Journal of Education & Humanities Research (JEHR)
Institute of Education & Research (IER), University of Balochistan, Quetta-Pakistan
Volume: 16, Issue-II, 2023; ISSN:2415-2366 (Print) 2710-2971 (Online)
Email: *jehr@um.uob.edu.pk*
URL: *http://web.uob.edu.pk/uob/Journals/jehr/jehr.php*

"Profiling the Factors affecting the Social Support and Academic Resilience of Undergraduate University Students"

Tooba Saleem: *Lecturer, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan.*
Aafia Zia: *Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan.*
Nasir Mehmood: *Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan.*

Received: October 29, 2023
Accepted: December 20, 2023
Published: December 31, 2023

KEY WORDS

Informational Support, Esteem Support, Motivational Support, Venting Support.

ABSTRACT

This current research focused on the role of background factors which influence social support and academic resilience traits among university students. Social support mitigates the stressful academic situations for students and academic resilience ensure efficient completion of academic tasks despite of difficulties faced by them. The cross-sectional survey design was used to collect responses from participants on adapted scales of social support and academic resilience. The data were collected from university students (n=600). The reliability and validity of adapted scales were ensured. The findings of the study revealed that there was no significant difference among social support and academic resilience based on their gender, age, enrolled program, semester, job status and locale. However, a significant difference in informational support was found among students based on their discipline. The findings further identified that students from sciences received better informational support as compared to students from other disciplines. This infers that background factors influence students' social support and academic resilience as several social and personal factors contribute to students' motivation to complete their study program

Introduction

University students from face to face and online learning setups confront variety of challenges which focuses on academic, interpersonal and environmental modifications. Their transition from high schools not only increases stress but also demands coping ability in order to inhibit psychological disturbances among them (Steinhardt & Dolbeir, 2008). More specifically, students are stressed out from summative assessments, more independence towards their learning, increased personal and social responsibilities and sometimes face isolation (Hartley, 2011). These stressful life experiences influences students in personal, social and academic life. Specifically, the challenges of distance learners in transformed learning practices focuses on digital literacies (Pawlicka, Tomaszewska, Krause, Jaroszewska-Chorąś, Pawlicki & Chorąś, 2022) complex technologies and difficulty in accessing authentic sources of learning (Barrot, Llenares & Del Rosario, 2021). Further challenges concentrates on disruptive home environment, increased workload (Adedoyin & Soykan 2020), Partial understandings (Mishra, Gupta & Shree, 2020), ineffective time management, family and monetary concerns (Warsi, 2021). This demands for the social support mechanism

These challenges require effective support structure and resilience among students to deal with them (Adhawiyah, Rahayu & Suhesty, 2021). There was significant influence of social support on academic resilience among university students (Sabouripour & Roslan, 2015) and these factors facilitate students to continue their learning practices while inhibiting academic burnout among them (Liu & Cao, 2022).

Moreover, social support is described as verbal and non-verbal assistance provided through information, concrete advice, action based facilitations by familiar individual in their social network. The support focuses on emotional benefits that ensures feelings of well-being (Gottlieb, Underwood & Cohen, 2000 as cited in Sujiarto, Solahudin, Mudrikah, Kosasih & Trisnamansyah, 2022). Moreover, several functions are performed by social support. Sarafino, Smith, King and DeLongis (2015) described social support functions based on the work of Cutrona and Gardner (2004) and Uchino (2004) as emotional or esteem support emphasizing on the assurance of social networks in providing positive regard and care. Secondly, Tangible or informational support that emphasizes on direct assistance in form of guidance and feedback by their social networks. Finally, the companionship support that underlines the feelings of belongingness to social groups and their accessibility to hang around with them. These functions facilitate individuals to cope with difficult academic scenarios and strengthen their relationship with their social networks to ensure their psychological wellbeing.

Furthermore, academic resilience is considered as reassuring behaviors expected from students while confronting threats and challenges in academic nature (Gizir, 2004). In addition, resilient students are able to efficiently deal with setbacks, challenge,

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

adversity and pressure in academic settings (Martin & Marsh, 2006). Academic resilience is considered as the influential predictor for effective learning experiences of students in school while participating in their class routines and sustaining their self-esteem (Martin & Marsh, 2009). There are varied threatening situations and risks involved in academic resilience as proximal risk which are directly experienced and distal risk which are indirectly experienced by students. They further described that risk factors faced by leaners are low performance, maintenance of better grades and dropout. Moreover these risk factors are encountered through protective factors of academic resilience as problem solving, self-efficacy, empathy (internal factors) and social support from family, school and community members (external factors). They focus on both personal and social aspects that facilitate students to bounce back from academic adversity and challenges.

Literature Review

Social support and academic resilience pave way for effective learning among students while enhancing their skills and competencies to continue their higher education despite varied challenges. Wilson, Weiss and Shook (2020) describes that social support from social agents dampens the effect of stressful experiences in academic nature while enhancing their psychological wellbeing. Similarly, Yıldırım and Tanrıverdi (2021) argued that support from family, friends and others promote resilience among college students and ensures higher satisfaction with life.

Furthermore, the researcher identified positive relationship between social support and academic resilience among undergraduate students at Columbia. Friends are the paramount source of support while transited from high schools and experienced online learning practices in wake of pandemic. The student were able to utilize family and friends support to discuss their frustrations (venting) and instructors facilitated their informational and motivational support by providing direct academic assistances towards challenging tasks and concepts. The researcher further argued that academic resilience was promoted through information support and their interaction with different social agents to deal with academic challenges (Lady, 2021). Similarly, Sujiarto, Solahudin, Mudrikah, Kosasih, and Trisnamansyah (2022) identified that social support and academic resilience positively and significantly influence academic resilience of Indonesian students while employing pathway analysis.

