The influences of parents' socioeconomic on elementary student' motivation in online learning at Jakarta, Indonesia

Karnadi
Fahrurrozi
Ika Lestari
Afra Hanina Rahimmakov

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37178/ca-c.21.5.102

Karnadi, Universitas Negeri Jakarta
email: karnadi2761@yahoo.co.id

Fahrurrozi, Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Ika Lestari, Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Afra Hanina Rahimmakov, Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Abstract

In online learning during the pandemic, learning facilities (such as smartphones, computers, internet connections) are needed to support learning activities. Meanwhile, parents with low socioeconomic status feel challenged in the fulfillment of these learning facilities. This study aims to analyze the relationship of parents' socioeconomic status with the motivation of students' learning in online learning. The study used a quantitative correlational method that involved 102 students through convenience sampling techniques. The research was conducted at several elementary schools in Setia Budi, South Jakarta. The research data obtained through the survey then analyzed using SPSS with Pearson Product Moment formula. The results explain that there is a connection between parents' socioeconomic and the learning motivation of students.

Keywords*: motivation; online learning; parent; socioeconomic; student*

Introduction

Since the Covid-19 pandemic, the Indonesian government has circumscribed *lockdown* or *quarantine.* It affects education. Teaching and learning activities can't be done face-to-face as usual. As an alternative to keep learning carried out, the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia made a policy of online learning [1]. Online learning is learning where teachers and students aren't in one room using internet-connected devices (e.g., computers, laptops, tablets, and smartphones) to be implemented anytime and anywhere, directly or indirectly [2-5].

Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia is working with several platforms to support online learning. The platform is accessible to teachers and students for free. The platform in cooperation with Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia is Google Indonesia, Microsoft, Zenius, Quipper, Sekolahmu, and Smart Classes [6]. However, the policy doesn't work as optimally as

face-to-face learning in developing students' attitudes towards knowledge, *self-efficacy,* and intrinsic motivation for learning [7-11].

Based on the observations at Azhari Islamic School elementary school and Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Daarul Uluum, one of the problems found during online learning is the learning device. Based on the data, desktop ownership for people with high socioeconomic status was 65.32%, while the socioeconomic status of the middle and lower 45.5%. Laptop ownership for people with high socioeconomic status was 98.39%, while the socioeconomic status of the middle and lower 92.06%. For people with high socioeconomic status, smartphone ownership was 96.77%, while the middle and lower socioeconomic status was 93.61%. Ownership of tablets for people with the high socioeconomic status of 76.61% while the socioeconomic status of the middle and lower 30.59% [5]. A computer or laptop, smartphone, and fast internet connection are required to support online learning. Meanwhile, parents with low socioeconomic status are challenged in online learning [12].

Some earlier studies have explained that parents' socioeconomic status has some effects on students' academic achievements. Research conducted by [13] explains that the correlation between parents and academic achievement of students is influenced by mindset, while [14] suggest that the socioeconomic status of parents and *self-concept* students relate to academic achievement. Another study conducted by [15]explains a correlation between parents' socioeconomic and students' academic achievement affected by parents' role and social mobility. In addition, the socioeconomic status of parents is also related to reading ability mediated by cognitive and linguistic variables[16]. These studies further explain the correlation between parents' socioeconomic status and haven't discussed aspects other than economics.

Other studies have found more concerns about parents' level of education. Parents' ability and desire to foster educational support to their children is high when they have a high level of education [17]. This result is also in line with the results of research conducted by [18]. Along with the high level of parents' education, their goals about students' education are also high. Therefore, their children's education should be higher or at least equal to theirs. In addition, students who have parents with high socioeconomic status are more ambitious in learning compared to students who have low socioeconomic status. Another study conducted by [16] explained a correlation between the level of education of parents and the IQ of children. However, based on the results of previous research, those haven't been analyzed as the correlation between socioeconomic status and learning motivation. During this time, research that discusses learning motivation tends to associate it with the way teachers teach, school programs, and psychological support of students [19-21]. Therefore, this study analyzes the correlation between parents' socioeconomic status and students' motivation to learn during online learning [22-28].

Materials and Method

Participants

The research was conducted by a survey at several elementary schools located in Setiabudi, South Jakarta. The sampling technique used in this study is convenience sampling, in which a participant in this study was chosen because they are ready and willing to be respondents [29]. The study involved 102 elementary school students.

