



Academic Behavior and Performance of Senior High School Student in Mariners Polytechnic Colleges Inc. Basis for an Intervention

Balbin Carla Angela O., Borja Ramil Jovas

1,2,3 University of the Cordilleras, Baguio City, 2600, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Academic achievement for all students is a top priority for public schools, which place a premium on instruction and results, especially for students with the lowest academic achievement levels. While educators aim to ensure that all students meet these high expectations, other factors often impede their advancement. The descriptive correlation technique, which is a measure of how closely two variables are related, was used in the study to find the relationship between the variables. A positive correlation is present when an increase in one variable tends to be accompanied by an increase in the other. The researchers constructed and used the survey questionnaire as the instrument in order to obtain the data needed to answer the problems of the study.

Keywords: Academic Student Behavior, Class Performance, Learning Intervention, Curriculum, Learning Matrix, Learning style, Individual Differences

Introduction

Academic success is a dynamic student activity affected by a range of abilities, including memory, prior experience, and aptitude, as well as psychological factors such as motivation, desires, temperament, and emotions. It can be difficult to ensure that each student is improving as educational expectations increase. Obstacles to achieving this aim do, however, appear from time to time. For example, student classroom behavior can have a major impact on the amount and quality of instruction given in the classroom, especially if the behavior is negative and disruptive. It may be difficult for the instructor to redirect or punish the student while also delivering quality instruction when these activities arise in the classroom.

Academic performance is a dynamic student activity affected by a combination of abilities such as memory, prior experience, and aptitude, as well as psychological factors such as motivation, interests, temperament, and emotions. It can be challenging to ensure that all students are improving as educational expectations increase. However, there are times when challenges to achieving this aim emerge. For example, negative and disruptive student classroom activities may have a direct effect on the amount and quality of instruction offered in the classroom. When these behaviors arise in the classroom, teachers can find it difficult to redirect or punish the student while also delivering quality instruction.

Methodology

The study utilized the Descriptive Correlation method which means discovering the connection - more specifically it is a measure of the degree to which two variables are associated. If an increase in a variable have a tendency to be related with an increase in the other then this is identified as a positive correlation. "Correlation studies are a type of research often used as a preliminary way to gather information about a topic or in situations where performing an experiment is not possible. The correlation method involves looking at relationships between two or more variables"

In this study the researcher described the teachers' academic behavior and performance of primary school learners. Correlation is a statistical technique that can illustrate whether and how strongly pairs of variables are related. One reason for using correlation research is to verify the degree to which a connection exists between two or more variables. This study aimed to determine academic behavior and performance of senior high school student in Mariners Polytechnic Colleges as basis for an intervention.

Result and Discussion

Set of criteria were formulated for the interpretation of the result of the data gathered in the evaluation on the assessment on the common behavior problems of the primary learners that affect the academic performance.

The Likert's scale was used to evaluate the result.

Table 1
Population and Sampling

Respondents	Population	Sampling	Percentage
Grade 11 Students	16	16	100.00
Grade 12 Students	24	24	100.00
Total	40	40	100.00

As presented in the table, 16 or 100.00 percent of grade 11 student; 24 or 100.00 percent of grade 12 student of the respondent.

Table 1 presents the population and sampling of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondents as Age

Respondents	Population	Sampling	Percentage
19 and Above	3	3	7.50
18 Yrs Old	7	7	17.50
17 Yrs old	18	18	45.00
16 Yrs Old	12	12	30.00
Total	40	40	100.00

As shown in the data, most of the respondents are within 19-16 years old with a frequency of 18 or 45.00 percent for 17 yrs old and above; followed by 12 or 30.00 percent for 17 yrs old; and a frequency of 7 or 17.50 percent for 18 yrs old; lastly a frequency of 3 or 7.50 percent for 19 yrs old and above.

Table 3
Respondents as to Sex

Respondents	Population	Sampling	Percentage
Male	19	19	48.00
Female	21	21	52.00
Total	40	40	100

As reflected in the data, most of the respondents are senior high school student with a frequency of 19 or 48.21 percent for male respondents; followed by others with a frequency of 21 or 52.00 percent for female respondents.

