

ASSESSING THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL INTERACTION ON STUDENT'S LEARNING

Vencent Claire C. Bastes¹, Christian Jay S. Lopez²,
Mae Ann B. Pineda³, and Dr. Henry C. Ligan⁴

UM Tagum College, Philippines

^{1,2,3}Students, Department of Engineering Education

⁴Faculty, Elementary Education Program

^{1,2,3,4}rpctagum@umindanao.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This study dealt on the influence of social interaction on students learning. The main goal of the study was to determine the significant influence of social interaction on students learning. The study was conducted at Balagunan Elementary School and Tulalian Elementary School in the municipality of Sto. Tomas Davao Del Norte involving 110 Grade VI pupils, as respondents of the study. Mean, Pearson (r) and Multiple Regression Analysis were the statistical tools used for the data treatment. Results showed a high level of social interaction in terms of teacher- student partnership, student-student partnership, family involvement, teacher- school community partnership and school community- community at large. The study also showed a high level of students learning in terms of physical health and well-being, connectedness, social-emotional development, school experience and use of after school time. Furthermore, there was a significant relationship between social interactions on the students learning. Therefore, all the domains in the social interaction as independent variable influenced the dependent variable students learning.

Keywords: *Elementary Education – Generalist, social interaction, student learning, Davao del Norte, Philippines.*

INTRODUCTION

Learning is a process that leads to progress, knowledge, and increased performance and learning opportunities. The transformed learner may take place at the level of consciousness, attitude, or behavior. As a consequence of learning, learners come to see ideas, emotions, and the world differently. It is not a teacher but something students do by themselves. It is the direct result of how students view and respond to their experiences. Students require practical learning experiences, analytical skills/thinking processes, motor skills, and attitudes/values necessary for professional and personal success. Students must also provide them the opportunity to grow their relational and social abilities (Ambrose *et al.*, 2010).

Likewise, study revealed that 20% (1,842) of students in Wilkes School failed more than one class, and 1,210 of them were not considered engaged in social interaction. 538 (20%) of these 1,842 students were in high school, and 734 (35%) were in middle school, with 173 of the high school and 664 of the intermediate learners omitted. Elementary students who were not given pass/fail grades or did not demonstrate academic progress comprise 570 (15%), and 373 of its students were not engaged socially. The percentage of elementary students is most likely to be poor because parental engagement with the youngest students is highest. Not being active means not being involved in specific schoolwork and not being present in the class or interested in it. It highlighted the productivity of students who realized that not doing or not working at all necessary work would lead to repeating a class or education level. Students whose lack of interaction with their parents and others, including some possibility of dropping out, are deemed at risk of failing classes. Therefore, a lack of student participation in Wilkes Country, North Carolina, and all over the country, along with everything else, is a significant source of stress for teachers. However, students' commitment to learning was thought to improve due to the outreach of principals, teachers, parents, and other school staff (Wilkes, 2020).

In the Philippines, a researcher discovered that very much created social interaction abilities are significant in improving positive confidence, building connections, and at last for acknowledgment into society. It likewise stresses that learners' social and emotional training might be tended to through different ways such as homeroom guidance, extracurricular exercises, a controlled school environment, and inclusion in community administration (Social Interaction Skills, 2012). Comprehensively speaking, social abilities portray how students explore social and learning settings and can be conceptualized as including interpersonal skills and mastering related abilities (McClelland & Tominey, 2009).

In Sto. Tomas, particularly Balagunan Elementary School, and Tullian Elementary School, the researchers will gather information about the influence of social interaction on student's learning. The collected data will allow analyzing the question of the problem. We will test the assumption that social interaction is essential for the development of students learning abilities.

The researchers have not come across a study that dealt with the influence of social interaction on student's learning in the local setting. It is in this context that the researchers are interested in determining this study.

The study aimed to determine the influence of social interaction on students learning in Balagunan and Tulalian in the municipality of Sto. Tomas.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following objectives:

1. To assess the level of social interaction in terms of:
 - 1.1 teacher- student partnership
 - 1.2 student-student partnership
 - 1.3 family involvement
 - 1.4 teacher- school community

- 1.5 school community- the community at large
2. To assess the level of student learning in terms of:
 - 2.1 physical health and well being
 - 2.2 connectedness
 - 2.3 social and emotional development
 - 2.4 school experience
 - 2.5 use of after school time
3. To determine the significant relationship between social interaction and student learning.
4. To determine which domain of social interaction significantly influences student's learning.

The hypotheses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance, stating that there is no significant relationship between the influence of social interaction on student learning and there is no domain of social interaction that significantly influences students' education.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Presented in this chapter are the data and results of the study. Tables are arranged in the following subheadings: Level of Influence of Social Interaction, Level of Student Learning, Significance on the relationship between the levels of Social Interaction and Regression Analysis of the Influence of Social Interaction and Students Learning with their corresponding indicators.

Level of Influence of Social Interaction

Shown in Table 1 are the mean scores for the indicators of social interaction with an overall mean of 3.92, describe as high with a standard deviation of 0.50. The high level could be attributed to the increased rating given by the respondents in all indicators. This means that social interaction is much observed in the item's teacher-student partnership, student-student partnership, family involvement,

teacher-school community partnership, and school community- the community at large.

The cited overall mean score was the result gathered from the following computed mean scores from highest to lowest: 4.08 or high for teacher-student partnership with a standard deviation of 0.63; 4.04 or high for family involvement with a standard deviation of 0.63; 3.88 or high in student-student partnership with a standard deviation of 0.68; 3.80 or high in teacher- school community partnership with a standard deviation of 0.71 and 3.80 or high in the school community- the community at large with a standard deviation of 0.69.

