 0.23.
10. There is no significant difference in the level of study interest of students when grouped according to their parents' educational attainment, based on the computed p-value of 0.620. Similarly, there is no significant difference in the level of parental support received by students based on their parents' educational attainment, supported by the computed p-value of 0.308. Furthermore, the level of learning environment of students also shows no significant difference when grouped according to their parents' educational attainment, based on the p-value of 0.628.
11. There is no significant difference in the level of study interest of students when grouped according to their average family monthly income, as indicated by the computed p-value of 0.241. Similarly, there is no significant difference in the level of parental support received by students based on their average family monthly income, supported by the computed p-value of 0.504. Furthermore, the level of learning environment of students also shows no significant difference when grouped according to their average family monthly income, based by the computed p-value of 0.023.
12. Based on the p-value of 0.513, there is no significant relationship between Grade 11 students' study interest and their academic performance.
13. Based on the p-value of 0.192, there is no significant relationship between Grade 11 students' parental support and their academic performance.
14. Based on the p-value of 0.167, there is no significant relationship between Grade 11 students' learning environment and their academic performance.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Based on the findings of the study, most of the respondents are females and are from the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS). Most of them have parents with a degree and college and has an average income of less than Php 9,520.
2. The level of study interest of Grade 11 students is generally high across all profiles. Female students reported a slightly higher study interest than males, and students from families with higher income levels showed the highest levels of study interest.
3. When analyze based on its domains, the study interest of students remained high, with intrinsic orientation scoring the highest among all domains.
4. Grade 11 students receive a high level of parental support overall, with IA strand students receiving the highest parental support among the different tracks and strands.
5. The overall level of parental support among students is high, with parental expectations being the highest and homework support being the lowest.
6. The learning environment of Grade 11 students is also high regardless of their sex, especially among ABM students and those who came from higher-income families.
7. The academic performance of Grade 11 senior high students is outstanding which means that they are able to perform excellently in school.
8. The study interest, parental support, and learning environment of Grade 11 students do not differ when grouped according to sex.
9. There is a significant difference in the study interest and parental support of students when grouped according to their track and strand. However, no significant difference was found in their learning environment.
10. The study interest, parental support, and learning environment of Grade 11 students do not differ when grouped according to parents' educational attainment.
11. The study interest, parental support, and learning environment of Grade 11 students does not differ when grouped according to average family monthly income.
12. The study interest of Grade 11 students does not affect their academic performance.
13. The parental support Grade 11 students receive does not affect their academic performance.
14. The learning environment of Grade 11 students does not affect their academic performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the summary of findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. School administrators may offer variety of extracurricular activities, workshop, and seminars to cater to various students' interest and talent to further enhance students' abilities based on their chosen track and strand. Moreover, they could organize parent-teacher conferences to educate parents about the importance of their involvement in their children's education. They may also consider improving students' environment by renovation and integration of technology.
2. Teachers may utilize online platforms in facilitating the communication between parents and teachers, allowing them to track their children's academic progress and get more involve in school- based programs.
3. Parents may consider supporting their child's interest and create a healthy learning environment for their children inside their homes.
4. Future researchers may conduct this study in a larger scale involving more students to ensure that the whole population is represented. Moreover, they could also consider more variables that is essential for the quality learning of students.

