

When Modules Work: How Access Constraints and Parent Scaffolding Shape Learning Continuity During Weather-Related Class Suspensions in a Philippine Public-School District

Junah Faith Aves-Lofamia¹ and Flor A. Jenkin²

¹Student, University of Sto. Tomas – Legazpi City

²Professor, University of Sto. Tomas – Legazpi City

Abstract— This qualitative study examined learning continuity during weather-related class suspensions at Daraga North Central School, assessing instructional modalities and stakeholder experiences to inform a remedial instruction framework. Separate focus group discussions were conducted with five teachers, five parents, and five pupils. Sessions were audio-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed thematically. Teachers used a constraint-responsive mix of printed modules/LAS, online classes via Google Meet for connected learners, blended online–offline activities, follow-up lessons after suspensions, and home visits for learners without access. Monitoring shifted from classroom observation to parent-mediated evidence (photos/videos and progress updates). Parents enabled learning through guidance, co-working, encouragement, patience, and occasional teaching, but effectiveness depended on parents’ time, content knowledge, and resources. Key bottlenecks included weak internet/no Wi-Fi, lack of devices, limited time to retrieve and complete modules, and parent knowledge gaps, which interacted to produce uneven participation. Findings support design considerations for continuity and remedial planning in disruption-prone public schools.

Keywords— Class Suspensions, learning continuity, modular instruction, parental scaffolding.

I. INTRODUCTION

Class suspensions are often a necessary safety measure during hazardous conditions, yet they carry immediate instructional costs that schools must address. In the Philippines, the suspension of classes is governed by policy guidelines (e.g., DepEd Order No. 037, s. 2020 and DepEd Order No. 22, s. 2022), which specify that classes may be suspended during events such as typhoons, torrential rainfall, or extreme heat. These same guidelines direct schools to implement alternative delivery modes (ADMs) to prevent the loss of instructional time. Despite these policy provisions, sustaining learning continuity during recurrent disruptions remains difficult in practice: teachers must revise lesson plans, parents often become primary learning supports at home, and pupils may experience reduced academic and emotional support during the suspension period.

This challenge is pronounced in disaster-prone localities where suspensions occur repeatedly within the school year. In the district under study, class

suspensions have substantially disrupted the academic calendar. During SY 2024–2025, the district recorded 25 canceled school days due to bad weather and unexpected holiday announcements—equivalent to 15.82% of the 158 total school days. Such figures illustrate that even when continuity is mandated by policy, the frequency and unpredictability of suspensions can make consistent implementation of recovery strategies challenging. Beyond the local context, repetitive cancellations have also been documented in other Philippine regions: Ombay (2024), as cited in the manuscript, reports closures reaching up to 35 days in the Cordillera Administrative Region, affecting hundreds of thousands of learners and highlighting the scale of disruption in high-risk schools.

Because suspensions remove scheduled contact time, schools must rely on instructional alternatives to maintain momentum and prevent learning loss. Contemporary literature points to blended learning and

technology-supported approaches as promising pathways for continuity. Blended learning—combining face-to-face and online instruction—has been associated with flexibility and increased opportunities for self-paced engagement. In disruption contexts, video conferencing tools have been found to sustain learning continuity (Moorhouse & Beaumont, 2020), and the strategic combination of in-person interaction with digital resources can support learner engagement (Jaffar, 2020). Institutional models developed during the pandemic further demonstrate how structured flexible learning designs may support participation: Balasta (2025) described the Flexible Dominican Education Model (FDOE) implemented at the University of Santo Tomas-Legazpi using Google Meet and learning management systems, aligned with Thorne’s blended learning framework and oriented toward personalized learning pathways. While pandemic conditions differ from weather-related closures, these studies collectively emphasize a core insight relevant to recurrent suspensions: continuity requires both modality options and the capacity to deploy them quickly and equitably.

However, access and socio-economic conditions shape whether remedial and continuity interventions can reach the learners most affected by disruption. Resource-limited families are less likely to participate in remedial programs, which can exacerbate educational inequality (Postlbauer et al., 2022). Moreover, learning delays attributed to suspensions may carry long-term academic consequences if not addressed (Singh et al., 2022). Technology-based solutions—such as remote tutoring (Hassan et al., 2022) and e-learning videos (Mailizar et al., 2024)—are frequently proposed as bridges to continuity, but their effectiveness is tied to the availability of devices, connectivity, and supportive learning environments at home. The manuscript also underscores that limited access to learning resources, including technology, can severely hinder learning when remote modalities become primary during disruptions (Pasha et al., 2024).