Table 1. *Level of Influence of Social Interaction*

Indicator	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Teacher- Student partnership	4.08	0.63	High
Student- Student partnership	3.88	0.68	High
Family Involvement	4.04	0.63	High
Teacher- School Community	3.80	0.71	High
School Community- Community at Large	3.80	0.69	High
Overall	3.92	0.50	High

The primary influence of social interaction observed is on teacher-student partnership being the indicator with the highest mean, known as the famous traditional way of learning and a perfect connection to function together in nurturing positive interaction in the learning process. Teachers play a significant role that helps and mold students to develop their abilities to encourage beneficial collaborations and relationships with other people. Thus, this would promote high aspirations and motivation to learn and achieve their goals and ambitions. Moreover, teachers use

approaches and strategies to enhance and maintain students' interests, including self-direction and self-innovation.

Regarding student-student partnership indicator of social interaction observed, this partnership is constantly present in school cooperation, group tasks, and activities most commonly encountered in a classroom setting. This interaction allows children to explore things and know other students' preferences, characteristics, and interests despite differences and diverse cultures.

This is followed by family involvement, which influences social interaction, obtaining the second highest mean score. The parents are the first persons that children with as they grow up. They taught us in everything we do and are in charge of helping us to learn more and do good things in the world. Additionally, parents' involvement trained children to expose and develop their social skills to interact with their peers and people. Listening and have communication in them creates a good relationship and strong bond that nurture children's self-esteem.

They were also followed by teacher-school community partnership, which is also an indicator of observed social interaction. A teacher's actual job in a school context is to facilitate and impart knowledge to students. On the other hand, school is always being part of the community. This would make a solid connection between two parties that significantly influenced the learning achievements and the school environment.

Finally, the social interaction that is much observed is on school community- the community at large, being the indicator together with teacher- school community partnership with has the lowest mean. School and community will lay the foundation for a common goal to improve their relationships with one another. School provides an environment where children may learn more effectively, and social contact is intact, with people building excellent relationships for the community's welfare. Consequently, good

relationships with the community inspire students to become better individuals and role models in society.

The respondent's level on the influence of social interaction is high. This indicates that the result of social interaction is much observed. This further means that social interaction influenced the students learning and is being influenced by; teacher-student partnership which means that the establishment of a good relationship between learners and educators helps to function together and enjoy each other in the class that learners feel motivated to do well; student-student partnership which means in peers it create a great deal in expressing thoughts and involved in activities which they can develop abilities, learning events and obtaining input that assessed own learning; family involvement which means parental engagement molds a safe and healthy atmosphere, suitable learning opportunities, support and a positive school attitude; teacher- school community which means they support the development of students and encourages pathways to multiple considerations and solutions generated to holistically address each child's needs; and school community- community at large which means that they promote opportunities for student's ability to provide clear and realistic real-world experiences for social interaction with students, teacher and the wider community.

This result is concerning the theory of Fodor (2002) that social interaction is generally much broader and, thus, there are widespread opportunities for involvement in the classroom. This is critical because it offers enough opportunities for students to develop knowledge. It is essential because it helps students to recognize aspects such as their personality. As in school, students connect with everyone. They also rely on such actions to respect other people's possessions, the act of sharing with others, and the importance of sympathizing with others. The social-economic disparity also impacts student success, so social interaction encourages students from different backgrounds to connect, helping to boost their

performance. Students from poor locations are combined with those from wealthy families, which is desirable since it allows students to compete on an equal playing field. Also, this interaction generally offers an atmosphere in which students with disabilities can openly communicate with other students who do not have a physical impairment. This is significant as it acknowledges and supports the rights of the disabled as well as their dignity.

With regard to teacher-student partnership, the level of social interaction is high. This indicates that teacher-student affiliation was much observed. This connotes that teacher helps in building learning environments that encourage healthy collaborations among positive cultures may enable students to channel their abilities and ambitions toward achieving their goals.

More so, the result is seemingly congruent to the findings of the study conducted by Bouras & Keskes' (2014) pointing out that teacher-student experiences shape learning environments. In reality, several studies have highlighted teacher-student engagement as a significant factor in establishing a substantial foundation and motivation for the teaching and learning process and encouraging students to actively participate in the educational environment to demonstrate helpful teachers and create a productive classroom environment to promote learning outcomes. Furthermore, (Gehlbach et al., 2016) stated that having an excellent education is a vital keystone in any person's life. This is imperative that learners have the resources to be effective, including inspiration and meaningful teacher engagement. Previous research indicates that a critical interpreter of motivation and academic achievement is the association between educators and learners. Students who constructively see their teachers have more significant results in triumph.

In terms of *the student-student partnership*, the level of social interaction is high. This indicates that student-student affiliation was much observed. This means that this relationship relates experiences

to create meaning, connect to prior experience, or solve problems with the course content.

This is in line with the views of (Sapungan et al., 2014) who states that students learn a great deal by expressing their thoughts to others and engaging in activities in which they can learn from their peer. They develop abilities in the organization and preparation of teaching events, collaborating with others in partnership, providing and obtaining input, and assessing their learning. Hattie (2008) cited that one of the most compelling reasons for putting so much emphasis on the connection and experiences between student and student goes beyond the evidence that indicates it to be an essential teaching approach. Learner-learner experiences are often a cultural match since they reflect a collectivist mindset in which interpersonal relationships are valued.

This was followed by *family involvement*. The level of social interaction is high. This indicates that family involvement was much observed. This means that family engagement is correlated with children's positive school attachment and also positive school environments. This is also one of the most critical factors in a child's entire development, including academic achievement and social-emotional abilities.