Measure

Socioeconomic status of parents

In this study, the socioeconomic status of parents was measured using questionnaires. Parents' socioeconomic status is determined by the level of parents' education, parents' occupation, parent's income, and household conditions [30]. On the other hand, facilities that parents own, such as personal vehicles, televisions, gadgets, and other household assets, are also included in the socioeconomic status

indicator [17, 19, 31]. Furthermore, the researchers also added an indicator of the number of pocket money parents give to students [32-36].

Student learning motivation

This study used a Likert Scale-type questionnaire to measure students' learning motivation. Four scale points explain whether students agree or disagree with the statements listed in the questionnaire. Students' learning motivation is distinguished into two factors, and there are intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation involves personal behavior based on students' desire, while extrinsic motivation involves doing something else in doing an activity to get rewarded or avoid punishment. On the other hand, the social environment becomes an extrinsic motivation that can affect intrinsic motivation [37]

Data analysis

The data analysis technique used in this study is a bivariate analysis technique involving two variables. This study used SPSS with *the Pearson Product Moment* formula to determine the correlation of both variables. The value of the socioeconomic status indicator becomes the determinant of the socioeconomic status level of parents set in four categories as described in Table 1. Meanwhile, students' learning motivation level is determined by learning motivation indicator values classified into four categories as described in Table 2.

Table 1

Categories of socioeconomic status of parents.

Value Range	category
0 – 26,25	low
26,26 – 37,5	middle to low
37,6 – 48,75	middle to upper
48,76 – 60	high

Table 2

Categories of student learning motivation

Value Range	category
0 – 26,25	very Low
26,26 – 37,5	low
37,6 – 48,75	fair
48,76 – 60	high

Result

Socioeconomic profile of parents

The data produced in this study consists of the socioeconomic status level of parents, including education level, income, occupation of parents, type and ownership status of the house, facilities and other wealth owned by parents, and the nominal amount of student's pocket money. This study has surveyed 102 pairs of parents through elementary school students in Setia Budi, South Jakarta, through the dissemination of questionnaires that are then presented in the form of tables. Table 3 describes the level of education, occupation, and income of parents [38-41].

Table 3

Parental education, employment, and income levels

Category	father		mother	
	F	%	F	%
Education				
Not Finished Elementary School / Elementary School	8	7,84%	12	11,76%
Junior High School	17	16,67%	19	18,63%
Senior High School	59	57,84%	53	51,96%
Bachelor/Undergraduate/Graduate	18	17,65%	18	17,65%
Occupation				
Unemployment / Housewife	12	11,76%	76	74,51%
Traders/ Laborers	45	44,12%	11	10,78%
Private Employees / Teachers / Lecturers	39	38,24%	14	13,73%
Police / Army / Civil Servants / Doctors / Businessmen	6	5,88%	1	0,98%
Income				
< 1,000,000 IDR	24	23,53%	71	69,61%
1.000.001 - 2.000.000 IDR	26	25,49%	14	13,73%
2.000.001 - 3.500.000 IDR	22	21,57%	7	6,86%
> 3.500.000 IDR	30	29,41%	10	9,80%

Table 3 shows that most parents have an education until high school. Most jobs owned by fathers are traders or laborers, while most mothers are housewives. Most fathers make more than 3,500,000 IDR a month, while most mothers earn less than a million. Next, Table 4 explains the condition of the parent's home, which includes the type of building and the status of ownership.

Table 4

The condition of the parents' home

Household	Frequency	percentage
type		
permanent	56	54,90%
semi-permanent	36	35,29%
wood	10	9,80%
ownership status		
owner	20	19,61%
rent	46	45,10%
join with other family	36	35,29%

Table 4 finds that most of the house buildings owned by parents are permanent with a percentage of 54.9%. However, most of the houses they own are not held but rented, with a percentage of 45.1%—the sum of parents who own a privately-owned home only 19.16% and 35.29% with their family. Furthermore, Table 5 explains the facilities owned by parents, such as vehicles, televisions, and gadgets.

Table 5

Facilities owned by parents

Facilities	Frequency	Percentage
motorcycle		
don't have	9	8,82%
1	65	63,73%
2	25	24,51%
>2	3	2,94%
car		
don't have	86	84,31%
1	13	12,75%
2	2	1,96%
>2	1	0,98%
television		
don't have	7	6,86%
1	80	78,43%
2	12	11,76%
>2	3	2,94%
smartphone		
don't have	1	0,98%
1-2	65	63,73%
3	16	15,69%
>3	20	19,61%
laptop / desktop / tablet		
don't have	66	64,71%
1-2	30	29,41%
3	3	2,94%
>3	3	2,94%

Table 5 shows that only 8.82% of parents don't have a motorcycle in vehicle ownership. In contrast, only 15.69% of parents own a car. In television ownership, only 6.86% of families don't have it. On the other hand, almost all families have smartphones, and only one doesn't have a smartphone. Meanwhile, families who own a laptop, desktop, or tablet are 35.29%. Then, Table 6 describes the wealth of parents who are worth more than a million in the form of savings, gold, and deposits.