The literature further suggests that disruption-driven modality shifts affect not only students and parents but also teachers’ workload and well-being. Transitioning

to online or hybrid learning can increase teacher stress and burnout and may negatively influence teaching quality (Bariyah et al., 2024). The loss of social interaction during remote learning has also been identified as a contributing factor to strain (Hascher et al., 2021), while professional identity and school community support can buffer stress (Jackson et al., 2022) and institutional supports can strengthen resilience (Kidger et al., 2021). These findings point to a critical practical implication for schools facing frequent suspensions: continuity plans must be workable under constrained teacher time and capacity, not merely theoretically effective.

At the household level, parental involvement consistently emerges as a key determinant of how well students cope with disruptions. Parents may feel disconnected from schooling when communication is limited (Bell & Puckett, 2020), and socioeconomic status can constrain parents’ ability to provide resources and learning support during remote or alternative delivery modes (Mısırlı & Ergüleç, 2021). Parents’ academic expectations also shape children’s motivation and performance (Almroth et al., 2019). In the sample school, this study frames socio-economic diversity as a major consideration: families vary in access to internet, learning materials, education, and private tutoring, producing unequal learning opportunities during suspensions and requiring remedial interventions that remain relevant across households.

Despite the breadth of literature on blended learning, remote instruction, and technological tools, an important gap remains: there is limited research on how these strategies are implemented and experienced by teachers, parents, and students in schools that undergo frequent, weather-related suspensions. The manuscript also notes that while parental involvement is widely recognized as crucial during disruptions, existing research does not sufficiently explain how socio-economic factors shape parents’ perceptions and their capacity to engage with educational interventions during class suspensions. This gap is particularly relevant for DNCS and similar public-school contexts where suspensions are recurrent, ADMs must be activated quickly, and learning recovery must be

achieved without overburdening teachers or excluding families with fewer resources.

To address this need, the present study focuses on learning disruptions caused by class suspensions and evaluates the effectiveness of measures adopted to recover disrupted learning. It examines how instructional modalities (e.g., blended learning, online platforms, and modular instruction) are implemented to mitigate disruption and restore lost instructional time, and it documents the experiences of key stakeholders—teachers, parents, and pupils—who navigate learning continuity during suspensions. The study is anchored in an integrative lens: Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory is used to understand how layered environments (home, school, broader contexts) shape learning experiences during disruption; Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory foregrounds the role of social interaction and scaffolding support during interrupted learning; and Technology Acceptance Theory (Davis, 1989) informs how perceived usefulness and ease of use can shape the adoption of digital tools for continuity and remediation.

The study aimed to assess the instructional modalities adopted by the school to address learning disruption during class suspensions and to document stakeholder experiences as a basis for developing a remedial instruction framework. Specifically, it sought to answer three research questions: (1) What instructional modalities are adopted by the school to recover learning loss during class suspensions? (2) What are the experiences of teachers, selected parents, and pupils during class suspensions, as narrated by them? and (3) What framework for a remedial program for instruction can be recommended based on these modalities and experiences?

II. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative research design to examine the instructional modalities implemented during class suspensions and to document stakeholder experiences that would inform the development of a remedial instruction framework. Informants were drawn from three groups—teachers, parents, and pupils—to capture perspectives from those who

deliver instruction, support learning at home, and directly experience learning disruption. The initial sample included five (5) teachers, five (5) parents, and five (5) pupils, with participation guided by data saturation (i.e., additional participants were included only if new insights continued to emerge). Participants were identified and recruited in coordination with the school head and class advisers, who helped generate and screen a pool of eligible individuals based on the study’s criteria (e.g., involvement in the school and willingness/availability to participate), after which informants were organized into separate FGDs by stakeholder group.

Data were collected through focus group discussions using structured FGD scripts tailored for teachers, parents, and pupils. FGDs were conducted in the school context either face-to-face or via virtual meetings depending on feasibility and participant availability.

Sessions were audio-recorded and then transcribed using transcription tools, and these transcripts served as the primary dataset for analysis. The discussions focused on stakeholders’ accounts regarding the perceived effectiveness of instructional modalities, the challenges encountered during suspensions, and recommendations relevant to designing a remedial instruction framework.

Thematic analysis was used to interpret the data. Transcripts were reviewed to identify recurring ideas and patterns aligned with the research questions, and a coding system was applied to categorize responses and generate themes that informed the proposed framework.