Table 4
Performance of Senior High School Student for S.Y. 2019-2020

School Year	MPS	Verbal Interpretation
2019-2020	88.30	Very Satisfactory

Legend:

MPS	Descriptive Equivalent
90 – 100%	Outstanding
85 – 89%	Very Satisfactory
80 – 84%	Satisfactory
75-79%	Fairly Satisfactory
74 and below %	Did not Meet Expectation

Table 5
Common Behavior
Problems in Terms of Social Problem

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
	1. I experience bullying inside the school.	2.49	
2. I am distracted by other students.	2.55	R	3
3. I engage into gambling.	2.58	R	1
4. I go to undesired places.	2.51	R	6
5. I am into cutting classes.	2.47	R	8
6. I am teased by other name.	2.53	R	4
7. I make noise and unnecessary remarks.	2.56	R	2
8. I engage into side conversation.	2.52	R	5
Overall Mean	2.53	R	

Legend:

Scale	Numerical Value	Descriptive Value
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very Frequently (VF)
4	3.40 – 4.19	Frequently (F)
3	2.60 – 3.39	Occasionally (O)
2	1.80 – 2.59	Rarely (R)
1	1.00 – 1.79	Never (N)

As shown in the data, all the indicators were assessed by the respondents as rarely, these are: I engage into gambling (WM=2.58) rank 1; I make noise and unnecessary remarks (WM=2.56) rank 2; I am distracted by other students (WM=2.55) rank 3; I am teased by other name (WM=2.53) rank 4; I engage into side conversation (WM=2.52) rank 5; I go to undesired places (WM=2.51) rank 6; I experience bullying inside the school (WM=2.49) rank 7; and I am into cutting classes (WM=2.47) rank 8.

Table 6
Common Behavior Problems in Terms of Psychological Problem

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
	1. I do cheating during examination, quizzes, etc.	2.42	
2. I disregard deadline of projects, assignments, etc.	2.36	R	7
3. I do grade grabbing.	2.45	R	2
4. I lie.	2.47	R	1
5. I do falsification of school documents.	2.40	R	6
6. I disrespect authority.	2.41	R	5
7. I came to school late.	2.44	R	3
Overall Mean	2.42	R	

As presented in the data, all the items were assessed by the respondents as rarely, these are: I lie (WM=2.47) rank 1; I do grade grabbing (WM=2.45) rank 2; I came to school late (WM=2.44) rank 3; I do cheating during examination, quizzes, etc. (WM=2.42) rank 4; I disrespect authority (WM=2.41) rank 5; I do falsification of school documents (WM=2.40) rank 6; I disregard deadline of projects, assignments, etc. (WM=2.36) rank 7.

Table 7
Common Behavior Problems in Terms of Emotional Problem

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
	1. I experience love related problem.	2.73	
2. I feel some insecurities with others.	2.68	O	3
3. I have parental conflicts.	2.61	O	6
4. I have conflicts to with the teachers.	2.65	O	5
5. I have conflicts with peers.	2.67	O	4
6. I experienced self-related problems such as self-pity, etc.	2.83	O	1
Overall Mean	2.70	O	

As portrayed in the data, all the indicators were assessed by the respondents as often, these are: I experienced self-related problems such as self-pity, etc. (WM=2.83) rank 1; I experience love related problem (WM=2.73) rank 2; I feel some insecurities with others. (WM=2.68) rank 3; I have conflicts with peers (WM=2.67) rank 4; I have conflicts to with the teachers (WM=2.65) rank 5; I have parental conflicts (WM=2.61) rank 6.

Table 8
Common Behavior Problems in Terms of Personal Problem

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
	1. I am part of a broken family.	1.53	
2. I am abused by Family Members.	1.76	N	1
3. I am abused by peers.	1.68	N	3
4. I am abused with my economic status.	1.75	N	2
5. I experience deprivation of my personal satisfaction.	1.52	N	5
Overall Mean	1.65	N	

Based on the Table 8, the common behavior problems of the intermediate learners that affect the academic performance in terms of personal problem gained an overall mean value of 1.65 and interpreted as never.

Table 9
Common Behavior Problems of in Terms of Physical Problem

Indicators	WM	VI	Rank
	1. I destroy school property.	1.77	
2. I hit others.	1.72	N	4
3. I engage into fighting.	1.76	N	3
4. I am into pushing others that cause pain.	1.79	N	1
5. I engage into drinking.	1.71	N	5
6. I am into using of illegal drugs.	1.51	N	7
7. I have physical incapacities.	1.55	N	6
Overall Mean	1.69	N	

As reflected in the data, all the indicators were assessed by the respondents as never, these are: I am into pushing others that cause pain (WM=1.79) rank 1; I destroy school property (WM=1.77) rank 2; I engage into fighting (WM=1.76) rank 3; I hit others (WM=1.72) rank 4; I engage into drinking (WM=1.71) rank 5; I have physical in capacities (WM=1.55) rank 6; and I am into using of illegal drugs (WM=1.51) rank 7.

Table 10
Summary Assessment on the Common Behavior
Problems of Grade 2 Learners

Variables	WM	VI	Rank
	1. Social Problem	2.53	
2. Psychological Problem	2.42	R	3
3. Emotional Problem	2.70	O	1
4. Personal Problem	1.65	N	5
5. Physical Problem	1.69	N	4
Overall Mean	2.20	N	

Table 10 displays the summary assessment of the respondents on the common behavior problems of the intermediate learners that affect their academic performance.