As mentioned in the study of Epstein (2009) states that parental involvement in their children's education begins at home, with parents providing a secure and healthy environment, appropriate learning opportunities, support, and a positive school attitude. Numerous research has found that students who live with their parents are more academically successful. Studies also show that parental engagement in collaborations between teachers and parents is most successful. Moreover, Zacarian and Silverstone (2015) mentioned that school family activities are tremendous opportunities to work with families. This involves social activities to foster community, showcasing the curriculum to make learning more

clear, utilizing our families' vast resources, and creating a common learning culture at home school.

Followed also by *teacher- school community*, the level of social interaction is also high. This indicates that teacher- school community was also much observed. It means that this partnership can be used to improve, encourage, and even turn individual partners, resulting in increased program efficiency, resource effectiveness, and alignment of priorities and curricula.

The viewpoint of Miller (2005) is seemingly congruent to this study that after-school programs with better relationships with schoolteachers and principals were more effective in improving homework completion, homework effort, positive conduct, and student initiative. This could be because positive school relationships can promote high-quality, engaging, and challenging activities, as well as employee engagement.

A high level of social interaction in the *school community- the community at large* was also evident and much observed. This means that good collaboration between schools, homes, and societies can contribute to academic achievement for students and reforms in education that have been validated and reaffirmed.

Henderson & Berla (2004) cited helping students excel at school is the critical justification for such a relationship. Other factors include improving the educational environment and school services, improving parenting skills and leadership, and assisting families in communicating. It is essential for parents to take an active role in their children's education to establish a positive and supportive connection with their children's schools. Community partnership means recognizing and incorporating the services and resources of communities to support and reinforce schools, students, and their families. Information on community health, cultural, recreational, social support, and other programs or services for students and families link the learning skills and abilities on community events

contribute to different outcomes. Each aspect involves various collaboration activities to include all families; each part also poses problems that must be overcome. Hence, it is critical for each school to determine which elements are most likely to assist the school in achieving its academic achievement goals to foster a collaborative environment between the school and the community.

Level of Students Learning

Shown in Table 2 are mean scores for indicators of students' learning with an overall mean of 3.79, with a descriptive equivalent of high, and with a standard deviation of 0.53. The high level could be attributed to the increased rating given by the respondents in all indicators. This means that the respondents' responses to students' learning were much observed in physical health and well-being, connectedness, social and emotional development, school experience, and use of after-school time.

The cited overall mean score was the result gathered from the following computed mean scores from highest to lowest: 3.93 or high for physical health and well-being with a standard deviation of 0.66; 3.88 or high for social-emotional development with a standard deviation of 0.62; 3.78 or high for connectedness with a standard deviation of 0.68; 3.78 or high for school experience with a standard deviation of 0.68; 3.60 or high for the use of after school time with a standard deviation of 0.75.

The highest level of student learning is physical health and well-being, being the indicator with the highest mean. This explains that overall health is an essential aspect of a child's learning process in a school setting. Good health improves the quality of life, increases student productivity, and increases engagement in the classroom, school, and community. Moreover, this would result from having good performance and academic achievements and recognitions.

That is also much observed regarding connectedness, which became a protective factor that supports consistent school attendance, which is critical for improving students' academic achievement and health outcomes. It emphasized students' relationships and connections with individuals in the school and society, allowing them to have a true sense of belongingness.

Table 2. Level of Students' Learning

Indicator	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Physical Health and Wellbeing	3.93	0.66	High
Connectedness	3.78	0.68	High
Social-Emotional Development	3.88	0.62	High
School Experience	3.78	0.68	High
Use of After School Time	3.60	0.75	High
Overall	3.79	0.53	High

This is followed by *social-emotional development*, in which it obtains the second highest mean score. This is essential to create and maintain solid and productive connections with peers, parents, and teachers. Recognizing one's feelings and emotions are highly beneficial to know their strength and weaknesses. With that, children would be responsible enough for their actions and decision-making. Children would have the capacity to interact with others to build good relationships and collaborations in accomplishing the task in the classroom.

Followed by *school experience* in which the engagement of the students can influence academic development. Schools are an essential environment of socialization and learning for students. School experiences will enhance their social skills, academic performance and to become a better version of themselves. By having experiences, students can participate and take the initiative

and provide a demanding and rewarding task that helps them develop new skills and personal abilities that can be applied.

Finally, *after-school time* provides learning environments that benefit the youth, families, and communities in various ways. After-school time can help children and teens develop socially, emotionally, cognitively, and academically, boost physical health, and provide students with a secure and supportive environment. Students can build their social skills, identify their talents/goals, and enhance and develop their learning through after-school time.

The respondent's responses on their level of student learning are on a high level. This means that all measures described in students learning were positive. This result is associated with the study of Kober (2015), who said that in inactive social classrooms, students' express information most efficiently, using interaction and different strategies to compromise understanding. As experienced learners, teachers should be mindful that students often have less defined or incomplete conceptual structures. Moreover, Kelly (2002) mentioned the transferable, embedded in a reality of learning, 'is a highly personal, complicated, and, to some extent, unspeakable method: something we simply do without giving it much thought. It is also a complex social activity. Conceivably, the most remarkable finding of previous studies on childhood and adolescent learning is that very little is learned through clear and direct teaching. The high *physical health and well-being* level indicated that the story in students' learning was much observed. This means that schooling impacts lifelong health; individuals who achieve higher levels of education tend to live longer in general.

This is congruent with the concept of Schonert- Reichl, and Thomson (2007). They said that area of physical health and well-being assesses students' mental, physical, and self-image, as well as their health-related behaviors. It has a substantial body of data that proper sleep, physical activity, and nutrition are essential for children's healthy physical development and social and

psychological adaptability. Rapid material changes occur throughout early adolescence due to puberty, significantly impacting a child's sense of self, physical appearance, and psychological well-being.

