Research Paper   Open Access

Classroom Social Environment and School Performance in The Selected Secondary Schools in The Municipality of Iba and Botolan, Zambales

Teresa V. Apagalang
(College of Teacher Education, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Philippines)

ABSTRACT: This research investigated teachers' perceptions of the social environment in the classroom and student performance in a sample of secondary schools in the Philippines' Municipality of Iba and Botolan, Zambales, including Amungan National High School, San Agustin Integrated School, Jesus F. Magsaysay High School, President Ramon Magsaysay State University-laboratory High School, Botolan National High School, and Bancal Integrated School. One hundred fifty-five respondents were chosen at random, and the researcher used the descriptive research design and questionnaire as the primary instruments to collect data. The school received a "Very High" rating for promotion, retention, and cohort or survival rates but a "Very Low" rating for failure and drop-out rates.There was a significant difference in the perception of the classroom social environment as to classroom mastery goals, classroom performance goals, classroom social interaction, classroom mutual respect, and classroom academic self-efficacy. There was a significant difference in the level of school performance on student progress and development as to failure rate, drop-out rate, promotion rate, retention rate, and cohort survival rate. There is a negligible relationship between the classroom social environment and the school student progress and development level.Regarding classroom mastery goals, classroom performance goals, classroom social interaction, classroom mutual respect, and classroom academic self-efficacy, there was a significant difference in perception. Concerning the failure rate, drop-out rate, promotion rate, retention rate, and cohort survival rate, there was a considerable variation in the level of school performance. The social climate in the classroom has very little bearing on how well students are progressing academically.

KEYWORDS: *Social Environment, Failure Rate, Drop-Out Rate, Survival Rate, Classroom Mastery Goals, Classroom Performance Goals, Classroom Social Interaction, Classroom Academic Self-Efficacy*

I.   INTRODUCTION

In terms of classroom mastery goals, classroom performance goals, classroom social interaction, classroom mutual respect, and classroom academic self-efficacy, there was a substantial difference in how these aspects of the classroom social environment were perceived. In terms of failure rate, drop-out rate, promotion rate, retention rate, and cohort survival rate, there was a substantial disparity in the degree of school performance on student advancement and development. The amount of academic achievement and development of students has very little to do with the social climate in the classroom. Incorporating a range of powerful teaching tactics that stretch and inspire students, a positive classroom social environment is focused on student learning and competency and offers opportunities for high-quality interactions among teachers and between teachers and students. Numerous variables can be used to assess school performance. These comprise the cohort survival, retention, drop-out, promotion, and failure rates. The principal and the teacher's job is to put the programs and strategies put forth by the Department of Education into practice in order to guarantee the students' high academic performance, low (if not zero) failure rate, high rates of promotion and retention and survival, and low rates of school abandonment.

Therefore, research is needed to uncover the specific educational environments that contribute to positive outcomes related to school-related engagement and behavior and to fully understand teacher perceptions of the classroom social environment and school performance, and to gain further insight into what aspects of the classroom social environment can affect school performance.

II.　　　　RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

Classroom Mastery Goals

Teachers' mastery-oriented behaviors such as encouraging academic interest in classroom materials, being flexible for failures and mistakes, and guiding students for focusing more on their own performance instead of others' performances improve students' learning (Fryer & Elliot, 2008). In mastery oriented classrooms, students focus more on learning, development, improvement, and understanding; they use more effective learning strategies and prefer more challenging tasks, demonstrate less disruptive behaviors while in performance-oriented classrooms, students focus more on doing better than others, demonstrate behaviors leading to recognition, praise, and higher confidence; they use less effective learning strategies, less effort, and prefer easy tasks and demonstrate more disruptive behaviors(Ames & Archer, 1988; Kaplan, Gheen, & Midgley, 2002; Midgley & Edelin, 1998; Ramnarain, 2013; Ryan, Pintrich, & Midgley, 2001; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2013).

Classroom Performance Goal

Again, due to the increased sensitivity and self-consciousness, adolescents' motivation may be especially harmed by the notion that the teacher encourages performance goals (Harter, 1990). Studies that looked at the importance of performance goals in the classroom and student motivation provide evidence for this. Ames and Archer (1988) and Urdan, Midgley, and Anderman (1998) discovered a negative correlation between students' perceived academic competence and a classroom's emphasis on performance goals. Although Roeser, Midgley, and Urdan (1996) found no significant relationship, some study (e.g., Midgley, Anderman, & Hicks, 1995) found middle school kids' view that performance goals are emphasized at school to be negatively associated to their academic efficacy. Additionally, students' beliefs that performance objectives are prioritized are inversely correlated with their perceptions of the teacher's social efficacy (Ryan & Patrick, 2004).