Moreover, Kwan (2022) identified high level of academic resilience and campus connectedness. However, moderate level academic burnout was found among under graduate students in context to Singapore. They further described positive association between resilience and campus connectedness but academic burnout was negatively related to resilience level and campus connectedness. They also found that resilience levels of female students were slightly lower than male counterparts. Besides, no significant difference existed between them. In addition, they found that number of years enrolled at university and

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

resilience levels were not significantly different.

In addition, Buren (2019) argued the academic success is the beneficial byproduct that is achieved through adequate resilience traits among university students. Their findings suggested that no significant difference among resilience scores of male and female undergraduate students existed. Besides, better reliance scores were reported by male students as compared to female ones. In similar lines, Sabouripour and Roslan (2015) argued that international university students resilience was influenced by support of their family, friends, teachers and significant others. They provided financial and emotional assistance to deal with academic challenges in context to Malaysian university. They further discussed that no significant difference in their resilience level was identified across gender.

In addition, researcher argued that a significant relationship was found among academic resilience and peer social support among migrant students at University in Jakarta. They also described that opportunity for nurturance, reliable alliance (action based support) and attachment and social integration (emotional based support) was associated significantly with academic resilience and its dimensions (perseverance, reflective and adaptive help seeking and negative affect and emotional response) delineated by Cassidy (2016). They further found no significant differences among peer support of migrant students based on their gender (Putri & Nursanti, 2020). However, Ulfah and Ariati (2017) establish significant gender differences among peer support among high school students. Similarly, Mahanta and Aggarwal (2013) argued that based on gender significant difference was found on perceived social support from friends. Therefore, high levels of perceived social support existed among female students than their male counterparts.

The purpose for examine the effect of demographic profiles on social support and academic resilience was that they are least examine in literature. The positive relationship among them are studied across various samples in different contexts. However, gender as background factors was focused by many researchers and semester system was examined by Kwan (2022). The current research focused on multiple background factors as gender, age groups, study discipline, study program, semester, job status and locale. This would provide better understanding of their influence on social support and academic resilience of university students.

Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the contribution of (personal and family related) demographic factors to influence academic resilience and social support of university students.

Hypotheses

H_{01}: There is no significant difference between male and female academic resilience and social support of university students.

H_{02}: There is no significant difference in the academic resilience and social support level of university students on the basis of age.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

H_{03}: There is no significant difference in academic resilience and social support level of university students on the basis of discipline.

H_{04}: There is no significant difference in academic resilience and social support level of university students on the basis of enrolled program.

H_{05}: There is no significant difference in academic resilience and social support level of university students on the basis of semester.

H_{06}: There is no significant difference in academic resilience and social support level of university students on the basis of job status.

H_{07}: There is no significant difference in academic resilience and social support level of university students on the basis of locale.

Methodology

The effect of social support on academic resilience of university students was examined by causal comparative research. Furthermore, the research method was cross sectional survey and the responses of students were collected on the above mentioned constructs through adapted scales with background factors.

Instruments

The scales employed in current research focuses on academic resilience and social support was adapted to the learning environment offered at university. The academic resilience scale by Cassidy (2016) was adapted with minor changes in the items. There were 30 items categorized into perseverance (behavioral responses) Reflecting and adaptive-help seeking (cognitive responses) and Negative affect and emotional response (emotional responses). The items of the scale were specified to the learning process offered at university. The value of cronbach alpha of adapted scale was 0.79.

Table 1
Cronbach's Alpha values of Academic Resilience

Scale	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Sample Items
1. Perseverance	14	0.683	11. I see the challenging situation as temporary.
2. Reflecting and Adaptive-help Seeking	9	0.804	21. I start to monitor and evaluate my achievements and efforts to attain improved performance.
3. Negative Affect and Emotional Response	7	0.666	29. I probably get annoyed with failures in exams.
Academic Resilience	30	0.79	

Note: p<.1

Furthermore, the social support scale was adapted from multidimensional scale of perceived social support (MSPSS) of Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet and Farley (1988). The adapted items were 8 and other items were developed based on the learning environment at university. The items were developed while incorporating the aspects of social support as informational support, esteem support, motivational support and venting support (Thompson & Mazer, 2009). The cronbach alpha value of adapted social support scale was 0.92.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

Table 2

Cronbach's Alpha values of Social Support

Scale	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Sample Items
1. Informational Support	13	0.877	7. My friends update me about timelines of assignments and presentations.
2. Esteem Support	5	0.702	15. My friends boost my confidence to deal with academic challenges.
3. Motivational Support	5	0.748	22. My teachers encourage me to work efficiently to attain standard performance.
4. Venting Support	6	0.793	29. My teachers facilitates in removing academic problems that hinders the completion of various academic tasks.
Social Support	29	0.935	

Note: p<.1

The content validity of adapted scales were ensured through the reviews of eight Subject Matter Experts (SMEs). The content validity index (CVI) was calculated and the critical value of Academic resilience (AR) scale was 0.85, and social support scale was 0.89. These values were considered as satisfactory performance after being reviewed by eight SMEs.

Sample and Study Procedure

The sample of the study has been drawn from undergraduate students of Public Sector University at Islamabad. The sample size was 600 students from different departments offering postgraduate programs. The multi stage stratified proportionate sampling technique was employed to collect data from students. Initially permission was taken from representative authorities to distribute questionnaire to students based on their feasibility to complete them, both hard form and Google form was utilized.

The data from students were collected through questionnaires of social support and academic resilience. They were randomly contacted to complete it. The students from science faculty was asked to complete the hard copy of form as their mode of learning was face to face. On contrary, students from social sciences, humanities and education were contacted through their email address and the Google form containing the questionnaires was emailed. The response rate from Google form was low as 8% students responded to it. Eventually, the proportionate sampling based on the enrollment trends of spring 2021 was difficult to achieve.