Moreover, Alliance LF (2001) mentioned that academic achievement is a vital school goal; it is not the only objective. Government schools also train students healthy, productive, and moral citizens by instilling an appreciation for a wide range of knowledge and attitudes, including arts and culture. Schools help students grow physically, socially, mentally, and cognitively by incorporating those skills and abilities and a welcoming atmosphere. It is easier for those who fulfill these basic needs to assist learners in changing their behavior, character, and achievements.

In the same manner, the respondents had a high level of students learning about *connectedness*. This means that solid interpersonal abilities make it possible for learners to sustain healthy relationships and a positive association between school connectivity and educational outcomes.

The viewpoint of Schonert- Reichl & Thomson (2007) is somehow associated with this result. Connectedness domain measures the sense of support and belonging of children at home, school, in the peer group, and in the neighborhood/community, as well as their perceptions of the intimacy of friendship, the number of significant adults in school, availability of safe places in the community for children, and availability of services in the community for children. Moreover, (Torgerson et al., 2018) cited that school interactions are especially significant for young adults at an elevated risk of feeling disconnected or separated from anyone. Children with disabilities, learners who were lesbian, homosexual, bisexual, and trans sexual or doubted their sexuality, students who are destitute, or any learner who is continually disengaged because of a lot of scenarios are at higher risk of feeling isolated. Students become more linked to the school through solid family engagement and cheerful school staff,

comprehensive educational setting, and curriculum content represent the reality of a diverse student body.

With regard to the indicator *social-emotional development*, which was on a high level. This means that children learn how to communicate their emotions, develop experiences, and exercise social skills.

This is in line with the views of Schonert- Reichl, and Thomson (2007), who mentioned that the area of socio-emotional development evaluates learners' motivation, life satisfaction, self-management (short- and long-term), broad self-perception, positive social attitudes, symptoms of depression, and anxiety symptoms. In addition, this is somehow connected to the ideas of (Durlak et al., 2007), who mentioned that several academic programs have focused on an interconnected set of abilities that fall under the categories of mental health promotion, character education, social and emotional development (SEL), awareness of bullying, basic skills, approaches based on strengths, and youth development. The social and emotional development principle has provided an umbrella framework for various methods over the last three decades. It seems to have the most outstanding and most intensively assessed empirical basis. Social and emotional development is how learners gain and successfully implement the knowledge, mindset, and abilities needed to recognize and manage feelings effectively, fix issues and develop a meaningful connection with others.

The indicator, *school experience*, which was on a high level. This indicates that school experience was much observed. This means that the area of school experiences measures the academic self-efficacy of adolescents, perceived school environment, belonging to the school, victimization, motivation, and potential goals and ambitions.

This finding parallels Silva & Bazon's (2017) result, who stated that the School bond is focused on three components: teacher

connection, engagement in education, and dedication to lifelong learning. Connection reflects the relationship of the student with the educator, which is characterized by positive outcomes. A good contact relationship among them concerning the content of the lessons and the student's sense of safety, based on affective identification with the teachers, based upon being able to get help when experiencing troubles with the content. Investing refers to the amount of time spent on research, as well as the perception of becoming professional or not, and the idea of doing one's best in school. Substantial educational success and connections to educators strengthen the degree of investing in school activities, and then this kind of financing often appears to compete with school activities investment. The adherence reflects what the learner creates regarding education, the determination that makes the school an internalized responsibility.

The indicator, use of after-school time, has a level of high. This indicates that the use of after-school time was much observed. This means that the time domain of after-school evaluates what kids do after school, with whom, and where they go. Children disclose whether they are engaging in organized activities. Moreover, Postlethwaite and Haggarty (2002) stated that the general opinion among students is that their perspectives on learning and the overall school experience are positively influenced by the variety of teaching, learning, and school experiences.

This is in line with the views of Children Academy (2018) that usually after-school program gives the children the space to be them and show imagination, excitement, and individuality in the social activity that the program provides, away from the formal environment of the classroom. It is important to remember that no matter what after-school activity you and your child select, the social interaction they will benefit from is the aspect that stands out. Your child may find that they have a talent for writing, painting, dancing, or acting, but the social atmosphere that after-school programs offer makes them a valuable activity in your child's growth. Children might

very well discover their passion through extra-curricular activities while having fun and making new friends. Furthermore, (Weiss et al., 2005) mentioned that the flexibility in the influence of school activities on the educational and behavioral results is well described by variability in learners' involvement. There is a three-portion framework that involves learners' participation, attendance, and engagement.

Significance of the Relationship between Social Interaction and Students' Learning

The sole purpose of this study is to determine the influence of social interaction on students' learning. Pearson r was used to determine the significant relationship between the level of social interaction and student learning. Results of computation are shown in Table 3.

The results revealed that the influence of social interaction versus student learning yields an r-value of 0.726, which is significant. The result is due to the p-value of 0.001, lower than the 0.05 level of significance. This led to the null hypothesis, which stated no significant relationship between social interaction and student learning, is rejected.

Table 3. Significance on the Relationship between Level of Influence of Social interaction on Students' Learning

Variables	Mean	SD	R=value	P=value
Influence of Social Interaction	3.92	0.50		
Students Learning	3.79	0.5	0.726*	0.001

* $p < 0.05$

This further means that there is a relationship between two variables correlated. Based on research on the relationship between social interaction and student learning, it has been evident that social

interaction influences student learning. Therefore, the result of the correlation exemplifies that when students' social interaction is high, their knowledge is also increased.