Table 6

Other wealth worth over a million

Wealth	Frequency	Percentage
Don't have	60	58,82%
Savings only / Gold only	30	29,41%
Savings and Gold	8	7,84%
Savings, Gold, and Deposits	4	3,92%

Table 6 shows that most parents don't have all such wealth, with a percentage of 58.82%. Only 4 (3.92%) parents have savings, gold, and deposits. The rest, 30 (29.41%) parents, have savings only or gold only, and 8 (7.84%) parents have savings and gold. Then, Table 7 explains the amount of pocket money that parents give to students every day. The nominal amount of pocket money for students is divided into four categories ranging from less than 5,000 rupiahs to more than 15,000 rupiahs per day.

Table 7

The nominal amount of student's allowance

category	Frequency	percentage
< 5,000 IDR	14	13,73%
5.001 - Rp 10.000 IDR	67	65,69%
10.001 - Rp 15.000 IDR	17	16,67%
> 15,000 IDR	4	3,92%

The Data indicators of parental social status have been described in table 3 – table 7. Table 7 explains that most parents give money around 5,000 - 10,000 rupiah for their children with a percentage of 65.69%. The overall socioeconomic status of parents can be seen in table 8.

Table 8

Overall socio-economic status of parents

Socioeconomic Status Level	Frequency	percentage
High	4	3,92%
Middle to upper	15	14,71%
Middle to low	68	66,67%
Low	15	14,71%
Total	102	100%

From the data, results are looked at that the parents` socioeconomic statuses fall into the middle to low category with 66.67%. On the other hand, parents who have low and upper-middle social levels are equal to 14.71%. Parents with high socioeconomic status were only 3.92%.

Motivation of students' learning during online learning during the pandemic

Intrinsic and extrinsic factors influence students' learning motivation. Motivation can arise from oneself and the circumstances and surroundings such as family, teachers, school, peers, learning facilities, and others. The results of the students' learning motivation indicators can be seen in table 9.

.

Table 9

Results from indicator scores for students' learning motivation during the covid-19 pandemic

statement	Totally disagree		disagree		agree		Totally agree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Lack of spirit	5	4,90	32	31,37	55	53,92	10	9,80
Study hard if the needs are fulfilled	6	5,88	36	35,29	52	50,98	8	7,84
Didn’t study if parent doesn’t order	1	0,98	27	26,47	54	52,94	20	19,61
Pay attention to teacher	0	0	7	6,86	69	67,65	26	25,49
Giving up easily in problem solving	3	2,94	19	19,61	67	66,67	11	10,78
Pleased to express an opinion	1	0,98	28	27,45	70	68,63	3	2,94
Forget or late to collect tasks	19	18,63	50	49,02	31	30,39	2	1,96
Get support from parent	4	3,92	6	5,88	67	65,69	25	24,51
Get a reward if have achievement	0	0	19	18,63	75	73,53	8	7,84
Learning facilities is inadequate	2	1,96	37	36,27	56	54,90	7	6,86
Has a problem with bad network	3	2,94	26	25,49	59	57,84	14	13,73
Enjoy with the way teacher teach	10	9,80	37	36,27	55	53,92	0	0
Learning media are monotonous	5	4,90	55	53,92	38	37,25	4	3,92
Agree to school rules	2	1,96	10	9,80	75	73,53	15	14,71
Study rarely due to the influence of friends	20	19,61	66	64,71	15	14,71	1	0,98

Table 9 shows that there are as many as 15 indicators asked of students. The first to seventh indicators are intrinsic indicators, while the eighth to fifteenth indicators are extrinsic indicators.

The first indicator is the lack of student spirit. From the data acquisition, there are 5 (4.90%) students who strongly disagreed, 32 (31.37%) students who disagreed, 55 (53.92%) students who agreed, and 10 (9.80%) students who strongly agree. In general, students answer disagree if it is said to lack the spirit of learning.