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of Undergraduate students

Demographic characteristics of undergraduate students	n=600
Gender	
Male	263
Female	337
Age	
Discipline	
Humanities	119
Sciences	200
Social Sciences	92
Education	189
Study Program	
BS	412
B.ED (4 yrs.)	76
B.ED (2.5 yrs.)	49
B.ED (1.5 yrs)	63
Semester	
1st	80
2nd	149
3rd	86
4th	64
5th	41
6th	44
7th	32
8th	104
Job status	
Unemployed	413
Employed	187
Locale	
Rural	279
Urban	321

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

Data Analysis and Results

The demographic profile features influence the social support and academic resilience of learners. These factors focuses on gender, age groups, study discipline, study program, semester, job status and locale.

Table 4

Mean Score Comparison of Students Gender and Academic Resilience

Scale	Gender	N	M	SD	t	df.	*p*
1. Perseverance	Male	263	61.69	12.436	.434	598	.664
	Female	337	61.26	11.724			
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	Male	263	41.47	9.373	.936	598	.350
	Female	337	40.74	9.697			
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	Male	263	25.92	8.047	1.175	598	.240
	Female	337	25.15	7.872			
Academic Resilience	Male	263	129.08	24.988	.970	598	.332
	Female	337	127.15	23.615			

Note: P<.05

The mean scores of academic resilience of respondents based on their gender examined through Independent sample t-test. The values in table 4 indicated that no significant difference among academic resilience of male and female students (p= .332) was present. Same was the case with the subscales Perseverance (p= .664), Reflective and adaptive help seeking (p= .350) and Negative affect and emotional response (p= .240). Although the mean scores of male students in response to academic resilience (M= 129.08) and their subscales Perseverance (M= 61.69), Reflective and adaptive help seeking (M= 41.47) and Negative affect and emotional response (M= 25.92) was better than female counterpart.

Table 5

Mean Score Comparison of Students Gender and Social Support

Scale	Gender	N	M	SD	t	df.	p
1. Informational Support	Male	263	75.44	20.349	-1.082	598	.280
	Female	337	77.22	19.593			
2. Esteem Support	Male	263	42.78	10.482	-.451	598	.652
	Female	337	43.17	10.386			
3. Motivational Support	Male	263	37.84	9.093	.724	598	.470
	Female	337	37.30	9.070			
4. Venting Support	Male	263	28.65	7.390	.740	598	.460
	Female	337	28.22	6.701			
Social Support	Male	263	184.71	42.535	-.344	598	.731
	Female	337	185.91	41.928			

Note: P<.05

In similar case, means scores of social support on basis of gender was examine by independent sample t-test. The table 5 revealed that no significant difference was found on perceived social support (p= .731) and their subscales informational support (p= .280), esteem support (p= .652), motivational support (p= .470) and venting support (p= .460) among male and female undergraduate students. Although, the mean scores of female students were better in perceived social support (M= 185.91), informational support (M= 77.22) and esteem support (M= 43.17) than male students, whereas male students were better in motivational support (M= 37.84) and venting support (M= 28.65) than female counterpart. This indicates that null hypothesis 1 was accepted.

Furthermore, for examining the effect of different age groups on academic resilience and social support one way ANOVA was applied. The three subscales linked to academic resilience and four subscales linked to perceived social support were used to observe the age group differences at university level.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

Table 6

Age Groups of Students and Mean Scores of Academic Resilience Subscales

Scale/Subscales	Age Groups	N	M	SD
1. Perseverance	Up to 20	133	62.24	10.267
	21-25	326	60.37	12.748
	26-30	84	62.55	13.157
	31-35	35	63.71	10.240
	36-40	17	66.18	7.350
	41-Above	5	60.40	4.159
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	Up to 20	133	41.52	8.587
	21-25	326	40.38	9.798
	26-30	84	41.42	10.612
	31-35	35	43.43	8.226
	36-40	17	45.76	5.943
	41-Above	5	34.20	11.692
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	Up to 20	133	25.81	7.559
	21-25	326	25.33	7.962
	26-30	84	25.00	9.005
	31-35	35	26.86	7.216
	36-40	17	25.82	7.650
	41-Above	5	24.40	6.656
4. Academic Resilience (Total)	Up to 20	133	129.57	20.225
	21-25	326	126.08	25.285
	26-30	84	128.96	28.221
	31-35	35	134.00	21.427
	36-40	17	137.76	13.274
	41-Above	5	119.00	8.888

Note: M= mean, SD= standard deviation

One way Analysis of Variance was calculated to compare mean scores of Academic resilience (Table 6) and its subscales i.e. Perseverance, Reflective and adaptive help seeking and Negative affect and emotional response based on different age groups.

Table 7

Age Groups of Students and Mean Scores of Social Support Subscales

Scale/Subscales	Age Groups	N	M	SD
1. Informational Support	Up to 20	133	79.05	17.315
	21-25	326	75.25	19.861
	26-30	84	77.27	22.708
	31-35	35	76.51	25.049
	36-40	17	77.88	13.596
	41-Above	5	65.40	15.852
2. Esteem Support	Up to 20	133	43.86	8.056
	21-25	326	42.18	10.984
	26-30	84	43.64	11.374
	31-35	35	43.97	12.251
	36-40	17	46.35	6.538
	41-Above	5	44.40	6.542
3. Motivational Support	Up to 20	133	38.21	7.439
	21-25	326	36.71	9.260
	26-30	84	38.38	9.896
	31-35	35	39.20	10.805
	36-40	17	41.24	7.437
	41-Above	5	35.20	11.054
4. Venting Support	Up to 20	133	29.09	6.288
	21-25	326	28.02	6.969
	26-30	84	28.26	7.456
	31-35	35	28.69	8.834
	36-40	17	30.82	6.116
	41-Above	5	27.40	9.154
5. Social Support	Up to 20	133	190.20	35.223
	21-25	326	182.16	42.801
	26-30	84	187.56	46.934
	31-35	35	188.37	52.710
	36-40	17	196.29	27.703
	41-Above	5	172.40	39.138