REFERENCES

1. Abdelrahman, R. (2020). Metacognitive awareness and academic motivation and them impact on academic achievement of Ajman University students. Retrieved from Heliyon: [https://www.cell.com/heliyon/fulltext/S2405-8440\(20\)31036-7](https://www.cell.com/heliyon/fulltext/S2405-8440(20)31036-7)
2. Adewale, B., Jegede.Foluke, Okubote.Feyisayo, & Olagbadegun, M. (2021). Impact of classroom environments' on the academic performance of architecture students in covenant university. International Conference on Energy and Sustainable Environment. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1088/1755-1315/665/1/012017>
3. Advincula, A., Morales, R., & Morales, R. (2023). Senior high school students' academic stress, academic motivation, and its relationship with their academic performance . Retrieved from issn:https://www.irjmets.com/uploadedfiles/paper//issue_4_april_2023/36164/final/fin_irjmets1681885157.pdf
4. Ahmed, g., tayyub, m., & ismail, r. (2020). Effects of classroom environment for improving students' learning at secondary level in punjab province, pakistan. Retrieved from science academique: <https://scienceacademique.com/archives/338>
5. Arhin, d., & yanney, e. (2020). Relationship between students' interest and academic in mathematics: a study of agogo state. Global scientific journals, 8(6). https://doi.org/https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342453651_relationship_between_students'_interest_and_academic_performance_in_mathematics_a_study_of_agogo_state_college
6. Ayirah, f., & kofi. (2021). Factors influencing academic performance of senior high school students in the cape coast metropolis. Retrieved from university of cape coast institutional: <http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/2928>
7. Azmer, a., rabun, m., & syakir, m. (2021). The correlates between students' sociodemographic and socioeconomic background factors and level of academic achievement: a case of uitm kampus kuala pilah students. Retrieved from jas: https://jas.uitm.edu.my/images/2021_dec/jas9.pdf
8. Bakare, j., maashin, a., & yisa, m. (2022). Influence of demographic variables on academic performance and entrepreneurial intentions of electro-mechanical technology students of nigerian universities. Retrieved from issn: <https://rsisinternational.org/virtual-library/papers/influence-of-demographic-variables-on-academic-performance-and-entrepreneurial-intentions-of-electro-mechanical-technology-students-of-nigerian-universities/>
9. Barbarona, a., & montejo, g. (2024). The mediating effect of attitude and knowledge on. International research journal of modernization in engineering technology and science, 6(6). <https://doi.org/https://www.doi.org/10.56726/irjmets59272>
10. Bardi, A., Lee, J. A., Hofmann-Towfigh, N., & Soutar, G. (2020). The structure of value relations: A new dataset for testing theories of value dynamics and development. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 51(7–8), 529–548. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022120941010>
11. Barger, M. M., Kim, E. M., Kuncel, N. R., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2021). The relation between parents' involvement in children's schooling and children's adjustment: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 147(5), 452–484. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000321>
12. Baron, j. (2022). Level of academic performance among senior high school students: a differential study. Retrieved from scimatic: <https://scimatic.org/storage/journals/11/pdfs/371.pdf>
13. Bektiarso, s., pratiwi, g., mustikarani, t., & mu'allimah, i. (2024). The role of parental support in the relationship between motivation and student learning outcomes. International journal of social science and human research, 2665-2669.
14. Brew, e., nketiah, b., & koranteng, r. (2021). A literature review of academic performance,. Open access library journal, 8(7423). https://doi.org/https://www.scirp.org/pdf/oalibj_2021060114294888.pdf
15. Catipay, j. (2023). Parenting styles and academic performance of senior high school students. Retrieved from american journal of humanities and social sciences research (ajhssr) : <https://www.ajhssr.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/p23706117127.pdf>

16. Carmona, m., salonava, m., & schaufeli, w. (2022). The strengthening starts at home: parent–child relationships, psychological capital, and academic. Retrieved from <https://repositori.uji.es/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10234/190011/71332.pdf?sequence=1&isallowed=y>
17. Cruz, s., & vargas, d. (2021). Relationship of learning environment and academic performance of grade eight students in public secondary schools. Ssrn. https://doi.org/https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3832562