The second indicator is a sense of enterprising learning. Generally, students answer I can't entirely agree if it is said enterprising spirit if the needs are fulfilled. From the statement that students are actively studying if the necessities are fulfilled, there are 6 (5.88%) students who strongly disagreed, 36 (35.29%) students who disagreed, 52 (50.98%) students who agreed, and 8 (7.84%) students who strongly agree.

The third indicator is students' initiative. From the statement that students don't study if not ordered, there are 1 (0.98%) students who strongly disagree, and there are 27 (26.47%) students who disagreed, 54 (52.94%) students who agreed, and 20 (19.61%) students who strongly agree. Most in case, students agree if they say not to study if not ordered.

The fourth indicator is the student's attention. From the statement that students pay attention to teachers, there are 7 (6.86%) students who disagreed, 69 (67.65%)

students who agreed, and 26 (25.49%) students who strongly agree. Mostly, students agree if it is said to pay attention to the teacher during online learning.

The fifth indicator is the tenaciousness of the students. From the statement that students give up easily in problem-solving, there are 3 (2.94%) students who strongly disagreed, 19 (19.61%) students who disagreed, 67 (66.67%) students who agreed, and 11 (10.78%) students who strongly agree. Commonly, students agree if it is said that students easily give up on solving problems.

The sixth indicator is student participation. From the statement that students are pleased to express their opinions, there are 1 (0.98%) student who strongly disagreed, and there are 28 (27.45%) students who disagreed, 70 (68.63%) students who agreed, and 3 (2.94%) students who strongly agree. Thus, mainly, students agree if it is said that students are pleased to express opinions during online learning.

The seventh indicator is student' discipline. From the statement that students forget or are late in submitting assignments, there are 19 (18.63%) students who strongly disagreed, 50 (49.02%) students who disagreed, 31 (30.39%) students who agreed, and 2 (1.96%) students who strongly agree. Thus, students disagree if it is said that students forget or are late to collect assignments.

The eighth and ninth indicators are parental support. The indicator obtained data from as many as 4 (3.92%) students who strongly disagreed, 6 (5.88%) students who disagreed, 67 (65.69%) students who agreed, and 25 (24.51%) students who strongly agreed. Usually, students agree if it is said to have the support of parents. The ninth indicator is to get a gift from parents if the student gets an achievement. The indicator obtained data from as many as 19 (18.63%) students who disagreed, 75 (73.53%) students who agreed, and 8 (7.84%) students who strongly agreed. In general, students agree if it is said that parents give gifts if they get an achievement.

The tenth and eleven indicators are learning facilities. The tenth indicator is the lack of adequate facilities. The indicator obtained data from as many as 2 (1.96%) students who strongly disagreed, 37 (36.27%) students who disagreed, 56 (54.90%) students who agreed, and 7 (6.86%) students who strongly agreed. Most in case, students agree if it is said that the learning facilities are inadequate. The eleventh indicator is having learning facilities problems. The indicator obtained data from as many as 3 (2.94%) students who strongly disagreed, 26 (25.49%) students who disagreed, 59 (57.84%) students who agreed, and 14 (13.73%) students who strongly agreed. In most cases, students agree if they have problems such as a bad network during online learning.

The twelfth and thirteenth indicators are the role of teachers. The tenth indicator is how to teach teachers. The indicator obtained data from as many as 10 (9.80%) students who strongly disagreed, 37 (36.27%) students who disagreed, and 55 (53.92%) students who agreed. Overall, students agree if they say they like the way the teacher teaches. The thirteenth indicator is the media which teachers use. The data obtained as many as 5 (4.90%) students who strongly disagreed, 55 (53.92%) students who disagreed, 38 (37.25%) students who agreed, and 4 (3.92%) students who strongly agreed. Students disagree if it is said that the media used by teachers makes them bored. The fourteenth indicator is school regulation. From the data, there were 2 (1.96%) students who strongly disagreed, 10 (9.80%) students who disagreed, 75 (73.53%) students who agreed, and 15 (14.71%) students who strongly agree. Regularly, the students agree with the rules made by the school.

The fifteenth indicator is the role of peers. From the statement that students rarely learn because of the influence of friends, there are as many as 20 (19.61%) students who strongly disagreed, 66 (64.71%) students who disagreed, 15 (14.71%) students who agreed, and 1 (0.98%) student who strongly agree. In the main, students disagree that their peers are influential in learning activities. It can show the overall value of learning motivation during online learning during the covid-19 pandemic in table 10.

Students' learning motivation is categorized into four levels: high, fair, low, and very low.