Classroom Social Interaction

When students are encouraged to interact and exchange ideas with each other during academic tasks they have opportunities to ask or answer questions, make suggestions, give explanations, justify their reasoning, and participate in discussions. These interactions are related to student learning and achievement (e.g., Cohen, 1994; Webb & Palincsar, 1996), consistent with expectations from both Piagetian and Vygotskian theories of learning and development (De Lisi & Golbeck, 1999; O'Donnell & O'Kelly, 1994). Students' perceptions that they are given opportunities to participate actively during lessons and are encouraged to interact with classmates in the pursuit of understanding are likely to be associated also with their motivation.

Classroom Mutual Respect

Students are more likely to be able to concentrate on learning activities in environments where respect is valued without being distracted by worries about what others might think or say if they are mistaken or have trouble. Additionally, respectful settings encourage students to solve problems, take cognitive risks, and comprehend concepts (Cohen, 1994; De Lisi & Golbeck, 1999).

According to Giesinger (2012), treating children with dignity allows them to consider themselves as human beings with the right to assert their rights and as such, have the same status as adults.

Teachers should work to instill in their children a variety of admirable qualities that will help them get respect. Higher levels of communication with the instructor will result in stronger relationships, and mutual respect will surely exist when there are positive relationships between students and instructors (Celkan, Green, Hussain, 2014).

Classroom Academic Efficacy

Research has shown that teaching self-efficacy is a key indicator of successful teacher and student results (Klassen & Tze, 2014; Zee & Koomen, 2016). Teacher self-efficacy has been examined using a variety of approaches, sample sizes, and instruments, as noted by Zee and Koomen (2016) in their overview of studies from 1970 to 2016. According to this review, the relationship between student outcomes and both general and domain-specific student accomplishment has been studied (e.g., math achievement). Simply said, "beliefs about whether one can generate certain activities" to achieve specific goals is the definition of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997,). Unlike the majority of other personal beliefs, self-efficacy, according to Lorsbach and Jinks (1999), can be accessed from and influenced by learning settings.

Drop-Outs

In the article of Malipot (2011) Manila, Philippines-The Department of Education (DepEd) announced on Thursday the significant decrease in the dropout rates among high school students as 56 secondary schools nationwide reported zero incidences of students quitting school. According to DepEd Secretary Armin Luistro, the number of high school drop-outs has declined because of the Dropout Reduction Program (DORP) which offers alternative delivery programs that aim to keep students in school and finish their basic education.

Over 6 million young people in the Philippines drop out of school, according to Digal (2011). One of the key factors is poverty. You need to "motivate" the parents to see the value of education for their children's lives, according to Bishop Ongtioco. programs for distance learning to assist students who leave school to continue

their studies. About 6 million Filipino youngsters who are old enough to attend school quit entirely. This information is the result of research done by the Department of Education in Manila. Nearly 25% of the 91 million people that live there are under the age of 18 and make up 30% of the population. The lack of public knowledge of the value of education is a major contributing factor to poverty.

Retention

Other retention strategies are employed to aid kids in resolving their academic and other school-related issues. Year-round activities that assist pupils in adjusting to the demands of school life. to prepare the children for the difficulties they experience on a daily basis both within and outside of the classroom. Students engage with one another through campus clubs and extracurricular activities in order to ease their adjustment to college life and create a "peer support system" (Selingo 2015).

Retention is suggested for a variety of factors, such as academic problems on a grade level, immaturity or a late birthday, missing a lot of school due to absences, and inadequate English proficiency. Academic failure brought on by reading difficulties in the primary grades and inability to gain course credit during the high school years is the two most frequent causes of student retention. Many educators and administrators support the practice because they believe that it gives children the opportunity to learn tssential abilities (St. Croix River, 2015).

III.   METHODOLOGIES

The study used a descriptive research design. According to Calmorin (2005), this strategy is intended to help the investigator learn more about the current state of the situation. The respondents in this study were the (JHS) Junior High School Secondary School teachers of the (6) chosen secondary schools. The study was carried out in the President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Amungan National High School, Jesus F. Magsaysay High School, San Agustin Integrated School, Botolan National High School, and Bancal Integrated School, among other randomly chosen public secondary schools in the municipality of Iba and Botolan. Through the distribution of questionnaires, information on teachers' perceptions of the social climate in the classroom was gathered. during the academic year in the municipalities of Iba and Botolan in Zambales. (Table 1).