18. Dangara, u., & geraldine, m. (2019). Evaluation of the effect of learning environment on student's academic performance in nigeria. Retrieved from eric: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ed602386.pdf>
19. Daminabo, d., & okafor, b. (2022). Environmental challenges and academic performance of senior secondary school students in enugu state. Retrieved from global research network: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/dagogo-daminabo2/publication/359627331_environmental_challenges_and_academic_performance_of_senior_secondary_school_students_in_enugu_state/links/6245cd568068956f3c5c6b28/environmental-challenges-and-academic-performa
20. Darmayanti, d., & sadriani, a. (2023). The importance of parental involvement in the education process: an. Celebes journal of elementary education, 1(1), 8-13. <https://doi.org/https://ojs.unsulbar.ac.id/index.php/cjee/index>
21. Donkor, m., atta, g., acheampong, f., & asiamah, e. (2024). Effects of parental involvement in education on the academic achievement of students in ghana. Publication of the european centre for research training and development -uk, 12(1), 49-65. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37745/bjpr.2013/vol12n14965>
22. Edelson, d., & joseph, d. (2023). The interest-driven learning design framework: motivating. Retrieved from repository: <https://repository.isls.org/bitstream/1/3939/1/166-173.pdf>
23. Edgerton, e., & mckechnie, j. (2023). The relationship between student's perceptions of their school environment and academic achievement. Frontiers, 13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.959259>
24. Ely, n., purwadi, & muarifah, a. (2023). Parents' social support and adjustment to students' learning motivation in junior high school country 18 central maluku. Retrieved from semantic scholar: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/parents'-social-support-and-adjustment-to-students'ely/e6db81afd4df908a16af7072b8f31e5896c39fe6>
25. Esteban, i. C., jabonillo, k. J., & solera, n. (2019). Demographic profile: factors affecting the academic performance of students living in rural areas. Retrieved from umir: <https://repository.umindanao.edu.ph/handle/20.500.14045/261>
26. Flores, d., & perez, h. (2022). Parent-school-community involvement in the academic performance of senior high school students-gas (grade 11 and 12) in one public high school in the new normal: towards project isla. Retrieved from american journal of interdisciplinary research and innovation: <https://journals.e-palli.com/home/index.php/ajiri/article/view/466>
27. Fuertes, h., evangelista, i., marcellones, i., & bacactan, j. (2023). Student engagement, academic motivation, and academic performance of intermediate level students. Retrieved from international journal of novel research in education and learning : <https://philarchive.org/archive/fuesea>
28. Gabriel, b., lazaro, c., & mimpin, h. (2024). Senior high school students' motivation toward science learning and science academic performance. Retrieved from works: <https://works.hcommons.org/records/4pt3d-48447>
29. Galarpe, s., maria, m., aperece, f., & moneva, j. (2019). Academic performance of grade 12 students in personal development. Retrieved from international journal of novel research in education and learning : <https://www.noveltyjournals.com/upload/paper/academic%20performance%20of%20grade-1649.pdf>
30. Garbacz, S. A., Herman, K. C., Thompson, A. M., & Reinke, W. M. (2021). Parent involvement in education: Conceptualizations, relationships, and interventions. School Psychology Review, 50(2–3), 221–235. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2020.1862620>
31. Garces nn, esteves fajardo zi, santander villao ml, mejía caguana dr, quito Esteves ac. Relationships between mental well-being and academic performance in university students.

32. Genie, s. (2024). Academic performance and motivation of the senior high school pantawid familyang pilipino program beneficiaries: basis for an action plan. Retrieved from international journal of research publication and reviews: <https://ijrpr.com/uploads/v5issue5/ijrpr28351.pdf>
- Guzman, s., & banaag, l. (2023). Correlational study among parents' demographic profile, level of parental involvement, and pupils' academic performance in the modular distance learning of kasiglahan village elementary school. Retrieved from philippine e-journals: <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=21668>
33. Harefa, d. (2023). The relationship between students' interest in learning and mathematics learning outcomes. *Afore*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.57094/afore.v2i2.1054>
34. Huang, C., & Prochner, L. (2021). Parental academic expectations and children's school performance: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(2), 515–540. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09558-0>Johare, j., gonzales, m.