Note: M= mean, SD= standard deviation

In the same manner, one-way ANOVA was used to compare mean scores of social support (Table 7) and its subscales i.e. informational support, esteem support, motivational support and venting support on the basis of different age groups.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

Table 8

Mean Score Comparison of Age Group of Students regarding Academic Resilience Subscales

Scale/Subscales		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
1. Perseverance	Between Groups	1132.808	5	226.562	1.572	.166
	Within Groups	85601.485	594	144.110		
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	Between Groups	995.838	5	199.168	2.203	.053
	Within Groups	53693.120	594	90.392		
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	Between Groups	115.106	5	23.021	.362	.874
	Within Groups	37760.812	594	63.570		
Academic Resilience (Total)	Between Groups	4890.686	5	978.137	1.676	.138
	Within Groups	346633.287	594	583.558		

One-way ANOVA was applied and table 8 displays mean score comparison results that showed insignificant difference in academic resilience (p=.138) with varied age groups of students. Furthermore, the subscales Perseverance (p=.166), Reflective and adaptive help seeking (p=.053) and Negative affect and emotional response (p=.874) was not significantly different on the basis of age.

Table 9

Mean Score Comparison of Age Group of Students regarding Social Support Subscales

Scale/Subscales		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
1. Informational Support	Between Groups	2066.445	5	413.289	1.041	.393
	Within Groups	235873.514	594	397.093		
2. Esteem Support	Between Groups	586.687	5	117.337	1.081	.370
	Within Groups	64469.306	594	108.534		
3. Motivational Support	Between Groups	700.504	5	140.101	1.711	.130
	Within Groups	48644.690	594	81.893		
4. Venting Support	Between Groups	218.601	5	43.720	.889	.488
	Within Groups	29206.173	594	49.169		
Social Support	Between Groups	10048.093	5	2009.619	1.132	.342
	Within Groups	1054839.505	594	1775.824		

Note: P<.05

In table 9, one-way ANOVA was used to compare mean scores of social support on the basis of age groups. The findings revealed no significant difference among social support (p= .342) on the basis of age groups. Additionally, there was insignificant difference among its subscales, informational support (p= .393), esteem support (p= .370), motivational support (p= .130) and venting support (p= .488). This infers that null hypothesis 2 was accepted.

Table 10

Discipline wise Mean Score of Academic Resilience Subscales

Scale/Subscales	Disciplines							
	Humanities (N= 119)		Sciences (N= 200)		Social Sciences (N= 92)		Education (N= 189)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. Perseverance	60.39	13.94	62.06	8.90	61.40	12.91	61.49	13.17
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	42.22	10.01	39.82	7.90	42.08	9.69	41.14	10.64
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	25.38	9.66	24.63	6.31	25.77	8.56	26.33	7.97
Academic Resilience (Total)	127.98	29.07	126.51	17.20	129.25	25.27	128.96	26.69

Note: M= mean, SD= standard deviation

The table 10 displays, one way Analysis of Variance that examined the mean difference among academic resilience and varied discipline of students, seven subscales related to academic resilience and disciplines were observed.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

Table 11

Discipline wise Mean Score of Social Support Subscales

Scale/Subscales	Disciplines							
	Humanities (N= 133)		Sciences (N= 326)		Social Sciences (N= 327)		Education (N= 327)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. Informational Support	77.19	22.86	78.50	14.28	71.27	21.68	76.31	21.81
2. Esteem Support	43.96	11.27	43.59	7.36	41.78	11.50	42.36	11.94
3. Motivational Support	37.97	10.04	37.83	6.94	36.99	10.48	37.22	9.71
4. Venting Support	29.09	7.84	28.79	5.04	28.33	7.78	27.61	7.77
5. Social Support	188.21	48.67	188.70	28.46	178.37	46.17	183.50	47.36

Note: M= mean, SD= standard deviation

In similar manner, One Way Analysis of Variance was applied (Table 11) to measure the mean difference among social support and discipline. There were eight subscales related to social support and discipline to observe the responses of university students.

Table 12

Discipline wise Mean Score Comparison of Academic Resilience Subscales

Scale/Subscales		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
1. Perseverance	Between Groups	208.322	3	69.441	.478	.697
	Within Groups	86525.971	596	145.178		
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	Between Groups	563.509	3	187.836	2.068	.103
	Within Groups	54125.450	596	90.815		
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	Between Groups	289.447	3	96.482	1.530	.206
	Within Groups	37586.471	596	63.065		
Academic Resilience (Total)	Between Groups	766.021	3	255.340	.434	.729
	Within Groups	350757.952	596	588.520		

Note: P<.05

One-way ANOVA was performed (Table 12), the mean score comparison findings indicated a not significant difference in academic resilience (p=.729) based on discipline of students. The mean scores were not significantly different on subscales Perseverance (p=.697), Reflective and adaptive help seeking (p=.103) and Negative affect and emotional response (p=.206).

Table 13

Discipline wise Mean Score Comparison of Social Support Subscales

Scale/Subscales		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
1. Informational Support	Between Groups	3376.996	3	1125.665	2.860	**.036**
	Within Groups	234562.962	596	393.562		
2. Esteem Support	Between Groups	391.462	3	130.487	1.203	.308
	Within Groups	64664.531	596	108.498		
3. Motivational Support	Between Groups	85.452	3	28.484	.345	.793
	Within Groups	49259.741	596	82.651		
4. Venting Support	Between Groups	204.014	3	68.005	1.387	.246
	Within Groups	29220.760	596	49.028		
5. Social Support	Between Groups	8345.167	3	2781.722	1.569	.196
	Within Groups	1056542.431	596	1772.722		

Note: P<.05

Similarly, one-way ANOVA was performed and table 13 demonstrates mean score comparison results which indicated not significant difference in social support (p=.196) on the basis of disciplines. In addition, no significant different among mean score of its subscales, esteem support (p= .308), motivational support (p= .793) and venting support (p= .246). Although, informational support (p= .036) was significantly different based on disciplines.