The present study reveals a significant relationship between social interaction and student learning. This indicates that social interaction influences the students learning, which can be seen in the data. This conforms to the study of McInerney & McInerney, 2002; Schunk, 2012, who mentioned that cognitive functions such as learning rely on experiences with others, such as teachers, friends, and parents. Education is thus critically dependent on the characteristics of a collaborative process within an educational culture, which is unique to the situation and bound by context. This result concerns the study of Routman (2005), which states that students learn more when they can converse with each other and participate actively. In short, social interaction is critical to the education process.

The correlation between the overall social interaction and students' learning is significant. This implies that the students learning is dependent on social interaction. These findings affirmed the study of Kober (2015) that inactive social classrooms, students' express information most efficiently, where they use engagement and different strategies to compromise understanding. As experienced learners, teachers should be mindful that students often have less defined or incomplete conceptual structures. This also conforms with the concept of (Ambrose et al., 2010) that teachers should develop approaches to assist students in developing and learning ways to become skilled learners with deeply integrated conceptual structures that are transferable, embedded in powerful cognition abilities can recover.

Regression Analysis of the Influence of Social Interaction and Students' Learning

Data shown in Table 4 are the regression coefficients to test the significant influence of the overall social interaction and student learning. Using the Multiple Regression Analysis, the data revealed that the power of social interaction towards student learning has an F-value of 24.06 and a corresponding p-value of 0.001.

This means that social interaction significantly influences students learning since the probability value is less than 0.05. The R^2 value of 0.536 implies that 53.6% of student learning is influenced by social interaction while the remaining 46.4 were affected by the other factors.

Table 4. Regression Analysis of the Influence of Social Interaction on Students' Learning

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t-value	p-value
	B	SE (B)			
Constant	0.762	0.293			
Teacher- Student Partnership	0.168	0.071	0.197*	2.379	0.019
Student- Student Partnership	0.165	0.070	0.212*	2.371	0.020
Family Involvement	0.117	0.066	0.138	1.769	0.080
Teacher- School Community Partnerships	0.230	0.063	0.307*	3.683	0.001
School Community- Community At Large	0.094	0.067	0.121	1.398	0.16

Dependent Variable: Students' Learning

R = 0.732	R² = 0.536
F - ratio= 24.06	p-value = 0.001

*p<0.05

The combined indicators: teacher-student partnership, student-student partnership, family involvement, teacher-school community partnership, and school community-community at large has a significant influence on the students learning based on the computed F-ratio and its corresponding p-value.

The regression coefficient is to test the significant influence of the overall social interaction and students' learning. Using the Simple Linear Regression, the data revealed that social interaction on students' learning has a significant impact. This means that social interaction significantly influences students learning since student learning was influenced by social interaction were influenced by other factors. The overall results of the social interaction predict students learning. Therefore, the significance level in the hypothesis of social interaction and students learning is rejected.

As stated in the previous section of the study, the computation on the significance of the relationship conformed to the two concepts espoused in the study. It could be repeatedly mentioned in this section that the significant influence of independent variable on the dependent variable accentuates the integrity of the two concepts to wit: This is in line with the idea of McInerney & McInerney, 2002; Schunk, 2012), who mentioned that cognitive functions such as learning rely on experiences with others, such as teachers, friends, and parents. Knowledge is thus critically dependent on the characteristics of a collaborative process within an educational culture, which is unique to the situation and bound by context. This result is also associated with Routman's (2005) work, which states that students learn more when they can converse and participate actively. In short, social interaction is critical to the education process.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, conclusions are drawn in this section. The level of social interaction is high for teacher-student partnership, student-student collaboration, high for family

involvement, high for teacher-school community partnership, and increased for school community- the community at large and the overall mean of high for the level of social interaction. This means that the students' social interactions are much observed. The story of student learning is high for physical health and well-being, high for connectedness, high for social-emotional development, high for school experience, and high for the use of after-school time. The overall mean is high for the level of students learning. This means that all measures described in students' learning were also much observed. There is a significant relationship between social interaction and student learning. Social interaction significantly influences the students learning. This is in line with Routman's (2005) study, which states that students know more when they can converse and participate actively. In short, social interaction is critical to the education process.

Recommendation

The following recommendations are offered in light of the initial findings and conclusions: First, elementary teachers are highly recommended to identify approaches and strategies needed to further shape students learning through social interaction. Moreover, the teacher should incorporate free play to students to enhance their social skills and collaboration in learning. Furthermore, parents should do the responsibility at home to facilitate and develop a child's socialization, values, and attitude.

Also, this study may help the Department of Education for having some ideas on how to deal with social interaction in students learning by creating extra-curricular activities, utilizing effective curriculum that are fit on social learning of the students, and enhancing positive interaction that plays a vital role with regards to students learning. This will also be beneficial to students since the social connection enables students to deal with challenges even after school.