35. Libarnes, f., maceda, k., & limbaga, v. (2024). Effects of motivation to the academic performance of senior high school students in northwestern agusan colleges in the a.y. 2023-2024. Retrieved from international journal of academic multidisciplinary research (ijamr): <http://ijeais.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/1/ijamr240106.pdf>
36. Kong, s., & wang, y. (2021). The influence of parental support and perceived usefulness on students' learning motivation and flo. *Bera*, 52(4), 1749-1770. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13071>
37. Kwarikunda, d., schiefele, u., ssenyonga, j., & muwonge, c. (2020). The relationship between motivation for, and interest in, learning physics among lower secondary school students in uganda. *African journal of research in mathematics, science and technology education*, 24(3). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/18117295.2020.1841961>
38. Li, d., tang, z., & zhao, n. (2023). How does users' interest influence their click behavior?: evidence from chinese online video media. Retrieved from pubmed central : <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc10359899/>
39. Liu, c., shi, y., & wang, y. (2022). Self-determination theory in education: the relationship between motivation and academic performance of primary school, high school, and college students. Retrieved from atlantis press: <https://www.atlantis-press.com/article/125975933.pdf>
40. Liu, Y., & Lu, Z. (2020). Parental education and academic achievement of students: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 30, 100336. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100336>
41. Mappadang, a., khusaini, k., sinaga, m., & elizabeth, e. (2022). Academic interest determines the academic performance of undergraduate accounting students: multinomial logit evidence. *Cogent business and management*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2022.2101326>
42. Moneva, j., & gonzaga, j. (2020). Parental motivation and students' interest in their studies. *Asia pacific journal of academic research in social sciences*, 5(1), 71-76. <https://doi.org/https://research.lpubatangas.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/apjarss-2020.010.pdf>
43. Monteiro, v., carvalho, c., & santos, n. (2021). Creating a supportive classroom environment through effective feedback: effects on students' school identification and behavioral engagement. Retrieved from frontiers: <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2021.661736/full>
44. Munir, m., ali, m., iqbal, a., farid, m., & siddique, m. (2021). Relationship between learning environment and performance of students at university level. *Humanities & social sciences reviews*, 9(3), 877-884. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2021.9385>
45. Mwinyi, h., omoro, m., & nsolezi, f. (2024). Parents' demographic characteristics and their involvement in student retention in kwimba district, tanzania. Retrieved from educational dimension: <https://acnsci.org/journal/index.php/ed/article/view/799/812>
46. Naite, i. (2021). Impact of parental involvement on children's academic. Retrieved from 2020 international symposium on water, ecology and environment: doi:10.1088/1755-1315/690/1/012064

47. Naite, i. (2021). Impact of parental involvement on children's academic performance at crescent international school, bangkok, thailand. Retrieved from purpose led publishing:<https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/690/1/012064/pdf>
48. Ogunkuade, i., & kenku, a. (2022). Socio-demographic determinants of academic achievement among secondary school students in the federal capital territory, abuja, nigeria: empirical analysis. Retrieved from international journal of social sciences: <https://www.ijsshr.com/journal/index.php/ijsshr/article/view/845>
49. Okigbo, e., & odiri, o. (2023). Relationship between academic motivation and academic performance of secondary school students in mathematics. Retrieved from indonesian journal of learning education and counseling: <https://journal.ilininstitute.com/index.php/ijolec/article/view/2058>
50. Owoeeye, o., faleye, b., & jimoh, k. (2022). Student factors and parental involvement on academic performance of senior secondary school students qualifying examination in osun state secondary schools. Retrieved from journal of digital learning and education: <https://journal.moripublishing.com/index.php/jdle/article/view/344>
51. Padilla, e., ramirez, a., ramirez, w., & gutierrez, j. (2023). Parental participation and parents' support: effects on mathematics achievement, 2018 national assessment of learning, mexico. Frontiers. <https://doi.org/doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.115447>
52. Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Coyne, S. M. (2020). Technology and parent-child communication: The role of media in fostering or hindering relationships. *Child Development Perspectives*, 14(1), 55-60. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12357>
53. Philippine Statistics Authority. (2022). Family income and expenditure survey 2021. Retrieved from <https://psa.gov.ph/content/family-income-and-expenditure-survey- Fies>
54. Ramos, c. (2024). Factors affecting the academic performance of pangasinan merchant marine academy's bachelor of marine transportation students. <https://doi.org/doi:10.22161/ijels.92.8>
55. Rozas, b., martin, e., & molina, e. (2022). Defining the profile of students with low academic achievement: a cross-country analysis through pisa 2018 data. Retrieved from frontiers:<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2022.910039/full>
56. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
57. Sanghi, s. (2022). Age as a site of law's meaning-making practices. Retrieved from springerlink: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s41020-022-00185-6>
57. Saromines, r., & villocino, r. (2024). Evels of motivation and the academic performance of senior high schoolstudents`. https://ijariie.com/adminuploadpdf/levels_of_motivation_and_theacademic_performance_of_seniorhigh_school_students_ijariie24464.pdf?srsltid=afmboorxyd8xvkt9czdo8oiicqwrlmfq3fsexxzandp2qgilets7n5a
58. Shah, z., mushtaq, m., & akhtar, j. (2020). Exploring the impact of demographic variables gender, parental education and locality on science achievement. Retrieved from bulletin of education and research: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ej1257994.pdf>
59. Siddiky, r., & haque, i. E. (2024). Factors affecting students' academic performance mediated by. *Asian journal of university education (ajue)*.