Table 14

Multiple Comparisons for Disciplines of Students (Tukey HSD)

Dependent Variable	(I) Discipline	(J) Discipline	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	p
Informational Support	Sciences	Social Sciences	7.228*	2.499	**.021**

* Mean difference is significant at the (p) .05 level

In addition, Tukey HSD post-hoc test (table 14) was employed to indicate the specific discipline that received better informational support than others. It was found that informational support is better among sciences students (p= .021; MD=7.228*). This suggests that null hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Table 15

Study Program wise Mean Score of Students regarding Academic Resilience Subscales

Scale/Subscales	Study Program							
	BS (N= 412)		B.ED (4 yrs) (N= 76)		B.ED (2.5 yrs) (N= 49)		B.ED (1.5 yrs) (N= 63)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. Perseverance	61.48	11.52	61.03	12.82	61.49	14.57	61.70	12.43
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	41.05	9.03	42.16	9.41	40.98	13.62	39.84	9.321
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	25.14	7.95	25.61	8.04	27.53	8.86	26.02	6.915
Academic Resilience (Total)	127.67	23.13	128.79	26.52	130.0	30.73	127.56	23.10

Note: M= mean, SD= standard deviation

In table 15, One-way Analysis of Variance was applied to compare mean scores of Academic resilience and its subscales i.e. Perseverance, Reflective and adaptive help seeking and Negative affect and emotional response on the basis of enrolled program.

Table 16

Study Program wise Mean Score of Students regarding Social Support Subscales

Scale/Subscales	Study Program							
	BS (N= 412)		B.ED (4 yrs) (N= 76)		B.ED (2.5 yrs) (N= 49)		B.ED (1.5 yrs) (N= 63)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. Informational Support	76.59	19.09	78.49	21.35	74.22	26.62	74.70	17.56
2. Esteem Support	43.33	9.66	42.36	11.86	41.29	14.41	42.94	9.79
3. Motivational Support	37.72	8.80	37.46	10.49	36.41	10.83	37.30	7.55
4. Venting Support	28.80	6.62	27.58	8.15	26.55	8.83	28.25	6.17
Social Support	186.45	39.73	185.88	48.53	178.47	57.76	183.19	35.00

Note. M= mean, SD= standard deviation

Similarly, One-way ANOVA was computed to compare mean scores of social support (Table 16) and its subscales i.e. informational support, esteem support, motivational support and venting support on the basis of enrolled program.

Table 17

Study Program wise Mean Score Comparison of students regarding Academic Resilience Subscales

Scale/Subscales		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	*p*
1. Perseverance	Between Groups	17.987	3	5.996	.041	.989
	Within Groups	86716.307	596	145.497		
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	Between Groups	185.531	3	61.844	.676	.567
	Within Groups	54503.427	596	91.449		
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	Between Groups	272.021	3	90.674	1.437	.231
	Within Groups	37603.897	596	63.094		
Academic Resilience (Total)	Between Groups	299.369	3	99.790	.169	.917
	Within Groups	351224.605	596	589.303		

Note. P<.05

In table 17, One-way ANOVA was applied, the mean score comparison findings revealed no significant difference in academic resilience (p=.917) based on

enrolled program of students. In addition, mean scores were not significantly different on subscales, Perseverance (p=.989), Reflective and adaptive help seeking (p=.567) and Negative affect and emotional response (p=.231).

Table 18

Study Program wise Mean Score Comparison of students regarding Social Support Subscales

Scale/Subscales		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	*p*
1. Informational Support	Between Groups	759.863	3	253.288	.636	.592
	Within Groups	237180.096	596	397.953		
2. Esteem Support	Between Groups	220.075	3	73.358	.674	.568
	Within Groups	64835.918	596	108.785		
3. Motivational Support	Between Groups	80.305	3	26.768	.324	.808
	Within Groups	49264.889	596	82.659		
4. Venting Support	Between Groups	287.113	3	95.704	1.958	.119
	Within Groups	29137.661	596	48.889		
5. Social Support	Between Groups	3129.921	3	1043.307	.586	.625
	Within Groups	1061757.678	596	1781.473		

Note. P<.05

Similarly, One-way ANOVA was executed (table 18) that demonstrate mean score comparison. The results indicated no significant difference in social support (p=.625) with enrolled program of students. Likewise, no significant different among its subscales, informational support (p= .592), esteem support (p= .568), motivational support (p= .808) and venting support (p= .119) was found. This infers that null hypothesis 4 was accepted.

Table 19

Semester wise Mean Score of Academic Resilience Subscales

Scale/Subscales	Semesters	N	M	SD
1. Perseverance	1st	80	62.30	11.113
	2nd	149	60.82	13.675
	3rd	86	60.72	10.855
	4th	64	62.00	11.695
	5th	41	59.44	13.937
	6th	44	62.84	11.554
	7th	32	63.97	7.945
	8th	104	61.38	11.892
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	1st	80	41.10	9.172
	2nd	149	40.64	9.985
	3rd	86	40.36	8.485
	4th	64	42.47	10.819
	5th	41	39.10	10.770
	6th	44	41.68	9.630
	7th	32	40.91	8.600
	8th	104	41.88	9.048
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	1st	80	26.36	6.859
	2nd	149	24.81	8.135
	3rd	86	25.94	6.956
	4th	64	25.86	9.874
	5th	41	25.07	9.048
	6th	44	25.25	8.516
	7th	32	25.56	7.224
	8th	104	25.43	7.590
Academic Resilience (Total)	1st	80	129.76	20.281
	2nd	149	126.27	26.778
	3rd	86	127.02	20.802
	4th	64	130.33	26.552
	5th	41	123.61	30.450
	6th	44	129.77	24.245
	7th	32	130.44	19.212
	8th	104	128.69	23.237