Table 10

Results of the overall value of student's learning motivation

Learning Motivation Level	Frequency	percentage
High	2	1,96%
Fair	80	78,43%
Low	20	19,61%
Very Low	0	0%
Total	102	100

The overall score of the student motivation data indicator in table 9 is categorized into four high, fair, low, and very low levels. However, none of the students had very low motivation. Of the 102 students, only 2 (1.96%) highly motivated students during online learning, 80 (78,43%) fair, and 20 (19.61%) others have low motivation. To find out if a student's social status and learning motivation have a relationship or not, table 11 shows the relationship between the socioeconomic status of parents and the motivation of students' learning.

Table 11

The relationship between the socioeconomic status of parents and the learning motivation of students.

		Socioeconomic Status	Motivation to Learn
Socioeconomic Status	Pearson Correlation	1	.210*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,035
	N	102	102
Motivation to Learn	Pearson Correlation	.210*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,035	
	N	102	102

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As seen in Table 11, it can be concluded that there is a significant correlation between parents' socioeconomic status and students' learning motivation with each sig score. (2-tailed) = 0.035 < 0.05. The relationship is positive but weak with a value of r = 0.210 > 0.193; respectively.

Discussion

One of the main functions of the family is to advance education and encourage educational goals. The family is responsible for providing the school experience to students [42, 43]. Family values have a significant impact on students' motivations as well as their integration and academic achievement. Part of the impact is due to parents' level of education and financial status [20]. This result is in line with the results of this study, which shows that parents' socioeconomic status is related to students' learning motivation. The results of this study were also supported by [44], who explained that socioeconomic background differences affect students' motivation. Middle-class parents tend to express high expectations for their children [45]. According to [46], parental expectations are external factors that can influence students' learning motivation.

Meanwhile, [43] research found that there was no difference between any socioeconomic level on any of the factors that increase motivation (including self-confidence, learning focus, school grades, study management, planning and monitoring, and persistence). Instead, [43] emphasized factors that trammel motivation, such as anxiety, low control, avoiding failure, and self-sabotage.

The socioeconomic status of parents is related to students' learning motivation and the achievements of students in school. High socioeconomic status tends to achieve higher academic achievement, and low socioeconomic status tends to have a greater risk of breaking up [44]. Students of low socioeconomic status are less likely to have general knowledge and skills (such as calculating, reading, recognizing color names, cutting with scissors, etc.). While students of intermediate social status likely to have general knowledge and skills [19, 45, 47, 48]. This thinking is because middle and high-class parents provide a good model for reading, singing, storytelling, and other learning activities by providing learning facilities such as books, educational games, computers, etc. Besides, they also provide outdoor learning experiences such as going to museums, zoos, concerts, and other places [44, 45, 49]. Access to early education opportunities always depends on the family's financial resources because parents will finance all the needs of children related to education. In contrast, families facing poverty have difficulties realizing the learning experience outside the home. No money and a lack of vehicles make travel outside the home limited, so many families rarely go on vacation [18, 44, 50].

Access to the internet is a significant problem for student's success during online learning in the Covid-19 pandemic. Poorer households face more internet problems and device constraints than wealthier households. Many parents report that they do not have enough time and cannot support their children learning from home. This result is also supported by research that has been done to find that most students say that learning facilities are inadequate and often face unsupported internet quotas. On the other hand, [51]revealed that parents' socioeconomic status does not affect student achievement. However, the research was conducted on students in universities, not elementary school students. Thus, the relationship between socioeconomic status and student learning achievement can depend on the student's age.

The socioeconomic status of parents also affects the family situation and the surrounding environment. Higher-grade parents are more likely to help students succeed in school and engage in educational activities[45]. On the other hand, low socioeconomic communities are less involved in school activities and are permissive. Permissive parents tend to be less educated and knowledgeable in parenting [52]. Moreover, low parental social status environments tend to have family conflict, violence, vandalism, drug abuse, more street gangs, and antisocial peers. The atmosphere is crowded, noisy, chaotic, and dangerous for students [44] These problems will have a destructive impact on students. One of them is to reduce students' learning motivation. However, these problems can be overcome by using external awards to motivate students [53].

In motivating students to learn, one of the approaches that can be implemented is operant conditioning. Operant conditioning is a powerful way to encourage punishment and reward [50]. Operant conditioning is at the keynote of B. F. Skinner's behavioral outlook. Human behavior determines the consequences (rewards and punishments). A result that improves the possibility of a behavior occurring is called a reward. Students' motivation will be embedded in the environment rather than within themselves when conducting an activity for awards [37]. Students will be motivated to do something based on the thought that they will be appreciated, praised, rewarded, and given a present if they succeed [46, 54]. Instead, a result that reduces the possibility of a behavior occurring is called a punishment [51].