60. Sugiyarto, b., widodo, a., & budi, l. (2024). The analysis of smk students' interesttopursuehigher education. *Advances in social science, education and humanities research*. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-198-2_137
61. Sutton, j. (2020). Erik erikson's stages of psychosocial development explained. Retrieved from positivepsychology:[https://positivepsychology.com/eriksonstages/#:~:text=erik%20erikson's%20\(1958%2c%201963\),from%20infancy%20to%20old%20age.](https://positivepsychology.com/eriksonstages/#:~:text=erik%20erikson's%20(1958%2c%201963),from%20infancy%20to%20old%20age.)
62. Tadese, m., yeshaneh, a., & mulu, g. (2022). Determinants of good academic performance among university students in ethiopia: a cross-sectional stud. Retrieved from bmc : <https://bmcmmededuc.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12909-022-03461-0>

63. Tan, j., jiang, y., & ming, g. (2021). The influence of academic emotions on learning effects: a systematic review. Retrieved from pubmed central: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc8472431/>
64. Taylor, i., coffie, i., agyei, s., & ackah, j. (2021). Teachers and students perception of the low academic performance of senior high school students in integrated science in ghana. Asian journal of education. <https://doi.org/https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/teachers-and-students-perception-of-the-low-of-high-taylor-coffie/5269a9625aa9d24e022f0234503ec84f99c536e6>
65. Ullah, n., & almani, a. (2022). Factors affecting students' academic performance: a case study of secondary schools of makran division balochistan, pakistan. Retrieved from webology: [https://www.webology.org/data-cms/articles/20220215110352amwebology%2019%20\(2\)%20-%20201%20pdf.pdf](https://www.webology.org/data-cms/articles/20220215110352amwebology%2019%20(2)%20-%20201%20pdf.pdf)
66. Widayati, t., fauzan, a., & khilmiyah, a. (2022). The effect of parental support and self regulated. International journal of social service and research. <https://doi.org/https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/international-journal-of-social-service-and-the-of-widayati-khilmiyah/2d7cf9fd138ba15b8c143234064c5eea6226629d>
67. Yarin, a., encalada, i., elias, j., surichaqui, a., sulca, r., & pozo, f. (2022). Relationship between motivation and academic performance in peruvian undergraduate students in the subject mathematics. Retrieved from wiley online library: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1155/2022/3667076>
68. Yieng, l., katenga, j., & kijai, j. (2019). The effect of parental support on academic performance among students at asia-pacific international university. Abstract proceedings international scholars conference, 7(1), 1432-1453. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35974/isc.v7i1.895>
69. Adewale, o. adeleye, adenuga akinyemi e, idowu, james o, soyombo aminat k. Socio-Demographic status as a predictor of academic performance among human kinetic and health education students of olabisi onabanjo university. Journal of social behavior and community health (jsbch). 2022; 6(2): 901-908.