Note: M= mean, SD= standard deviation

One-way Analysis of Variance was performed in table 19, to examine the mean difference among academic resilience based on varied semesters of students, eleven subscales related to academic resilience and semesters.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

Table 20

Semester wise Mean Score of Social Support Subscales

Scale/Subscales	Semesters	N	M	SD
1. Informational Support	1st	80	72.58	19.288
	2nd	149	76.03	21.755
	3rd	86	77.76	16.188
	4th	64	73.44	22.819
	5th	41	78.39	20.907
	6th	44	75.23	21.164
	7th	32	80.94	12.334
	8th	104	79.13	19.308
2. Esteem Support	1st	80	41.85	10.572
	2nd	149	42.19	11.042
	3rd	86	42.90	9.177
	4th	64	41.66	11.627
	5th	41	43.83	11.595
	6th	44	45.41	10.451
	7th	32	44.13	7.898
	8th	104	44.24	9.702
3. Motivational Support	1st	80	37.05	8.488
	2nd	149	36.65	9.861
	3rd	86	38.34	8.249
	4th	64	36.72	9.355
	5th	41	38.63	10.148
	6th	44	37.68	9.702
	7th	32	37.72	7.965
	8th	104	38.47	8.508
4. Venting Support	1st	80	28.48	6.189
	2nd	149	27.54	7.681
	3rd	86	28.63	6.560
	4th	64	28.00	7.547
	5th	41	29.83	7.311
	6th	44	28.70	7.754
	7th	32	28.94	6.069
	8th	104	28.82	6.473
Social Support	1st	80	179.95	40.078
	2nd	149	182.41	46.499
	3rd	86	187.62	35.060
	4th	64	179.81	47.531
	5th	41	190.68	46.983
	6th	44	187.02	45.216
	7th	32	191.72	29.265
	8th	104	190.66	39.027

Note: M= mean, SD= standard deviation

In similar manner, One Way Analysis of Variance was applied (Table 20) to indicate the mean difference among social support and semesters. There were twelve subscales related to social support and semesters.

Table 21

Semester wise Mean Score Comparison of students regarding Academic Resilience Subscales

Scale/Subscales		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
1. Perseverance	Between Groups	636.756	7	90.965	.625	.735
	Within Groups	86097.537	592	145.435		
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	Between Groups	441.358	7	63.051	.688	.682
	Within Groups	54247.600	592	91.634		
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	Between Groups	167.197	7	23.885	.375	.917
	Within Groups	37708.721	592	63.697		
Academic Resilience (Total)	Between Groups	2292.649	7	327.521	.555	.792
	Within Groups	349231.324	592	589.918		

Note: P<.05

In table 21, one-way ANOVA was applied and the mean difference findings indicated no significant difference in academic resilience (p=.792) based on semesters of students. Furthermore, mean scores were not significantly different on subscales, Perseverance (p=.735), Reflective and adaptive help seeking (p=.682) and Negative affect and emotional response (p=.917).

Table 22

Semester wise Mean Score Comparison of students regarding Social Support Subscales

Scale/Subscales		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	*p*
1. Informational Support	Between Groups	3569.420	7	509.917	1.288	.254
	Within Groups	234370.538	592	395.896		
2. Esteem Support	Between Groups	803.010	7	114.716	1.057	.390
	Within Groups	64252.983	592	108.535		
3. Motivational Support	Between Groups	375.943	7	53.706	.649	.715
	Within Groups	48969.251	592	82.718		
4. Venting Support	Between Groups	241.316	7	34.474	.699	.673
	Within Groups	29183.458	592	49.296		
Social Support	Between Groups	11548.139	7	1649.734	.927	.485
	Within Groups	1053339.459	592	1779.290		

Note. P<.05

In After performing One-way ANOVA (table 22), the results revealed no significant difference in social support (p=.485) based on semesters of students. In addition, no significant different among mean score of its subscales, informational support (p= .254), esteem support (p= .390), motivational support (p= .715) and venting support (p= .673) were found. This indicates that null hypothesis 5 was accepted.

Table 23

Mean Score Comparison of Students Job Status and Academic Resilience

Scale	Job Status	N	M	SD	t	df.	*p*
1. Perseverance	Unemployed	413	61.59	11.318	.443	598	.658
	Employed	187	61.12	13.507			
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	Unemployed	413	41.27	9.067	.766	314.919	.445
	Employed	187	40.59	10.565			
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	Unemployed	413	25.42	7.741	-.329	598	.742
	Employed	187	25.65	8.417			
Academic Resilience	Unemployed	413	128.28	22.662	.402	305.663	.688
	Employed	187	127.36	27.418			

Note. P<.05

Independent sample t-test was performed to examine the means scores of academic resilience based on students' job status. The table 23 showed no significant difference among academic resilience of unemployed and employed students (p= .688). In addition, their subscales Perseverance (p= .658), Reflective and adaptive help seeking (p= .445) and Negative affect and emotional response (p= .742) were also not significantly different based on job status. Although, the mean scores of unemployed students in response to academic resilience (M= 128.28) and their subscales Perseverance (M= 61.59), Reflective and adaptive help seeking (M= 41.27) was better than employed students. On the other hand the Negative affect and emotional response (M= 25.65) was better in employed students.