The trustworthiness of findings was supported by triangulating perspectives across the three informant groups and by grounding interpretations in verbatim, transcript-based accounts derived from recorded FGDs. Ethical safeguards included informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality through removing identifying information and using pseudonyms, and recognition of participants’ right to withdraw without penalty.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Teachers' modality selection and the constraints shaping these choices

Table 1 shows that continuity during class suspensions was implemented through a set of complementary modalities selected largely on the basis of feasibility and access. Printed materials emerged as the baseline option when online access was limited, with teachers distributing modules, worksheets, or LAS through group chats and printed packets, while also using Google Meet mainly for learner queries and clarifications. Online learning, delivered through Google Meet, was reserved for pupils who could “accommodate” internet-based instruction, indicating that participation was strongly contingent on device availability and connectivity. For learners with partial access, teachers reported using blended learning by combining online instruction with offline activities tailored to varied needs, supported by submissions and check-ins that could occur through multiple channels. After suspensions, teachers strengthened recovery through follow-up lessons implemented immediately upon resumption of classes, highlighting a deliberate “catch-up” mechanism to reinforce missed competencies. For learners unable to participate online, home visits served as a compensatory strategy for reaching disconnected pupils, allowing teachers to deliver resources and check learning progress directly.

A key pattern across the modalities is that monitoring shifted from classroom-based observation to evidence-based, parent-mediated reporting. When direct supervision was not possible, teachers relied heavily

on parents to verify engagement and completion by sending photos or videos of pupils doing activities and providing progress updates, which became a practical substitute for face-to-face monitoring. This reliance positioned parents as essential intermediaries in the continuity system: even when instruction was teacher-designed, proof of participation and pacing was often transmitted through the household. The table therefore suggests that continuity during suspensions was not simply about distributing learning tasks; it required an accompanying monitoring infrastructure that functioned through parent communication, learner submissions, and teacher follow-ups across different modalities.

Finally, the table highlights technology constraints as the central driver shaping both modality selection and equity of participation. Teachers explicitly identified lack of phones or internet access as limiting learners' inclusion in online learning and pushing instruction toward printed, blended (where possible), and home-visit strategies. At the same time, logistical constraints—such as parents' limited time to retrieve modules—affected even printed delivery, creating uneven starting points for learning and reinforcing reliance on low-tech options. Taken together, Table 1 indicates that instructional continuity during suspensions was an adaptive, constraint-responsive system in which the “best” modality was typically the one that could realistically be implemented and monitored given household access conditions and the availability of parent support.

Table 1. Continuity modalities during class suspension: feasibility logic and monitoring evidence

Modality theme	Feasibility / access condition	What teachers did (implementation)	How learning was monitored (evidence)	Exemplar narrative (verbatim)
Use of printed materials	Works when online access is limited; can be distributed via group chat / printed worksheets	Sent modules / worksheets / LAS (Learning Activity Sheets)	Monitored later via parent feedback / evidence of completion	“We send modules and worksheets through group chat.” (T-K1) / “We provide printed materials like worksheets.” (T-1) / “We send LAS and Gmeet for queries.” (T-2)

Online learning	For learners “who can accommodate” internet-based learning	Conducted online classes (Google Meet)	Participation/continuity dependent on access	“We have online class for those who can accommodate online learning.” (T-1)
Blended learning	For those who can combine online + offline resources	Used online classes + offline activities tailored to needs	Continued via combined submission/check-ins	“Blended learning was used for those who could accommodate online learning.” (T-3) / “We used a mixture of online and offline activities for different needs.” (T-2)
Follow-up lessons	After suspension (recovery phase)	Conducted follow-up lessons immediately after suspension	Learning reinforced via post-suspension follow-ups	“After the suspension, we have follow-up lessons.” (T-K1) / “We do follow-ups right after suspension.” (T-1)
Home visits	For students who cannot access online learning	Delivered resources / checked learners through home visitation	In-person follow-up supplements remote limits	“Home visits were conducted for students who couldn’t access online learning.” (T-3)
Remote monitoring via parents	When direct classroom observation is impossible	Relied on parents as messengers/observers of task completion	Photos/videos + parent updates/feedback	“Parents send pictures or videos of the students doing their activities.” (T-1) / “Teachers knew if the student did the activities based on parents’ feedback.” (T-2) / “We monitored the students by receiving videos and pictures of them doing their work.” (T-1) / “Parents were helpful in sending progress updates.” (T-2)
Technology constraints (driver of modality choice)	Lack of devices/internet; parent time constraints retrieving modules	Limits who can participate in online modalities; affects module retrieval	Contributes to uneven participation and reliance on low-tech options	“Some students don’t have cell phones or internet access.” (T-K2) / “One of the challenges is when parents don’t have time to get modules.” (T-2)