REFERENCES

- Acar, I. H., Pérez-González, S., Kutaka, T. S., & Yıldız, S. (2019). *Difficult temperament and children's peer relations: the moderating role of quality of parent-child relationships*. *Early Child Development and Care*, 189(13), 2141-2155.
- Ainley, M. (2004, November). *What do we know about student motivation and engagement*. In annual meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Melbourne (Vol. 29).
- Alcalay, L., Milicic, N., & Torretti, A. (2005). *Alianza efectiva familia-escuela: un programa audiovisual para padres*. *Psykhe (Santiago)*, 14(2), 149-161.
- Alliance, A. (2014). *America after 3PM: Afterschool programs in demand*.
- Alliance, L. F. (2001). *Every child learning: Safe and supportive schools*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Alvermann, D.E. and Phelps, S.F. (2005). *Content reading and literacy*. Needham Heights, ma: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Barber, B. K., & Olsen, J. A. (2007). *Socialization in context: Connection, regulation, and autonomy in the family, school, and neighborhood, and with peers*. *Journal of adolescent research*, 12(2), 287-315.
- Battin-Pearson, S., Newcomb, M. D., Abbott, R. D., Hill, K. G., Catalano, R. F., & Hawkins, J. D. (2000). *Predictors of early high school dropout: A test of five theories*. *Journal of educational psychology*, 92(3), 568.
- Battistich, V., Schaps, E., & Wilson, N. (2001). *Effects of an elementary school intervention on students' "connectedness" to school and social adjustment during middle school*. *Journal of primary prevention*, 24(3), 243-262.
- Blum, R. W. (2002). *Improving the odds: The untapped power of schools to improve the health of teens*. Center for Adolescent Health and Development.
- Bohlin, G., & Hagekull, B. (2009). *Socio-emotional development: From infancy to young adulthood*. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 50(6), 592-601.
- Bouras, H., & Keskes, S. (2014). *Teacher-learner rapport impact on EFL learners' motivation*. In Proceedings) A paper presented at the International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities. Istanbul, Turkey.
- Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (2018). *Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Brown, P. C, Smith, J.K., (2015). Roediger III, HL, & McDaniel, MA (2014). *Make It Stick. The Science of Successful Learning*.
- Cantor, P., Osher, D., Berg, J., Steyer, L., & Rose, T. (2018). *Malleability, plasticity, and individuality: How children learn and develop in context*¹. *Applied Developmental Science*, 23(4), 307-337.

- Carter, D. (2016). *A Nature-Based Social-Emotional Approach to Supporting Young Children's Holistic Development in Classrooms with and without Walls: The Social-Emotional and Environmental Education Development (SEED) Framework*. International Journal of Early Childhood Environmental Education, 4(1), 9-24.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). *School connectedness: Strategies for increasing protective factors among youth*.
- Cantor, P., Osher, D., Berg, J., Steyer, L. and Rose, T. (2018). *Malleability, plasticity, and individuality: How children learn and develop in context*1. Applied Developmental Science, 23(4), pp.307-337.
- Carter, D. (2016). *A Nature-Based Social-Emotional Approach to Supporting Young Children's Holistic Development in Classrooms with and without Walls: The Social-Emotional and Environmental Education Development (SEED) Framework*. International Journal of Early Childhood Environmental Education, 4(1), pp.9-24.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). *School connectedness: Strategies for increasing protective factors among youth*.
- Claassen, A., Knipping, C., Koopmans, A. and Vierke, H. (2008). *Variatie in brede scholen en hun effecten*. Nijmegen. ITS Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.
- Clarke, A. (2007). *The handbook of school management*. Kate McCallum.
- Comer, J.P., Joyner, E.T. and Ben-Avie, M. eds. (2004). *Six pathways to healthy child development and academic success: The field guide to Comer schools in action*. Corwin Press.
- De Blaay, N., Van Leijenhorst, J., El Khetabi, Z., Van der Grinten, M., Marlet, G. and Larsen, V. (2007). *Maatschappelijke kosten-batenanalyse brede school*. Utrecht: Berenschot, Oberon, Stichting Atlas voor Gemeenten.
- Durlak, J.A., Dymnicki, A.B., Taylor, R.D., Weissberg, R.P., Schellinger, K.B., Dubois, D., Lipsey, M., Greenberg, M. and O'Brien, M.U. (2007). *Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL)*.
- Durlak, J.A., Weissberg, R.P., Dymnicki, A.B., Taylor, R.D. and Schellinger, K.B. (2011). *The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions*. Child development, 82(1), pp.405-432.
- Dyson, A. and Raffo, C. (2007). *Education and disadvantage: the role of community-oriented schools*. Oxford Review of Education, 33(3), pp.297-314.
- Edwards, R. and Alldred, P. (2000). *A typology of parental involvement in education centering on children and young people: Negotiating familiarization, institutionalization and individualization*. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 21(3), pp.435-455.
- El Nokali, N.E., Bachman, H.J. and Votruba-Drzal, E. (2010). *Within-and between-child parent involvement and academic and social skills in elementary school*. Child Development, 81(3), pp.988-1005.

- Epstein, J.L. (2009). *School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share*. Phi delta kappan, 92(3), pp.81-96.
- Epstein, J.L. (2009). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Corwin Press.
- Eschenmann, K.K. (2014). *Student Perceptions of Teaching Style in the Health Occupations Classroom*. Journal of Health Occupations Education, 6(1), p.6.
- Fantuzzo, J., Sutton-Smith, B., Coolahan, K.C., Manz, P.H., Canning, S. and Debnam, D. (2000). *Assessment of preschool play interaction behaviors in young low-income children: Penn Interactive Peer Play Scale*. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 10(1), pp.105-120.
- Fenwick, T.J. (2003). *Learning through experience: Troubling orthodoxies and intersecting questions*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Fodor, J. (2000). *In Critical Condition: A Bradford Book Massachusetts*. London: IT Press.
- Gehlbach, H., Brinkworth, M.E. and Harris, A.D. (2016). *Changes in teacher–student relationships*. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(4), pp.690-704.
- Goldberg, J.M., Sklad, M., Elfrink, T.R., Schreurs, K.M., Bohlmeijer, E.T. and Clarke, A.M. (2019). *Effectiveness of interventions adopting a whole school approach to enhancing social and emotional development: a meta-analysis*. European Journal of Psychology of Education, 34(4), pp.755-782.
- Goodman, A., Joshi, H., Nasim, B., & Tyler, C. (2015). *Social and emotional skills in childhood and their long-term effects on adult life*. London: Institute of Education
- Gopnik, A. (2016). *The gardener and the carpenter: What the new science of child development tells us about the relationship between parents and children*. Macmillan.
- Grandzol, C.J. and Grandzol, J.R. (2010). *Interaction in online courses: More is not always better*. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 13(2).
- Harvard Family Research Project. (2010). *Partnerships for Learning: Promising Practices in Integrating School And Out-of-School Time Program Supports*.
- Hattie, J. (2008). *Interactions Matter: Impact learning through student, classroom, family and community partnerships*
- Henderson, A.T. and Berla, N. (2004). *A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement*.
- Hussain M., Akhtar S., Afzal M. and Gilani, S.A. (2019). *The impact of teacher–student interaction on student motivation and achievement*. European Academic Research, 7(2), pp.1201-1222.
- Ingirige, B. and Goulding, J. (2009). *Maximising social interactions and effectiveness within distance learning courses: cases from construction*. Journal for education in the Built Environment, 4(1), pp.75-99.
- Ingirige, B., Amaratunga, D., Keraminiyage, K. and Baldry, D. (2005). *Leveraging distance learning tools for broadbasing education in construction industry disciplines: The importance of a continuous social discourse*.