**Table 1 : Distribution of Respondents from the Selected Schools in the municipality of
Iba and Botolan, Zambales
N=155**

SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF JHS TEACHERS	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
President Ramon Magsaysay State University	12	12
Amungan National High School	36	36
Jesus F. Magsaysay High School	16	16
San Agustin Integrated School	11	11
Bancal Integrated School	10	10
Botolan National High School	70	70
Total	**155**	**155**

The survey questionnaires used by the researcher were modified from the Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey (PALS) it was developed and used by Midgley et al. to assess teachers' perceptions, of the classroom mastery goal, classroom performance goal, classroom mutual respect,and self-efficacy. The classroom social environment was measured using four-item scales from the Classroom Social Environment (CSE) scale developed by Ryan and Patrick (2001) and adapted from Mutual respect and social interaction were measured which uses a 4-point Scale, 1 (never) and 4 (always) was also used by the researcher.

The researcher requested permission from the superintendent of the school's division so that they may provide the respondent's study instrument. To ensure the efficient administration and the success of the questionnaire retrieval, the help of the school principals and school heads was also sought.

To address the research's open-ended questions and evaluate the hypothesis, data from the questionnaire checklist was obtained, processed, and interpreted.

The percentage, average weighted point (AWP), and analysis of variance were the statistical techniques employed in the study.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Perception of the respondents towards Classroom Social Environment

1.1. Classroom mastery Goals

Table 4 : Perceptions of the Respondents towards Classroom Social Environment as to Classroom Mastery Goals

N=155

	Classroom Mastery Goals	WM	QI	Rank
1	I want my students to understand their work, not just memorize it.	3.82	Always	2
2	I really want my students to enjoy learning new things.	3.83	Always	1
3	I recognize my students for trying hard learning and working on their assigned tasks.	3.70	Always	4
4	I give my students time to really explore and understand new ideas.	3.68	Always	5
5	I make a special effort to recognize students' individual progress, even if the progress is slow.	3.65	Always	7
6	During class, I often provide several different activities so that students can choose among them.	3.43	Always	10
7	I consider how much students have improved when I give them report card grades.	3.63	Always	8
8	I give a wide range of assignments, matched to students' needs and skill level.	3.44	Always	9
9	I believe that when my students feel motivated and in control, they can make choices at which they can succeed.	3.67	Always	6
10	I want my students to learn from their mistakes rather than hide or avoid them.	3.72	Always	3
	Overall Weighted Mean	**3.66**	**Always**	

Table 4 shows the perceptions of the respondents towards Classroom Social Environment as to Classroom Mastery Goals.The teacher respondents assessed "Always" to have really their students enjoy learning newthings manifested in the high mean value of 3.83 and ranked 1st followed by the desire that their students understand their work, not just to memorize it with a mean of 2.82 and ranked 2nd and the least on the statement that during class, they often provide several different activities so that students can choose among them with mean of 3.43 and ranked 10th. Overall, the computed mean on the responses towards classroom mastery goals was 3.66 with the qualitative interpretation of "Always".

1.2. Classroom Performance Goal

> Table 5 shows the perceptions of the respondents towards Classroom Social Environment as to Classroom Performance Goals.

Table 5 : Perceptions of the Respondent's towards Classroom Social Environment as to Classroom Performance Goals

N=155

	Classroom Performance Goals	WM	QI	Rank
1	I point out those students who get good grades as an example to all of them.	3.45	Always	6
2	I point out those students who do well as a model for the other students.	3.50	Always	2.5
3	I let my students know which of them get the highest scores on a test.	3.52	Always	1
4	I display the work of the highest achieving students as an example.	3.44	Always	7
5	I give special recognition to students who do the best work.	3.48	Always	4
6	My students like schoolwork that they would learn from, even if they make a lot of mistakes.	3.43	Always	9
7	My students like schoolwork best when it really makes them think.	3.43	Always	9
8	An important reason my students do their schoolwork is because they want to improve their skills.	3.46	Always	5
9	An important reason my students do their schoolwork is because they are interested in it.	3.43	Always	9
10	An important reason my students do their schoolwork is because they like to learn new things.	3.50	Always	2.5
	Overall Weighted Mean	**3.46**	**Always**	