Parents are one of the extrinsic factors that can motivate students in encouraging and providing feedback to students. There are several things parents can do to engage during online learning. For example, dialogue with students about the learning

schedule and assignments, celebrating student achievements, building a supportive learning environment at home, discussing topics they are interested in adapting to learning, giving time off learning and playtime, or enjoying activities. In line with the results of this study, most parents support learning activities and give the student a present if they get an achievement.

Another extrinsic factor that can motivate students to learn is the teacher. Unfortunately, the absence of a warm relationship between teachers and students can decrease students' learning motivation. In addition, the way teachers organize the learning process and explain learning materials and too many tasks is the cause of the decrease in student learning motivation [55]. Thus, there are some tips that teachers can do to motivate students, such as explaining learning objectives and using different learning strategies. Besides that, teachers provide instructional media that doesn't make students depend on the teacher, encouraging them to engage and participate in learning to assess student achievement, follow up on students' behavior regularly and give them space to react, ask questions, and suggest (UNESCO, 2020).

Conclusion

This study revealed a weak correlation between the socioeconomic status of parents and the learning motivation of students. Students have low socioeconomic status, and families have low learning motivation and vice versa. Students from middle-low socioeconomic status parents often experience problems in learning facilities. In general, this is because parents from low socioeconomic status middle-low class cannot bolster up the facilities that support learning activities compared to students from high socioeconomic status backgrounds. Moreover, although most parents from low to high socioeconomic status already support learning activities during online learning, students from middle-low socioeconomic status have a shared sense of spirit, initiative, and unyielding compared to students from middle-upper. This research needs to be further examined on the factors that affect the sense of spirit, initiative, and unyielding students also how to infuse it.

References

1. Wajdi, M.B.N., et al., *Education Policy Overcome Coronavirus, A Study of Indonesians.* EDUTEC: Journal of Education And Technology, 2020. **3**(2): p. 96-106 DOI: https://doi.org/10.29062/edu.v3i2.42.
2. Dhawan, S., *Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis.* Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 2020. **49**(1): p. 5-22 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239520934018.
3. Gustiani, S., *STUDENTS'MOTIVATION IN ONLINE LEARNING DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC ERA: A CASE STUDY.* HOLISTICS, 2020. **12**(2).
4. Pr, P.R.S. and D. Sharma, *Online learning: Adoption, continuance, and learning outcome—A review of literature Int.* J. Inf. Manage, 2016. **43**: p. 1-14 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.05.005.
5. Pratama, A.R. and L.L. Scarlatos, *Ownership and use of mobile devices among adolescents in Indonesia.* Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 2020. **48**(3): p. 356-384 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239519886584.
6. Abidah, A., et al., *The impact of covid-19 to indonesian education and its relation to the philosophy of "merdeka belajar".* Studies in Philosophy of Science and Education, 2020. **1**(1): p. 38-49 DOI: https://doi.org/10.46627/sipose.v1i1.9.
7. Usman, I. and N.M. Rozar, *Assessing Halal Supply Chain Performance of Skincare Product Through SCOR Model at Aesthetic Clinic in Surabaya.* AgBioForum, 2021. **23**(2): p. 22-36.
8. Miller, J.J.H. and E. O'Riordan, *Robust numerical method for a singularly perturbed problem arising in the modelling of enzyme kinetics.* BIOMATH, 2020. **9**(2): p. 2008227 DOI: https://doi.org/10.11145/j.biomath.2020.08.227.
9. Makangali, B., et al., *Religious aspects of the Syrian crisis on social media.* Central Asia and the Caucasus, 2020. **21**(1): p. 102-111 DOI: https://doi.org/10.37178/ca-c.20.1.10.
10. Özigci, Y.E., *Crimea as Saguntum? A Phenomenological Approach to the Ukrainian Crisis within the Framework of a Transforming Post-Bipolar Structure.* Croatian International Relations Review, 2020. **26**(86): p. 42-70 DOI: https://doi.org/10.37173/cirr.26.86.2.