Table 2. Joint display: parent scaffolding functions across stakeholders (parents, pupils, teachers)

Parent scaffolding	Parent narrative (verbatim)	Pupil narrative (verbatim)	Teacher corroboration (verbatim)	Analytic takeaway (1 sentence)
---------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	---------------------------------------

function (analytic code)				
Guidance / co-working	“We guide the children in answering the modules.” (P-2)	“Parents guide us in answering the modules and encourage us to keep going.” (Pupil)	“Teachers knew if the student did the activities based on parents’ feedback.” (T-2)	Guidance is the core mechanism that converts modules into understanding rather than mere completion.
Encouragement / motivation	“I tell my children, ‘You can do it, it’s for you.’” (P-2) / “The support I can give is to encourage my children to answer the modules.” (P-4)	“Parents guide us... and encourage us to keep going.” (Pupil)	“Parents were helpful in sending progress updates.” (T-2)	Motivation sustains persistence during disruptions, especially when tasks accumulate.
Emotional regulation / patience	“We remind them to stay patient.” (P-5)	(Same pupil emphasis on encouragement)	(Indirect support via continued parent-teacher connection)	Emotional support is described as necessary to keep children engaged under uncertainty.
Teaching / explaining content	“Some parents need to study again to help their children answer the modules.” (P-3) / “The parents were able to teach them.” (P-3)	— (not directly quoted in the extracted section)	(Consistent with reliance on parent feedback/updates during remote monitoring)	Parents sometimes function as “second teachers,” but this depends on parents’ knowledge and capacity.
Conditional effectiveness (key mechanism statement)	“For the module to be effective, it depends on how the parent helps the child.” (P-3)	(Supports the same idea via valuing parent guidance)	Evidence of dependence on parent-submitted proof/feedback	This is your publishable “mechanism claim”: module success is contingent on feasible parent scaffolding.

Parent scaffolding actions enabling modules to function as learning (beyond compliance)

Table 2 synthesizes teacher, parent, and pupil accounts to show that learning continuity during class suspensions hinges on a set of parent scaffolding functions that extend beyond simple supervision. Across stakeholders, guidance/co-working appears as the most consistently described support: parents reported actively guiding children through modules, pupils affirmed this guidance as central to their ability

to continue working, and teachers indirectly corroborated it through their reliance on parent feedback as evidence of participation. Together, these perspectives suggest that parent guidance operates as the practical bridge between module distribution and meaningful engagement—helping learners interpret instructions, sustain effort, and complete tasks with greater understanding rather than purely for compliance.

In addition to academic guidance, the joint display highlights the motivational and emotional dimensions of parental support. Parents described providing encouragement and motivation (e.g., urging children to persist), which pupils also emphasized as sustaining their willingness to continue answering modules. Teachers reinforced this role through reports that parents supplied progress updates, indicating that encouragement is intertwined with accountability and monitoring.

A related function is emotional regulation/patience, where parents described reminding children to remain patient—an important support in a disrupted routine where frustration and uncertainty can reduce engagement. While teacher evidence here is less direct, the overall pattern indicates that parental emotional support is perceived as necessary to maintain participation, especially when the learning environment shifts abruptly from classroom routines to home-based independent work.

The table also shows that in some households, parents assume an even more intensive role—teaching or explaining content—especially when children struggle with module tasks. However, this function is explicitly constrained by parental capacity, as some parents reported needing to “study again” to help their children, implying uneven instructional support across families. This variation culminates in the table’s most significant mechanism claim: the perceived effectiveness of modules is conditional on the nature and feasibility of parent scaffolding. Parents themselves articulated that module effectiveness depends on how the parent helps the child, and teachers’ dependence on parent-submitted feedback and proof-of-work further demonstrates that the modular approach relies on households as co-producers of learning. Overall, Table 2 positions parent scaffolding as the enabling mechanism that determines whether modular continuity functions as learning or devolves into mere completion under disruption.