The teacher respondents assessed "Always" on allowing their students to know which of them get the highest scores on a test manifested in the high mean value of 3.52 and ranked 1st followed by pointing out students who do well as a model for the other students and for valid important reason allowing students do their schoolwork because they like to learn new things with equal mean of 3.50 and ranked 2.5th respectively while least on knowing students like schoolwork that they would learn from, even if they make a lot of mistakes, the students like schoolwork best when it really makes them think, and d for an important reason my students do their schoolwork is because they are interested in it with equal mean of 3.43 and ranked 9th. Overall, the computed mean on the responses towards classroom performance goals was **3.46** with the qualitative interpretation of "**Always**".

1.1. Classroom Social Interaction
Table 6 shows the perceptions of the respondents towards the Classroom Social Environment and Classroom Social Interaction.

Table 6
Perceptions of the Respondent's towards Classroom Social Environment
as to Classroom Social Interaction
N=155

	Classroom Social Interaction	WM	QI	Rank
1	I allow my students to discuss their work with classmates.	3.46	Always	9
2	I encourage my students to share ideas with one another in class.	3.61	Always	1.5
3	I let my students ask other students when they need help with their work.	3.55	Always	7
4	I encourage my students to get to know all the other students in class.	3.60	Always	3
5	In my classes, my students are supposed to be active all the time.	3.57	Always	6
6	I allow my students to learn from others.	3.59	Always	4.5
7	Every student is given a chance to talk in my classroom.	3.61	Always	1.5
8	Students are able to achieve more, faster, and more accurately when they work in groups.	3.53	Always	8
9	No student feels alone and excluded in my class.	3.59	Always	4.5
10	I allow my students to have fun and be noisy while learning when they work in groups.	3.34	Always	10
	Overall Weighted Mean	**3.54**	**Always**	

The teacher respondents assessed "Always" on encouraging students to share ideas with one another in class and giving every student is given a chance to talk in my classroom with an equal mean of 3.61 and ranked 1.5th respectively and followed by encouraging students to get to know all the other students in class with mean of 3.60 and ranked 3rd while least on allowing students to have fun and be noisy while learning when they work in groups with mean of 3.34 and ranked 10th. Overall, the computed mean on the responses towards classroom social interaction was **3.54** with the qualitative interpretation of "**Always**".

1.1. Classroom Mutual Respect
Table 7 shows the perceptions of the respondents towards the Classroom Social Environment as to Classroom Mutual Respect.

Table 7 :Perceptions of the Respondent's towards Classroom Social Environment
as to Classroom Mutual Respect
N=155

	Classroom Mutual Respect	WM	QI	Rank
1	I want my students to respect each other's opinions.	3.78	Always	1
2	I do not allow my students to make fun of other students' ideas in class.	3.70	Always	8
3	I make sure that my students don't say anything negative about each other in the class.	3.72	Always	3.5

4	I do not let my students make fun of someone who gives the wrong answer.	3.75	Always	3.5
5	I want all my students to feel respected.	3.75	Always	3.5
6	I expect all my students to value one another.	3.75	Always	3.5
7	I want my students to value their classmates' contributions they make to classroom life.	3.75	Always	3.5
8	My students are focused on understanding tasks and do not worries about what other say if they are incorrect.	3.68	Always	9
9	I want my students to feel safe, comfortable and free from worry.	3.72	Always	6.5
10	My students' attention is not diverted by concern about what others might think if they experience difficulty.	3.65	Always	10
	Overall Weighted Mean	**3.73**	**Always**	

The teacher respondents assessed "Always" that the students should respect each other's opinions manifested on the weighted mean of 3.78 and ranked 1st followed by the four indicators which that the teacher makes sure the students don't say anything negative about each other in the class, for not allowing students to make fun of someone who gives the wrong answer, and the students to feel respected and want my students to value their classmates' contributions they make to classroom life with equal mean of 3.75 and ranked 3.5th respectively while least on the indicatorwhere the student's attention is not diverted by concern about what others might think if they experience difficulty with mean of 3.65 and ranked 10th. Overall the computed mean on the responses towards classroom mutual respect was **3.73** with the qualitative interpretation of "**Always**".