- Jones, S.M. and Bouffard, S.M. (2012). *Social and emotional learning in schools: From programs to strategies and commentaries*. Social policy report, 26(4), pp.1-33.
- Kelly, L. (2002). *What is learning... and why do museums need to do something about it*. In *Why Learning?* Seminar, Australian Museum/University of Technology Sydney.
- Kim, Y.S. (2008). *Situated Learning in a Korean Older Adults' Computer Classroom: A Situated Activity and Participation in Communities of Practice*.
- Klem, A.M. and Connell, J.P. (2004). *Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement*. Journal of school health, 74, pp.262-273.
- Kober, N. (2015). *Reaching students: What research says about effective instruction in undergraduate science and engineering*. National Academies Press.
- Larson, R.W. (2000). *Toward a psychology of positive youth development*. American psychologist, 55(1), p.170.
- Lauer, P.A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S.B., Apthorp, H.S., Snow, D. and Martin-Glenn, M.L. (2006). *Out-of-school-time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students*. Review of educational research, 76(2), pp.275-313.
- Le Blanc, M. (2006). *Self-control and social control of deviant behavior in context: development and interactions along the life course*. The explanation of crime: Context, mechanisms, and development, pp.195-242
- Lee, M. (2019). *Today's preschool incorporates more than ABC's*
- Lewallan, T.C. (2004). *Healthy learning environments*. ASCD: Info Brief, 38.
- Little, P. (2011). *Expanded learning opportunities in Washington state: Pathways to student success*.
- Lohrmann, D. (2003). *Healthy school report card background paper*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mahoney, J.L., Lord, H. and Carryl, E. (2005). *An ecological analysis of after-school program participation and the development of academic performance and motivational attributes for disadvantaged children*. Child development, 76(4), pp.811-825.
- Maulana, R., Opdenakker, M.C., Stroet, K. and Bosker, R. (2017). *Changes in teachers' involvement versus rejection and links with academic motivation during the first year of secondary education: A multilevel growth curve analysis*. Journal of youth and adolescence, 42(9), pp.1348-1371.
- McClelland & Tominey (2009). *Social Skills*.
- McNeely, C.A., Nonnemaker, J.M. and Blum, R.W. (2003). *Promoting school connectedness: Evidence from the national longitudinal study of adolescent health*. Journal of school health, 72(4), pp.138-146.
- McWayne, C., Hampton, V., Fantuzzo, J., Cohen, H.L. and Sekino, Y. (2004). *A multivariate examination of parent involvement and the social and academic competencies of urban kindergarten children*. Psychology in the Schools, 41(3), pp.363-377.

- Miller, B. M. (2005). *Pathways to success for youth: What counts in after-school*. United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley
- Miller, K. (2007). *The benefits of out-of-school time programs*. *Principal's Research Review*, 2(2), pp.1-6.
- National Research Council. (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School: Expanded Edition*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Noels, K., Clément, R. and Pelletier, L. (2016). *Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French-Canadian learners of English*. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), pp.424-442.
- OCDE, O. (2015). *OECD Skills Studies: Skills for Social Progress: The Power of Social and Emotional Skills*. OECD Publishing.
- Okita, S. (2012). *2 Social Interactions and Learning*.
- Osborne, G. and Ireland, S. (2000, December). *Yes, we are listening: Listening to student voice*. In *Proceedings Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference*.
- Osher, D., Cantor, P., Berg, J., Steyer, L. and Rose, T. (2018). *Drivers of human development: How relationships and context shape learning and development 1*. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(1), pp.6-36.
- Oyarzun, B., Stefaniak, J., Bol, L. and Morrison, G.R. (2018). *Effects of learner-to-learner interactions on social presence, achievement, and satisfaction*. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 30(1), pp.154-175.
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2003). *Learning for the 21st century: A report and mile guide for 21st century skills*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Paterson, K. (2005). *55 Teaching Dilemmas: Ten Powerful Solutions to Almost Any Classroom Challenge*. Pembroke Publishers Limited
- Pérez S, C. N., Betancort, M., & Cabrera, L. (2013). *Family Influences in Academic Achievement: A study of the Canary Islands*. *Reigta Inter de Socio*, 71(1), pp.169-187.
- Pianta, R. C. (2014). *Enhancing relationships between children and teachers*.
- Postlethwaite, K. and Haggarty, L. (2002). *Towards the improvement of learning in secondary school: students' views, their links to theories of motivation and to issues of under-and over-achievement*. *Research papers in education*, 17(2), pp.185-209.
- Reschke, K. (2019). *Who Am I? Developing a Sense of Self and Belonging*. *Zero to Three*, 39(3), pp.5-8.
- Resnick, M.D., Bearman, P.S., Blum, R.W., Bauman, K.E., Harris, K.M., Jones, J., Tabor, J., Beuhring, T., Sieving, R.E., Shew, M. and Ireland, M. (2000). *Protecting adolescents from harm: findings from the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health*. *Jama*, 278(10), pp.823-832.
- Richardson, S.A. (2009). *Principals' perceptions of parental involvement in the "big 8" urban districts of Ohio*. *Research in the Schools*, 16(1), p.1.
- Rosenfeld, L.B., Richman, J.M. and Bowen, G.L. (2008). *Low social support among at-risk adolescents*. *Children & Schools*, 20(4), pp.245-260.