Table 3. Bottlenecks mapped to the continuity chain (where continuity breaks)

Barrier (theme)	Continuity stage disrupted	Who reports it	Exemplar narrative (verbatim)	Likely interaction (brief)
Weak internet / no Wi-Fi	Access → downloading/participating/submitted	Parents; Pupils	“The internet is weak, making it hard to download materials.” (P-2) / “It’s difficult because there’s no Wi-Fi.” (P-6)	Forces shift toward printed-only modalities and increases parent logistics burden.
Time constraints / time management	Completion → deadlines → submission	Parents	“It takes time to finish modules, and time management becomes a challenge.” (P-4)	When paired with parent work/household duties, reduces ability to scaffold learning.
Parent knowledge gaps (“study again”)	Understanding → quality of guidance	Parents	“Some parents need to study again to help their children answer the modules.” (P-3)	Even when time exists, scaffolding may be weak if parents lack content mastery.

Parent availability to retrieve modules	Retrieval / distribution	Teachers	“One of the challenges is when parents don’t have time to get modules.” (T-2)	Delays access to printed materials, compounding time pressure on completion.
Lack of devices	Online participation feasibility	Teachers	“Some students don’t have cell phones or internet access.” (T-K2)	Creates modality stratification: online/blended for some, printed/home visit for others.

Key continuity barriers and their interactions

Table 3 identifies the most common points at which learning continuity breaks during class suspensions by mapping reported barriers to specific stages in the “continuity chain,” from access and retrieval to completion, understanding, and submission. The first and most frequently emphasized bottleneck is weak internet or lack of Wi-Fi, reported by both parents and pupils, which directly disrupts access to digital learning materials and makes downloading or participating in online activities difficult. This barrier effectively narrows the set of feasible modalities, pushing families toward printed-only options and increasing the logistical demands on households to secure, manage, and return learning tasks. In this sense, connectivity constraints do not simply reduce online participation—they restructure the entire continuity process by shifting it to lower-tech systems that require different forms of support.

A second set of bottlenecks appears after materials are obtained: time constraints and time management challenges, reported by parents, disrupt the completion and submission stages. When modules require extended time to finish, households must balance learning tasks with work and domestic responsibilities, which can compress available study time and lead to late or incomplete outputs. Importantly, this time scarcity also reduces the capacity for active parental scaffolding; parents may be able to monitor or remind children but have limited time to sit with them, explain content, or review answers. Thus, even when modules

are available, the continuity chain can break at the level of sustained engagement and timely completion.

The table also highlights barriers that operate at the level of learning quality and equity. Parent knowledge gaps, captured in statements about parents needing to “study again,” disrupt the understanding stage by limiting the instructional strength of parental guidance. This means that in some households, even when time is available, scaffolding may remain weak because parents are unsure how to explain lessons or support higher-level tasks. Finally, two teacher-reported constraints—parents’ limited availability to retrieve modules and lack of devices—show how logistical and resource inequalities compound disruptions. Limited time to pick up modules delays retrieval and compresses the window for completion, while device scarcity creates modality stratification, where only some learners can access online or blended learning and others depend on printed materials or home visits. Taken together, Table 3 demonstrates that continuity failures are multi-stage and interacting: access constraints trigger modality shifts, logistical constraints delay entry into learning, and capacity constraints (time and knowledge) shape whether modules translate into meaningful learning or fragmented compliance.

IV. CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that instructional continuity during class suspensions operates as a constraint-responsive system rather than a single fixed approach. Teachers implemented multiple modalities—printed

materials, online and blended learning, follow-up lessons, and home visits—based primarily on what was feasible for learners given varying levels of internet access, device availability, and household circumstances. Monitoring practices also shifted away from classroom observation toward household-mediated reporting, with parents serving as the main channel through which teachers verified engagement and task completion. Overall, continuity depended not only on providing learning materials but also on sustaining communication and follow-up mechanisms that could function under disrupted conditions.

Across stakeholder perspectives, parental involvement emerged as the central mechanism that determines whether modular instruction functions as learning or becomes mere compliance. Parents supported learners through guidance, co-working, encouragement, and emotional support, and in some cases took on teaching roles when children struggled with content. Pupils recognized this support as essential for persistence, while teachers depended on parent feedback and evidence submissions to monitor progress. However, the effectiveness of this arrangement varied across households because parents differed in time availability, confidence in lesson content, and access to resources—reinforcing that “module effectiveness” is conditional on feasible and sufficiently instructional parent scaffolding.