1.1. Classroom Academic Self-Efficacy
Table 8 shows the perceptions of the respondents towards the Classroom Social Environment as to Classroom Academic Self-Efficacy. The teacher respondents assessed "Always" for helping the students to believe they can do well in school work manifested on the weighted mean of 3.54 and ranked 1st followed by the three indicators as getting students to work together, for the students to follow classroom rules and can control disruptive behavior in the classroom with equal

Table 8 : Perceptions of the Respondent's towards Classroom Social Environment as to Classroom Academic Self-Efficacy
N=155

	Classroom Academic Self-Efficacy	WM	QI	Rank
1	I can get through to the most difficult students.	3.41	Always	9
2	I can do great to promote learning where there is lack of support from the home.	3.42	Always	8
3	I can keep students on task on difficult assignments.	3.34	Always	10
4	I can motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork.	3.48	Always	7
5	I can get students to work together.	3.52	Always	3
6	I can overcome the influence of adverse community conditions on students' learning.	3.51	Always	5
7	I can get students to do their schoolwork.	3.50	Always	6
8	I can let my students to follow classroom rules.	3.52	Always	3
9	I can control disruptive behavior in the classroom.	3.52	Always	3
10	I can help students to believe they can do well in school work.	3.54	Always	1
	Overall Weighted Mean	**3.47**	**Always**	

mean of 3.52 and ranked 3rd respectively while least on keeping the students on the task on difficult assignments with a mean of 3.34. Overall, the computed mean on the responses towards classroom academic self-efficacy was **3.47** with the qualitative interpretation of "**Always**".

Table 9: Summary Table on the responses of the teacher-respondents towards
Social Classrooms Environment
N=155

	Dimensions	OWM	Qualitative Interpretation	Rank
1	Classroom Mastery Goals	3.66	Always	2
2	Classroom Performance Goals	3.46	Always	5
3	Classroom Social Interaction	3.54	Always	3
4	Classroom Mutual Respect	3.73	Always	1
5	Classroom Academic Self-Efficacy	3.47	Always	4
	Grand Mean	**3.57**	**Always**	

Table 9 shows the Summary Table on the responses of the teacher-respondents towards the Social Classrooms Environment. The respondents assessed "Always" on all dimensions of Social Classrooms Environmentas to classroom mutual respect with a high mean value of 3.73 and ranked 1st; classroom mastery goals, 3.66 and ranked 2nd; classroom social interaction, 3.54 and ranked 3rd; classroom academic self-efficacy, 3.47 and ranked 4th while classroom performance goals, 3.46 and ranked 5th. The computed grand mean on the responses towards dimensions Social Classrooms Environmentwas 3.57 with the qualitative interpretation of "Always".

2. **Level of Schools' Performance on Student Progress and Development**
   Table 10 shows the level of schools' performance on student progress and development as to failure rate, promotion rate, retention rate, drop-out rate and cohort survival rate.

Table 10
Level Schools' Performance on Student Progress and Development

Level of Schools Performances	Failure Rate	Promotion Rate	Retention Rate	Drop-out Rate	Cohort Rate
Amungan National High School (ANHS	2.37	96.00	93.00	2.54	82.00
Bancal Integrated School (BIS)	4.30	100.00	92.00	0.00	81.15
Botolan National High School (BNHS)	5.60	94.16	93.68	1.78	76.73
Jesus Magsaysay High School (JMHS)	0.00	93.00	92.00	2.00	75.78
President Ramon Magsaysay State University (PRMSU)	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
San Agustin Integrated School (SAIS)	5.68	91.47	94.55	0.97	81.82
Total	**2.99**	**95.77**	**94.21**	**1.22**	**82.91**
Interpretation	**Very Low**	**Very High**	**Very High**	**Very Low**	**Very High**

As to the failure rate, the President Ramon Magsaysay State University (PRMSU) and Jesus Magsaysay High School (JMHS) was noted to have a very low failure rate of 0.00 respectively while higher for Botolan National High School (BNHS) and San Agustin Integrated School (SAIS) with 5.60 and 4.68 respectively. The low percentage of failure rate is accounted on the school and administration support in the conduct of home visitation, and close monitoring of student attendance.

For Promotion Rate, the President Ramon Magsaysay State University (PRMSU) and Bancal Integrated School (BIS) with 100% promotion rate and the least on San Agustin Integrated School (SAIS) with 91.47%. The high promotion rate is anchored on the adherence to DepEd "No Child Left Behind" policy. The teacher conducted remedial or tutorial activities to assure that the students mastered the knowledge and skills competencies.