Table 24

Mean Score Comparison of students Job Status and Social Support

Scale	Gender	N	M	SD	t	df.	*p*
1. Informational Support	Unemployed	413	77.48	18.541	1.773	304.079	.077
	Employed	187	74.14	22.583			
2. Esteem Support	Unemployed	413	43.25	9.904	.827	316.042	.409
	Employed	187	42.44	11.491			
3. Motivational Support	Unemployed	413	37.67	8.605	.537	598	.591
	Employed	187	37.24	10.057			
4. Venting Support	Unemployed	413	28.51	6.636	.498	313.305	.619
	Employed	187	28.18	7.783			
Social Support	Unemployed	413	186.91	39.442	1.231	306.423	.219
	Employed	187	182.01	47.568			

Note: P<.05

Likewise, independent sample t-test was applied to compare means of social support on basis of job status. The values in table 24 identified that insignificant difference was found among social support (p= .219) and their subscales informational support (p= .077), esteem support (p= .409), motivational support (p= .591) and venting support (p= .619) among male and female undergraduate students. Besides, the mean scores of unemployed students were better in social support (M= 186.91), informational support (M= 77.48) and esteem support (M= 43.25), motivational support (M= 37.67) and venting support (M= 28.51) than employed ones. This suggests that null hypothesis 6 was accepted.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

Table 25

Mean Score Comparison of Students Locale/Area Type and Academic Resilience

Scale	Area Type	N	M	SD	t	df.	*p*
1. Perseverance	Rural	279	61.40	11.957	-.093	598	.926
	Urban	321	61.49	12.117			
2. Reflective And Adaptive Help seeking	Rural	279	41.11	9.626	.117	598	.907
	Urban	321	41.02	9.508			
3. Negative Affect And Emotional Response	Rural	279	25.24	7.969	-.712	598	.476
	Urban	321	25.70	7.943			
Academic Resilience	Rural	279	127.75	24.189	-.233	598	.816
	Urban	321	128.21	24.292			

Note. P<.05

In table 25, Independent sample t-test was applied to examine the mean scores of academic resilience of students on the basis of locale. The findings indicated no significant difference among academic resilience of students belonging to rural and urban areas/locales (p= .816). Their subscales Perseverance (p= .926), Reflective and adaptive help seeking (p= .907) and Negative affect and emotional response (p= .476) was also found to be insignificantly discriminate among locales of students. Nevertheless, the mean scores of students belonging to urban locales in response to academic resilience (M= 128.21) and their subscales Perseverance (M= 61.49), and Negative affect and emotional response (M= 25.70) were better than rural ones. Yet the Reflective and adaptive help seeking (M= 41.11) was better among students belonging to rural areas.

Table 26

Mean Score Comparison of Students Locale/Area Type and Social Support

Scale	Area Type	N	M	SD	t	df.	*p*
1. Informational Support	Rural	279	76.96	19.883	.590	598	.555
	Urban	321	75.99	19.992			
2. Esteem Support	Rural	279	43.24	10.495	.533	598	.594
	Urban	321	42.79	10.369			
3. Motivational Support	Rural	279	38.10	8.695	1.429	598	.154
	Urban	321	37.04	9.380			
4. Venting Support	Rural	279	28.70	6.731	.952	598	.341
	Urban	321	28.15	7.243			
Social Support	Rural	279	187.00	41.488	.876	598	.381
	Urban	321	183.98	42.757			

Note. P<.05

Similarly, independent sample t-test performed to compare means of social support on basis of area type/locale. The values on table 26 revealed no significant difference on social support (p= .381) and their subscales, informational support (p= .555), esteem support (p= .594), motivational support (p= .154) and venting support (p= .341) among university students belonging to rural and urban locales. Besides, the mean scores of students belonging to rural areas were better in perceived social support (M= 185.91), informational support (M= 77.22) and esteem support (M= 43.17) motivational support (M= 37.84) and venting support (M= 28.65) than urban ones. This infers that null hypothesis 7 was accepted.

Discussion

The current research found no significant difference among social support and academic resilience based on gender. It was in line with the findings of Putri and

Nursanti (2020) that no significant difference among peer support was found among male and female students. Similarly, Kwan (2022) described no significant difference in social support based on gender. In similar lines, Buren (2019) indicated that no significant difference in resilience scores among university students based on their gender. These findings were consistent among international students in context to Malaysia (Sabouripour & Roslan, 2015). On contrary, Ulfah & Ariati (2017) argued that significant difference among peer social support based on gender were found in high school students. The reason for no significant difference among genders was their unequal participation, Cheng and Catling (2015) experienced similar scenarios. The current research findings based on the mean values found that male scored better on academic resilience as compared to female students. In addition, social support mean scores were slightly higher in female students than male counterparts.

Furthermore, current research revealed that there was no significant difference in social support and academic resilience of university students based on their semester. These findings were echoed by the work of Kwan (2022) that resilience levels of students were not influenced number of years enrolled in university (semesters).

However, there was significant difference among social support and academic resilience on the basis of discipline. The students from science faculty experience better informational support than students from other disciplines.

Moreover, the current research found no significant difference among social support and academic resilience based on their job status. However, the mean scores indicted that social support was better among unemployed students than employed ones. The academic resilience was slight better among unemployed students than employed ones. In addition, the current research indicated that no significant difference among social support and academic resilience on the basis of locale. Although, the mean scores revealed that academic resilience was better among students belonging to urban areas and social support experiences were better in students belonging to rural areas. Furthermore, there was no significant difference on the basis of age groups and study program among social support and academic resilience.

Hence, the social support experiences and academic resilience traits were not significantly differ on profile factors except for discipline. The previous literature only focused on gender and semesters to influence the social support and academic resilience of students.

Conclusions

Hence, the literature provide limited profile factors of students to differentiate the social support experiences and academic resilience traits among university students. Although, the current research focused on many profile factors of students. Besides, there were no significant difference among the constructs under study, only discipline

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |

differentiated informational support of students. The science students experience better informational support than students from other discipline. However, the mean scores identified that academic resilience scores of male students were greater than female ones and social support experiences of female student were slightly better than male counterpart. The students from rural areas experienced better social support experiences and students from urban areas scored better on academic resilience.

Recommendations

1. The students should be provided with interactive learning tasks so that their academic resilience should be promoted and special attention should be provided to enhance these traits in female students and those belonging to rural areas.