70. Arabianmemory. (2022). Definition of academic excellence. Retrieved from arabianmemory: <https://arabianmemory.com/memory/en/english-definition-of-academic-excellence/Amaoed>. (2021). Online senior high. Retrieved from amaoed: <https://www.onlineshs.com/guide-to-all-strands-in-senior-high>
71. Bates, t. (2020). What is a learning environment? Retrieved from libretexts: [https://socialsci.libretexts.org/bookshelves/education_and_professional_development/teaching_in_a_digital_age_2e_\(bates\)/06%3a_building_an_effective_learning_environment/06.2%3a_what_is_a_learning_environment](https://socialsci.libretexts.org/bookshelves/education_and_professional_development/teaching_in_a_digital_age_2e_(bates)/06%3a_building_an_effective_learning_environment/06.2%3a_what_is_a_learning_environment)
72. Bin abdulrahman, k. A., alshehri, a. S., alkhalfah, k. M., alasiri, a., aldayel, m. S., Alahmari, f. S., alothman, a. M., & alfadhel, m. A. (2023). The relationship between motivation and academic performance among medical students in riyadh. Cureus, 15(10), e46815. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.46815>
73. Brew, e.a., nketiah, b. And koranteng, r. (2021) a literature review of academic Performance, an insight into factors and their influences on academic outcomes of students at senior high schools. Open access library journal, 8: e7423. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1107423>
74. Bhandari, r., & timsina, t. (2024). Scrutinizing the impact of family economic status on students' academic achievement. Retrieved from nepal journals online: <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/irjmmc/article/view/63047>
75. Canillo, j., dacillo, v., relatos, j. T., paran, j., alesna, t. K., soliban, m. L., & alvarez, F. (2024). Students' engagement and academic performance among accountancy, business and management (abm) students of tuyom senior high school and gelacio c. Babao sr. Memorial national high school. International multidisciplinary journal of research for innovation, sustainability, and excellence (imjrise), 1(5), 312-317. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/view/397>
76. Chen, z. (2024). The effect of learning interests on academic performance of secondary school student. Retrieved from researchgate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383314175_the_effect_of_learning_interests_on_academic_performance_of_secondary_school_student

77. Corpuz, jaysi & pena, glenda & baconguis, rowena. (2022). Achievement, affiliation, Power and academic performance of business management students of a state university in cavite, philippines. Cogent social sciences. 8.10.1080/23311886.2022.2060538.
78. De leon, i. P. (2023). A decade of tweaking, rethinking: looking back at k-12 program. Retrieved from inquirer.net: <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1872796/a-decade-of-tweaking-rethinking-looking-back-at-k-12-program>
79. Department of education. (n.d.). Understanding deped k-12 program in the philippines. Retrieved from deped: <https://depedph.com/deped-k-12-program/>
80. Dizon, jermie & david, eden & leoveras, ma elizabeth & rosa, rhodora. (2023). descriptive analysis of socio-demographic profile, family structure, and parental involvement during the modular distance education on the student's academic achievement in science. International journal of sciences: basic and applied research (ijsbar). 67. 185-203.