For Retention Rate, the President Ramon Magsaysay State University (PRMSU) with 100.00% retention rate, followed by San Agustin Integrated School with 94.55% and the least Bancal Integrated School (BIS) and Jesus Magsaysay High School (JMHS) with equal rate of 92.00% respectively. The high retention rate for PRMSU is anchored on the small number of students which is easily controlled, monitored, and supervised compared to other schools where the student population is more than a thousand.

For Drop-Out rate, Bancal Integrate School (BIS) and the President Ramon Magsaysay State University were equally noted to have a very low drop-out rate of 0.00 rate followed by San Agustin Integrated School (SAIS) with a 0.97% drop-out rate and the least on Amungan National High School (ANHS) with 2.54% drop-out rate. According to the teacher and school administrators in ANHS who had been interviewed, the drop-outs of students are anchored on the transfer to other schools; some helped their parents in farm work and fishing activity, while some are engaged in early marriage. In the article of Malipot (2011) Manila, Philippines-The Department of Education (DepEd) announced on Thursday the significant decrease in the dropout rates among high school students as 56 secondary schools nationwide reported zero incidences of students quitting school. According to DepEd Secretary Armin Luistro, the number of high school drop-outs has declined because of the Dropout Reduction Program (DORP) which offers alternative delivery programs that aim to keep students in school and finish their basic education Or cohort survival rate, the President Ramon Magsaysay State University with the high rate of 100.00% followed by Amungan National High School (ANHS) with 82.00% and the least on Jesus Magsaysay High School (JMHS) with 75.78 cohorts or survival rate.

3. **Test of Differences in the perception towards dimensions of classroom social environment.**
   Table 11 shows the Single Analysis of Variance to test the differences in the perception towards dimensions ofthe classroom social environment

Table 11
Single Analysis of Variance to test the differences in the perception towards dimensions of classroom social environment.

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Classroom Mastery Goal	10	34.64	3.464	0.001137778
Classroom Performance Goals	10	36.57	3.657	0.018045556
Classroom Social Interaction	10	35.45	3.545	0.007294444
Classroom Mutual Respect	10	37.25	3.725	0.001538889
Classroom Academic Self-Efficacy	10	34.76	3.476	0.004182222

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.522332	4	0.130583	**20.277563**	1.32E-09	**2.578739**
Within Groups	0.28979	45	0.006439			
Total	0.812122	49				

Decision: Reject Null Hypothesis (There is a Significant Difference)
The computed F-value of **20.277563** is greater than the (>) F-critical value of **2.578739** using a 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, indicating significant differences in perception of classroom social environment dimensions. As a result, the null hypothesis is **rejected**, and **there are alsosignificant differences** in perception of classroom mastery goals, performance goals, classroom social interaction, classroom mutual respect, and class climate.

4. **Test of Differences in Student Progress and Development**
   Table 12 shows the Single Analysis of Variance to test the differences in the level of school performance on Student Progress and Development.
   There are significant differences in the level of school performance on the student progress and development as to failure, promotion, retention, drop-outs, and cohort survival rate manifested on the computed F-value of **670.30340** which is greater than (>) F critical value of **2.759**, therefore the null hypothesis is Rejected, hence there is a significant difference.

Table 12 : Single Analysis of Variance to test the differences in the level of school performance on Student Progress and Development

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Failure	6	17.95	2.991667	6.805776667
Promotion	6	574.63	95.77167	12.91873667
Retention	6	565.23	94.205	9.03055
Drop-out	6	7.29	1.215	1.14071

Cohort Survival Rate		6	497.48	82.91333	77.24222667	

Source of Variation	SS	Df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	57451.9725	4	14362.99	**670.30340**	5E-25	**2.759**
Within Groups	535.69	25	21.4276			
Total	57987.6629	29				

The data clearly shows the differences in the level of school performance on student progress and development. Each school has itsdistinct way ofan intervention program to lessen several drop-outs and failures and increase the percentage of promotion, retention, and survival rates.

5. Test of Relationship

Table 13 shows the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation to test the relationship between the classroom social environment and the level of school performance on student progress and development.

Table 13

Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation to test the relationship between the classroom social environment and the level of school performance on student progress and development

Sources of Correlations		Level of School Performance	Classroom Social Environment
Level of School Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.138
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.086
	N	155	155
Classroom Social Environment	Pearson Correlation	-0.138	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.086	
	N	155	155

There is a negligible relationship between the level of school performance on student progress and development and the perception ofthe classroom social environment manifested in the computed Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation value of 0.138. The computed Sig. P-value of 0.086 which is higher than (>) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is Accepted, hence there is no significant relationship.