Continuity broke most often at predictable points in the learning chain: access constraints (weak internet/no Wi-Fi, lack of devices), logistical constraints (limited time to retrieve printed modules), and capacity constraints (time management and parent knowledge gaps). These barriers interacted to produce uneven opportunities: connectivity and device limitations narrowed feasible modalities, while time and knowledge constraints reduced the quality and consistency of home-based support. As a result, the same continuity strategy could lead to different outcomes across learners, suggesting that equitable learning recovery during suspensions requires targeted supports that reduce reliance on household capacity alone.

To strengthen learning continuity during class suspensions, the school should implement a streamlined, tiered continuity package that matches support to access conditions while reducing parent burden. First, standardize a printed “core continuity kit” (modules/LAS + a one-page parent guide per lesson) distributed in advance during high-risk months, with clear weekly submission schedules. Second, add low-bandwidth support for connected families through short Google Meet “help sessions” focused on learner questions and teacher clarifications, supported by simple messaging-based reminders. Third, institutionalize monitoring protocols that minimize friction (e.g., a single template for photo/video proof, short progress checklists, and scheduled check-in times) and prioritize learners who miss submissions for rapid follow-up lessons upon return. Finally, for learners with persistent access barriers, schedule targeted home visits or community pickup points and provide brief parent orientations on how to guide modules, focusing on common difficult topics—so continuity becomes more equitable, consistent, and learning-centered during repeated suspensions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Department of Education. (2024). DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024: Guidelines on the Implementation of...on.
- [2] Ombay, G. (2024). School closures in cordillera: 35-day disruption affects 317,000 learners...., 1–4.
- [3] Moorhouse, B. L., & Beaumont, A. M. (2020). Utilizing video conferencing software to teach young language learners in Hong Kong during the COVID-19 class suspensions. *TEFLIN Journal - A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 31(2), 178–196.
- [4] Jaffar, A. (2020). Blended learning: The convergence of classroom and online education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 11(15), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.7176/jep/11-15-01>
- [5] Balasta, V. (2025). Flexible Dominican education model: A personalized approach to learning. *International Journal of Academic Multi-disciplinary Research*, 9(1), 27–32.

- [6] Postlbauer, M., Gleirscher, J., & Bacher, J. (2022). Educational inequality has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic: Analysis of the social selectivity of summer schools...., 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1954925/v1>
- [7] Singh, A., Hwa, Y., & Kaur, K. (2022). Educational disruption due to school closures: Impacts and long-term effects. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 109, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101849>
- [8] Hassan, H. M. K., Hasan, A. R., & Rahman, M. (2022). Telementoring: a transition solution for primary education during COVID-19 school closure in rural Bangladesh. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 15(3), 231–248. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jrit-10-2021-0065>
- [9] Mailizar, M., Widyasari, M., Rifisqi, M., & Asadh, A. (2024). Developing e-learning-based remedial videos to bridge students' learning gaps in the post-pandemic era. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, 11(1), 104–110. <https://doi.org/10.20448/jeelr.v11i1.5345>
- [10] Pasha, R., Sultana, N., Paul, A., & Mukerjee, D. (2024). Socio-economic status and academic engagement: Exploring the roles of self-efficacy and learning interest. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 6, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2024.100317>
- [11] Bariyah, K., Fikri, A., Rahayu, N. W., & Syafii, I. (2024). Teachers' mental workload and job burnout in hybrid learning during the covid-19 pandemic...., 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3889730/v1>
- [12] Hascher, T., & Waber, J. (2021). Teacher well-being: a systematic review of the research literature from the year 2000–2019. *Educational Research Review*, 34, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100411>
- [13] Jackson, C., Makaye, J., Muranda, Z., & Masuku, S. (2022). Teacher resilience in a context of crisis: The role of professional identity and school community support. *Perspectives in Education*, 40(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593x/pie.v40.i2.01>
- [14] Kidger, J., Stone, T., Tilling, K., Brockman, R., Campbell, R., Ford, T., Hollingworth, W., King, M., Araya, R., & Gunnell, D. (2021). Study protocol: a cluster randomised controlled trial of the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the WISE intervention...., 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1914-6>
- [15] Bell, C., & Puckett, T. (2020). Parents feel disconnected with remote learning during COVID-19. *Journal of Family Studies*, 26(2), 1–5.
- [16] Mısırlı, Ö., & Ergüleç, F. (2021). Emergency remote teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic: Parents experiences and perspectives. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26, 6699–6718. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10520-4>
- [17] Almroth, M., Skoog, T., & Hall, S. (2019). Parental academic expectations and student motivation and performance: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31, 1069–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09472-7>
- [18] Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.