11. Piñeros, M.L., *Economic sectors and the monetary policy risk-taking channel.* Cuadernos de Economía, 2020. **43**(123): p. 275-290.
12. Cuisia-Villanueva, M.C. and J.L. Núñez, *A Study on the Impact of Socioeconomic Status on Emergency Electronic Learning during the Coronavirus Lockdown.* FDLA Journal, 2021. **6**(1): p. 6.
13. Destin, M., et al., *Do student mindsets differ by socioeconomic status and explain disparities in academic achievement in the United States?* AERA open, 2019. **5**(3): p. 2332858419857706 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858419857706.
14. Li, S., Q. Xu, and R. Xia, *Relationship between SES and academic achievement of junior high school students in China: The mediating effect of self-concept.* Frontiers in psychology, 2020. **10**: p. 2513 DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02513.
15. Zhang, F., et al., *Family socio-economic status and children's academic achievement: The different roles of parental academic involvement and subjective social mobility.* British Journal of Educational Psychology, 2020. **90**(3): p. 561-579 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12374.
16. Dolean, D. and A. Cãlugãr, *How Reliably Can We Measure a Child's True IQ? Socio-Economic Status Can Explain Most of the Inter-Ethnic Differences in General Non-verbal Abilities.* Frontiers in Psychology, 2020. **11**: p. 2000 DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02000.
17. Tesfagiorgis, M., et al., *The correlation between parental socioeconomic status (SES) and children's academic achievement: The case of Eritrea.* Children and Youth Services Review, 2020. **116**: p. 105242 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105242.
18. Passiri, Y., *Impact of Education and Parent Learning Effect on Student Learning Achievement of School Students Country Je'netallasa District Gowa. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 19(06), 29–34.* . 2017 DOI: https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-1906042934.
19. Chue, K.L. and Y. Nie, *International students' motivation and learning approach: A comparison with local students.* Journal of International Students 2016 Vol 6 Issue 3, 2012. **6**(3): p. 678-699 DOI: https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v6i3.349.
20. Hodo, Z., *Students' Motivation Factors: Albania Case.* IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education, 2016. **6**(6): p. 22-29.
21. Muharam, L.O., et al., *The effect of teaching style on students' motivation and academic achievement: Empirical evidence from public senior high school in konawe selatan regency.* International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research, 2019. **8**(9): p. 1934-1938.
22. Abdi Zarrin, S. and E. Gracia, *Prediction of Academic Procrastination by Fear of Failure and Self-Regulation.* Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 2020. **20**(3): p. 34-43.
23. MacIntyre, P.D., W. Lanxi, and G.H. Khajavy, *Thinking fast and slow about willingness to communicate: A two-systems view.* Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2020. **6**(3): p. 443-458 DOI: https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.834681.
24. Sethuraman, M. and G. Radhakrishnan, *Promoting Cognitive Strategies in Second Language Writing.* Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 2020. **88**: p. 105-120 DOI: https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2020.88.5.
25. Giorgadze, T.G., et al., *Silver atoms encapsulated in G4 PAMAM (polyamidoamine) dendrimers as a model for their use in nanomedicine for phototherapy.* EUROPEAN CHEMICAL BULLETIN, 2020. **9**(1): p. 22-27 DOI: https://doi.org/10.17628/ecb.2020.9.22-27.
26. Kováčik, M., *Freedom to Choose Between Good and Evil: Theological Anthropology in Discussion with Philosophy.* European Journal for Philosophy of Religion, 2020. **12**(4) DOI: https://doi.org/10.24204/ejpr.v12i4.3521.
27. Meyer, N. and R. Klonaridis, *THE IDENTIFICATION OF FEMALE ENTREPRENEURS'BUSINESS GROWTH FACTORS: EVIDENCE FROM SOUTH AFRICA.* International Journal Of Business And Management Studies, 2020. **12**(1): p. 208-224.
28. Mitskaya, E., *Theoretical Thoughts on Legal Regulation of Mediation in Criminal Process in Kazakhstan.* International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences, 2020. **15**(1): p. 91-113.
29. Taherdoost, H., *Group, H.(2017).* Validity and Reliability of the Research Instrument; How to Test the Validation of a Questionnaire/Survey in a Research, 2016 DOI: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205040.
30. Galobardes, B., et al., *Indicators of socioeconomic position (part 2).* Journal of epidemiology and community health, 2006. **60**(2): p. 95 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2004.028092.
31. Chen, Q., et al., *Effects of socioeconomic status, parent–child relationship, and learning motivation on reading ability.* Frontiers in psychology, 2018. **9**: p. 1297 DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01297.