V. CONCLUSION

The respondents assessed "Always" on classroom social dimensions as to classroom mastery goals, classroom performance goals, classroom social interaction, classroom mutual respect, and classroom academic self-efficacy. The school was assessed as "very low" in the failure rate and drop-out rate while "Very High" in promotion, retention, and cohort or survival rate. There is a significant difference in the perception towards dimensions of the classroom social environment as to classroom mastery goals, classroom performance goals, classroom social interaction, classroom mutual respect, and classroom academic self-efficacy.

There are significant differences in the level of school performance on student progress and development as to failure rate, drop-out rate, promotion rate, retention rate, and cohort survival rate.

There is a negligible relationship between the classroom social environment and the school student's progress and development.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

[1].   Albert, J.R. & Raymundo, M.G. A. (2016). Trends in Out-of-School Children and Other Basic Education Statistics

[2].   Anuradha S. (2017). Classroom Environment: An Analytical Review of the Related Literature

[3].   Asiroglu1, S., Akran, S.K .(2018).The Readiness Level of Teachers in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Education.

[4.].   Celkon, Gul, Green, Linda, Hussain, Kashif (2014). Student Perceptions of Teacher Respect Toward College Students.

[5].   Corso,M.J., Bundick,M.J. Quaglia,R.J. & Haywood, D.E.(2013). Where Student, Teacher, and Content Meet: Student Engagement in the Secondary School Classroom.

[6].   Fletke, L. L.(1997). "Parental Involvement in Education"

[7].   Gablinske, P. B. (2014). A Case Study of Student and Teacher Relationships and the Effect on Student Learning.

[8].   Giesinger, Johannes (2012). Respect in Education.

[9].   Gönül S. (2015). "Perceived teacher factors about students' achievement related outcomes in science classrooms in elementary school."

[10].   Hannah, R, (2013). "The Effect of Classroom Environment on Student Learning".

[11].   Koca, F. Ph.D. (2016). Motivation to Learn and Teacher–Student Relationship, Journal of International Education and Leadership

[12].   Keller, M. M., Chang, M., Becker,E.S., Goetz1,T.and Frenzel,A.C.(2014). Teachers'Emotional Experiences and Exhaustion as Predictors of Emotional Labor in the Classroom: An Experience Sampling Study.

[13].   Lorsbach, A., Jinks, J. (1999).Self-efficacy Theory and Learning Environment Research.

[14].   Midgley, C., Maehr, M. L., Hicks, L., Urdan, T. U., Roeser, R. W., Anderman, E., &Kaplan, A. (1995).

[15].   Miller, R.. & Pedro, J.(2006). Creating Respectful Classroom Environments.

[16].   Montebon, D.R. (2015). "A Needs Assessment Survey on Teacher Readiness of Science Pre-Service Teachers: Towards a Contextualized Student Teaching Enhancement Program (STEP)"

[17].   Norazlin, M. R.. Teachers' Readiness in Implementing 21st-Century Learning Viewed from: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i4/4270

[18].   Nugent, T.T. (2009) "The Impact of Teacher-Student Interaction on Student Motivation and Achievement.(Dissertation Paper)

[19].   Roeser, R. W., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. C. (1996). Perceptions of the School Psychological Environment and Early Adolescents' Psychological and Behavioral Functioning in School: The Mediating Role of Goals and Belonging.

[20].   Rizman (2015). The Factors that Affect the Drop-Out Rate of Students

[21].   Rusdin, N. M. (2018). Teachers' Readiness in Implementing 21st Century Learning. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences

[22].   Saul, R. (2015)."What is the influence of teacher-student relationships on learning

[23].   Sharma, A. (2017). Classroom Environment: An Analytical Review of the Related Literature.

[24]. Skaalvik, E.& Skaalvik S.(2007). Dimensions of Teacher Self-Efficacy and Relations with Strain Factors, Perceived Collective Teacher Efficacy, and Teacher Burnout.

[25]. Stewart, K. (2016) "Examining Student and Teacher Perceptions of the Classroom Social Environment across School Context: Effects of Individual Factors

[26]. St. Croix River (2015). A Special Education Guideline for Retention Number 25.