2. The students must be provided with hands on exercises to develop skills essential to complete their academic tasks, especially for students belonging to rural areas.

References

Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-13.

Adhawiyah, R., Rahayu, D., & Suhesty, A. (2021). The effect of academic resilience and social support towards student involvement in online lecture. *Gadjah Mada Journal of Psychology*, 7(2), 212-224.

Barrot, J. S., Llenares, I. I., & Del Rosario, L. S. (2021). Students' online learning challenges during the pandemic and how they cope with them: The case of the Philippines. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(6), 7321-7338.

Buren, A. V. (2019). An exploration of resilience: Evaluating resilience scores among Honors undergraduates involved in leadership programs. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. East Tennessee State University.

Cassidy, S. (2016). The academic resilience scale (ARS-30): A new multidimensional construct measure. *Frontier in Psychology*, 7 (1787), 1-11.

Dawson, M., & Pooley, J. A. (2013). Resilience: The Role of Optimism, Perceived Parental Autonomy Support and Perceived Social Support in First Year University Students. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 1(2), 38-49.

Gizir, C.A. (2004). Academic factors contributing to the academic achievement of eight grade student of poverty. *Thesis.* Istanbul: Department Educational Science of Middle East Technical University

Jowkar, B., Kojuri, J., Kohoulat, N., and Hayat, A. A. (2014). Academic resilience in education: the role of achievement goal orientations. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education and Professionalism*, 2, 33-38.

Khan, M. Y., Raza, S. A., Sibtain, M. (2021). Online Learning and Motivational Strategies in the Backdrop of COVID-19: An EFL Perspective on Teachers and Students' Perceptions at Tertiary Level in Pakistan. *Sir Syed Journal of Education & Social Research,* 4(1), 135-147.

Kumalasari, D. & Akmal, S. Z. (2021). Less stress, more satisfaction with online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: The moderating role of academic resilience. *Psychological Research on Urban Society*, 4(1). 36-44.

Kwan, J. (2022).Academic burnout, resilience level, and campus connectedness among undergraduate students during the Covid-19 pandemic: Evidence from Singapore. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 5(1), 52-63.

Lady, G. M. (2021). How can I help? Investigating the role of social supports in academic resilience for undergraduate students. *Senior Theses*. Retrieved from https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/senior_theses/429

Mahanta, D., & Aggarwal, M. (2013). Effect of perceived social support on life satisfaction of university students. *European Academic Research*, 1 (6), 1083-1094.

Martin, A. J., and Marsh, H. W. (2006). Academic resilience and its psychological and educational correlates: A construct validity approach. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43(3), 267–281.

Martin, A. J., & Marsh, H. W. (2009). Academic resilience and academic buoyancy: Multidimensional and hierarchical conceptual framing of causes, correlates and cognate constructs. *Oxford Review of Education,* 35(3), 353-370.

Masten, A. S., and Tellegen, A. (2012). Resilience in developmental psychopathology: contributions of the project competence longitudinal study. *Development and Psychopathology,* 24, 345–361.

Mishra, D. L., Gupta, D. T., & Shree, D. A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research Open,* 1(100012).

Pawlicka, A., Tomaszewska, R., Krause, E., Jaroszewska-Choraś, D., Pawlicki, M., & Choraś, M. (2022). Has the pandemic made us more digitally literate? Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12652-022-04371-1

Putri, W. C., & Nursanti, A. (2020). The relationship between peer social support and academic resilience of young adult migrant students in Jakarta. *International Journal of Education,* 13(2), 122-130.

Sabouripour, F., & Roslan, S. B. (2015). Resilience, optimism and social support among international

students. *Asian Social Science*, 11(15), 159.

Sarafino, E. P., Smith, T. W., King, D. B. & DeLongis, A. (2015). *Health psychology: Biopsychosocial interactions*. John Wiley & Sons.

Steinhardt, M., & Dolbier, C. (2008). Evaluation of a resilience intervention to enhance coping strategies and protective factors and decrease symptomatology. *Journal of American College Health*, 56(4), 445-453.

Sujiarto, H., Solahudin, M., Mudrikah, A., Kosasih, U., & Trisnamansyah, S. (2022). The Influence of social support, digital literacy ability and self-efficacy on students' academic resilience. *Specialusis Ugdymas (Special Education)*, 1(43), 9351-9373.

Thompson, B. & Mazer, J. P. (2009). College student ratings of student academic support: Frequency, importance, and modes of communication. *Communication Education*, 58(3), 433-458.

Ulfah, A. N., & Ariati, J. (2017). The relationship between peer support and achievement motivation in Islamic boarding school santri alIrsyad. *Jurnal Empati*, 6(4), 297-301.

Warsi, F. (2021). Factors affecting online learning: perceptions of future professionals of Allama Iqbal Open University in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research*, 4(4).

Wilson, J. M., Weiss, A., Shook, N. J. (2020). Mindfulness, self-compassion, and savoring: Factors that explain the relation between perceived social support and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 152, (10956), 1-9.

Wright, M. O., Masten, A. S., & Narayan, A. J. (2013). Resilience processes in development: Four waves of research on positive adaptation in the context of adversity. In S. Goldstein, & R. B. Brooks (Eds.), *Handbook of Resilience in Children* (pp. 15-37). Springer.

Yıldırım, M., & Tanrıverdi, F. Ç. (2020). Social support, resilience and subjective wellbeing in college students. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*. https://journalppw.com/index.php/JPPW/article/view/229

Zee, K. S., Bolger, N., & Higgins, E. T. (2020). Regulatory effectiveness of social support. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 119(6), 1316.

Zimet, G., Dahlem, N., Zimet, S., & Farley, G. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(1), 30-41.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tooba.saleem@aiou.edu.pk | jehr@um.uob.edu.pk |+92-81-9211245 |