32. Payne, B.K. and L. Hadzhidimova, *Disciplinary and interdisciplinary trends in cybercrime research: An examination.* International Journal of Cyber Criminology, 2020. **14**(1) DOI: https://doi.org/10.37178/ca-c.20.2.10.
33. Mosala, K. and E. ChİNomona, *Motorists Attitudes Towards Implementation Of E-Tolls In Gauteng Province, South Africa.* International Journal Of Ebusiness And Egovernment Studies, 2020. **12**(1): p. 48-62 DOI: https://doi.org/10.34111/ijebeg.202012104.
34. Meyer, D.F. and A.S. Hassan, *Analysis Of The Impact Of Exchange Rate Volatility On The South African Government Bond Market.* International Journal Of Economics And Finance, 2020. **12**(2): p. 271-289.
35. Premporn Khemavuk, A.L., *A Conceptual Model for Uncertainty Demand Forecasting by Artificial Neural Network and Adaptive Neuro – Fuzzy Inference System Based on Quantitative and Qualitative Data.* International journal of operations and quantitative management, 2020. **26**(4): p. 285-302 DOI: https://doi.org/10.46970/2021.26.4.3.
36. Mazibuko, M. and N. Dlodlo, *The Influence Of Information Heuristics In Determining The Evaluation Of Microblog Music Review Credibility.* International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies, 2020. **12**(1): p. 82-97.
37. Legault, L., *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.* Encyclopedia of personality and individual differences, 2020: p. 2416-2419 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24612-3_1139.
38. de Souza, G.H.S., et al., *Brazilian students' expectations regarding distance learning and remote classes during the COVID-19 pandemic.* Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri, 2020. **20**(4): p. 65-80.
39. Salavrakos, I.-D., *A Re-Assessment of Italian Defence Production and Military Performance in the World Wars.* Res Militaris, 2020.
40. Da Silva, D.F., et al., *Changes in mood state and recovery-stress perception after an HRV-guided running program in untrained women.* Revista de Psicología del Deporte (Journal of Sport Psychology), 2020. **29**(1): p. 83-94.
41. Rykiel, Z., *Freedom of science in the semi-periphery vs pandemic.* socialspacejournal. eu, 2020: p. 31.
42. Madhavanprabhakaran, G., et al., *COVID-19 pandemic and remote teaching: transition and transformation in nursing education.* International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship, 2021. **18**(1) DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ijnes-2020-0082.
43. Martin, A., *Motivation and academic resilience: Developing a model for student enhancement.* Australian journal of education, 2002. **46**(1): p. 34-49 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/000494410204600104.
44. Ormrod, J.E., E.M. Anderman, and L.H. Anderman, *Educational psychology: Developing learners*. 2016: Pearson.
45. Slavin, R.E., *Educational psychology: Theory and practice.* 2012.
46. Filgona, J., et al., *Motivation in learning.* Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 2020: p. 16-37 DOI: https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2020/v10i430273.
47. Breton, T.R. and G. Canavire-Bacarreza, *Low test scores in Latin America: poor schools, poor families or something else?* Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 2018. **48**(5): p. 733-748 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2017.1342530.
48. Gimenez, G., D. Ciobanu, and B. Barrado, *A proposal of spatial measurement of peer effect through socioeconomic indices and unsatisfied basic needs.* Economies, 2021. **9**(2): p. 72 DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/economies9020072.
49. Caro, D.H., *Socio-economic gaps in subject interest: the mediating role of parental cognitive involvement.* Large-scale Assessments in Education, 2018. **6**(1): p. 1-38 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-018-0067-9.
50. Long, M., et al., *The psychology of education*. 2010: Routledge DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203840092.
51. Sulaiman, N.F.C., et al., *Data on the impact of socioeconomic status on academic achievement among students in Malaysian public universities.* Data in brief, 2020. **31**: p. 106018 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2020.106018.
52. September, S.J., E.G. Rich, and N.V. Roman, *The role of parenting styles and socio-economic status in parents' knowledge of child development.* Early Child Development and Care, 2016. **186**(7): p. 1060-1078 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2015.1076399.
53. Serin, H., *The use of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations to enhance student achievement in educational settings.* International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies, 2018. **5**(1): p. 191-194 DOI: https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v5i1p191.

54. Melnic, A.-S. and N. Botez, *Academic learning motivation.* Economy Transdisciplinarity Cognition, 2014. **17**(2): p. 56.
55. Przybysz-Zaremba, M., et al., *Parents and Class Teachers' Cooperation in Dealing with Students' Learning Motivation Problems. In Social Pedagogy and Social Inclusion (hal. 141–149).* . 2017.