- Ross, T. (2016). *The differential effects of parental involvement on high school completion and postsecondary attendance*. Education Policy Analysis Archives/Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas, 24, pp.1-38.
- Routman, R. (2005). *Writing essentials: Raising expectations and results while simplifying teaching*. Education Review.
- Sanders, M.G. and Sheldon, S.B. eds. (2009). *Principals matter: A guide to school, family, and community partnerships*. Corwin Press.
- Sapungan, G.M. and Sapungan, R.M. (2014). *Parental involvement in child's education: Importance, barriers and benefits*. Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education, 3(2), pp.23-43.
- Saul, D. (2005). *Education Unplugged: Students Sound off about What Helps Them Learn*. Education Canada, 45(2), pp.18-20.
- Schonert-Reichl, K.A., Buote, D., Jaramillo, A., Foulkes, K., Rowcliffe, P., Calbick, J. and Cleathero, J. (2007). *Middle childhood inside and out: The psychological and social world of children 9–12*. Burnaby, BC: University of British Columbia/United Way of the Lower Mainland.
- Shaughnessy, J. (2001). *From opinion to action... empowering students via survey analysis*. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved March, 12, p.2009.
- Sheldon, S. B. (2009). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Corwin Press.
- Sheridan, S.M., Knoche, L.L., Kupzyk, K.A., Edwards, C.P. and Marvin, C.A. (2010). *A randomized trial examining the effects of parent engagement on early language and literacy: The Getting Ready intervention*. Journal of school psychology, 49(3), pp.361-383.
- Shin, K.M., Cho, S.M., Shin, Y.M. and Park, K.S. (2016). *Effects of early childhood peer relationships on adolescent mental health: A 6-to 8-year follow-up study in South Korea*. Psychiatry investigation, 13(4), p.383.
- Silva, J.L.D. and Bazon, M.R. (2017). *School experience during adolescence: a comparative study between adolescent offenders and not offenders*. Psico-USF, 23(3), pp.437-449.
- Sklad, M., Diekstra, R., Ritter, M.D., Ben, J. and Gravesteyn, C. (2012). *Effectiveness of school-based universal social, emotional, and behavioral programs: Do they enhance students' development in the area of skill, behavior, and adjustment?* Psychology in the Schools, 49(9), pp.892-909.
- So, H.J. and Brush, T.A. (2008). *Student perceptions of collaborative learning, social presence and satisfaction in a blended learning environment: Relationships and critical factors*. Computers & education, 51(1), pp.318-336.
- Social Interaction Skills (2012). *The Expanded Core Curriculum*. American Foundation for the Blind.
- Spee, I., & Seuren, W. (2003). *Levensbreed Leren - Brede scholen in het voortgezet onderwijs en integraal jeugbeleid*. 's-Hertogenbosch: KPC Groep.

- Stanberry, K. (2019). *Understanding Social and emotional development in preschoolers*.
- Strawhun, J., Hoff, N., Kane, E., Parnell, K., & Peterson, R. L. (2014). *Before & After School Programs*, Strategy Brief. Lincoln, NE: Student Engagement Project, University of Nebraska-Lincoln and the Nebraska Department of Education.
- Taylor, R.D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J.A. and Weissberg, R.P. (2017). *Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects*. *Child development*, 88(4), pp.1156-1171.
- Torgerson, C.N., Love, H.A. and Vennum, A. (2018). *The buffering effect of belonging on the negative association of childhood trauma with adult mental health and risky alcohol use*. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*, 88, pp.44-50.
- Tyler, K.M. and Boelter, C.M. (2018). *Linking black middle school students' perceptions of teachers' expectations to academic engagement and efficacy*. *Negro Educational Review*, 59(1/2), p.27.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2000). *Healthy people 2010: Understanding and improving health (2nd ed.)*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office
- Vacca, R.T., Vacca, J.L., & Mraz, M. (2011). *Content area reading: Literacy and learning across the curriculum (10th ed.)*. Boston: Pearson
- Van Voorhis, F.L., Epstein, J.L., Sanders, M.G., Sheldon, S.B., Simon, B.S., Salinas, K.C., Jansorn, N.R., Martin, C.S., Thomas, B.G., Greenfeld, M.D. and Hutchins, D.J. (2013). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Corwin Press.
- Vandell, D.L., Shernoff, D.J., Pierce, K.M., Bolt, D.M., Dadisman, K. and Brown, B.B. (2005). *Activities, engagement, and emotion in after-school programs (and elsewhere)*. *New directions for youth development*, 2005(105), pp.121-129.
- Weiss, H.B., Little, P.M. and Bouffard, S.M. (2005). *More than just being there: Balancing the participation equation*. *New Directions for Youth Development*,
- Wilkes, J. H. (2020). *Lack of student engagement in remote learning tackled*. North Wilkesboro, NC. (105), pp.15-31.
- Zacarian & Silverstone (2015). *Interactions Matter: Impact learning through student, classroom, family and community partnership*