81. Gonzales, e., & digo, g. (2024). Senior high school track and course preference of the students. Retrieved from researchgate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379029335_senior_high_school_track_and_course_preference_of_the_students
82. Hu, h., lu, h. Academic motivation among senior students majoring in rehabilitation Related professions in china. BMC med educ 21, 582 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-03016-9>
83. Jenny grace i. Almazan, digna a. Jacob, christa jesusa s.saniatan, & jeffrey galangco. (2020). Stem curriculum implementation and academic performance of senior high school students. The vector: international journal of emerging science, technology and management (ijestm), 29(1). <https://doi.org/10.69566/ijestm.v29i1.60>
84. Kragel, P. A., & LaBar, K. S. (2020). Emotional valence and arousal shape neural dynamics of cognitive control. Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 36, 131–138. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.09.002>
85. Kunwar, r. (2020). The effect of demographic variables on secondary level students'. Retrieved from nepaljournalonline: <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/researcher/article/download/33710/26509>
86. Liu, j., peng, p. & lu, l. The relation between family socioeconomic status and Academic achievement in china: a meta-analysis. Educ psychol rev 32, 49–76 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09494-0>
87. Malaguial, p., martinez, e., abusama, h., & valdez, a. (2023). Senior high school strands: factors affecting the students' preference. Retrieved from asean journal of educational research and technology: <https://ejournal.bumipublikasinusantara.id/index.php/ajert/article/viewfile/135/13>
88. Mazure, c. (2021). What do we mean by sex and gender? Retrieved from yale school of medicine: <https://medicine.yale.edu/news-article/what-do-we-mean-by-sex-and-gender/>
89. Middleton, f. (2023). Reliability vs. Validity in research | difference, types and examples. Retrieved from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/reliability-vs-validity/>
90. Miesner, e. (2023). Boosting interest in learning by focusing on both content and students' needs. Retrieved from edutopia: <https://www.edutopia.org/article/increasing-student-interest-learning/Coffie/5269a9625aa9d24e022f0234503ec84f99c536e6>
91. Ramasamy, p., and s. Deepika. “a study on socio-demographic profile and parental Bonding among boys in madurai corporation schools.” Shanlax international journal of education, vol. 7,no. 4, 2019, pp. 63-69.
92. Regidor, analyn r., armida t. Vesmanos, and prima o. Deguito. 2024. “the impact of Supportive learning environment on student learning motivation of senior high school students”. Asian journal of education and social studies 50 (7):558-71. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i71487>.
93. Rivera, h., chang, h., zhu, y. J., & taheri, m. (2024). Examining the home learning environment practices for emergent bilinguals: insights from parental survey. Retrieved from mdpi: <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/14/11/1152>
94. Suleiman, a. (2023) factors that affect students' academic achievement in the faculty of social science at the university of bosaso, garowe, somalia. Open journal of social sciences, 11, 446-461. Doi: 10.4236/jss.2023.112029.

95. Suman, s., & sinha, p. (2020). Interest in science of secondary school students in relation to parental education. Retrieved from researchgatehttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/344326815_interest_in_science_of_secondary_school_students_in_relation_to_parental_education
96. Suna, h. E., tanberkan, h., gür, b., perc, m., et al. (2020). Socioeconomic status and School type as predictors of academic achievement. Journal of economy culture and society(61), 41-64. <https://doi.org/10.26650/jecs2020-0034>
97. Tron, c., & khabirymbai, b. (2021). Educational interest in relation to academic achievement of the secondary school students in meghalaya, india. Retrieved from journal of education culture and society: <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs2021.1.555.562>
98. Tus, jhoselle. (2020). Academic stress, academic motivation, and its relationship on the academic performance of the senior high school students. 8. 29-37.10.6084/m9.figshare. 13174952.v1.
99. Tus, j. (2020). Self-efficacy and its influence on the academic performance of the senior school students. Journal of global research in education and social science, 13(6), 213–218. Retrieved from https://ikprress.org/index.php/jogress/article/view/high_4854
100. Vadivel, b., alam, s., nikpoo, i., & ajanil, b. (2023). The impact of low socioeconomicbackground on a child's educational achievements. Retrieved from wiley online Library: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1155/2023/6565088>
101. The bryq team. (2021). A guide to holland's theory and holland codes. Retrieved from bryq: <https://www.bryq.com/blog/bryq-guide-to-holland-codes>
102. Wgu. (2020). What is cognitive learning? Retrieved from wgu: <https://www.wgu.edu/blog/what-is-cognitive-learning2003.html>
103. Yurt, eyüp. (2022). Examining high school students' academic amotivation. 1. 51-63. 10.5281/zenodo.676235
104. Zhigang, c., aeamtussana, t., & chularut, p... (2023). Factors affecting on academic success of senior high school students. Journal of modern learning development, 8(7), 291–305. Retrieved from <https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jomld/article/view/266002>