Table 11
Suitability of the Proposed Intervention Program

Indicators	School Admins		Teachers		GPTA		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. The intervention program considered policy guidance of implementation.	3.98	S	4.12	S	4.05	S	4.05	S	1
2. The intervention program is suitable for operation/ administrative practices, procedures and system of school.	3.95	S	4.08	S	4.09	S	4.04	S	2
3. The intervention program is suitable and in accordance with CHED's vision, mission, goals and objectives.	3.93	S	4.08	S	4.01	S	4.01	S	5
4. The intervention program provides a reasonable preparatory time to enable program to make necessary adjustments for adaptation and implementation.	3.92	S	4.11	S	4.04	S	4.02	S	4
5. The objectives of the intervention program is suitable since it can be achieved in reasonable time frame.	3.91	S	4.14	S	4.04	S	4.03	S	3
Overall Mean	3.94	S	4.11	S	4.05	S	4.03	S	

Legend:

Scale	Numerical Value	Descriptive Value
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very Suitable (VS)
4	3.40 – 4.19	Suitable (S)
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Suitable (MS)
2	1.80 – 2.59	Inadequately Suitable (IS)
1	1.00 – 1.79	Not Suitable (NS)

The respondents assessed the suitability of the proposed intervention program as suitable evidenced by the overall mean value of 4.03.

Table 12
Acceptability of the Proposed Intervention Program

Indicators	School Admins		Teachers		Parents		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. The intervention program could be program adopted by the institution.	4.09	A	4.16	A	4.13	A	4.13	A	2
2. The over-all action of the intervention program can be made clear to all concerned.	4.06	A	4.19	A	4.17	A	4.14	A	1
3. The intervention program will benefit the institution.	4.04	A	4.12	A	4.17	A	4.11	A	3
4. The intervention program is workable and operative.	4.03	A	4.15	A	4.13	A	4.10	A	4
5. The intervention program is flexible enough to adopt to different conditions for which it is intended.	4.02	A	4.11	A	4.13	A	4.09	A	5
Overall Mean	4.05	A	4.15	A	4.15	A	4.11	A	

Legend:

Scale	Numerical Value	Descriptive Value
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very Acceptable (VA)
4	3.40 – 4.19	Acceptable(A)
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Acceptable(MA)
2	1.80 – 2.59	Inadequately Acceptable (IA)
1	1.00 – 1.79	Not Acceptable (NA)

Table 13 depicts the acceptability of the proposed intervention program.

Table 13
Feasibility of the Proposed Plan of Action

Indicators	School Admins		Teachers		GPTA		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Requirement for operational procedure, specific policies and standards are specified in the proposed intervention program.	3.99	F	4.07	F	3.83	F	3.96	F	5
2. The proposed intervention program has featured of being able to be implemented amidst existing environment both internal and external to the organization.	4.05	F	4.03	F	4.05	F	4.04	F	2
3. The proposed intervention program installs budgetary funding which institute appropriation can provide.	3.91	F	4.11	F	3.92	F	3.98	F	4
4. Manpower and other resources can be allotted effectively to fit the requirement of the intervention program.	4.03	F	4.14	F	3.98	F	4.05	F	1

5. Facilities and other equipment are available for utilization to carry out the purpose of the intervention program.	4.08	F	4.05	F	3.89	F	4.01	F	3
Overall Mean	4.01	F	4.08	F	3.93	F	4.01	F	

Legend:

Scale	Numerical Value	Descriptive Value
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very Feasible (VF)
4	3.40 – 4.19	Feasible (F)
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Feasible (MF)
2	1.80 – 2.59	Inadequately Feasible (IF)
1	1.00 – 1.79	Not Feasible (NF)

Table 14
Summary Assessment on the Proposed Intervention Program

Variables	School Heads		Teachers		GPTA		Composite	
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. Suitability	3.94	S	4.11	S	4.05	S	4.03	S
2. Acceptability	4.05	A	4.15	A	4.15	A	4.11	A
3. Feasibility	4.01	F	4.08	F	3.93	F	4.01	F

Table 15 unveils the summary of the suitability, acceptability and feasibility of the proposed intervention program.

Table 15
Significant Difference on the Respondents' Assessment

Variables	SS	df	MS	F- Computed Value	F-critical Value at .05	Interpretation	Decision
Suitability							
Between Groups	.0724	2	.0362	.684	3.885	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Groups	.0091	12	.0008				
Acceptability							
Between Groups	.0320	2	.0160	2.061	3.885	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Groups	.0091	12	.0008				
Feasibility							
Between Groups	.0534	2	.0267	1.952	3.885	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Groups	.0538	12	.0044				

Table 16 shows the significance difference among the assessments of the respondents on above mentioned variables.

References

Zappala, H. (2017). Residency performance. *Academic Medicine*, 62(9). doi:10.1097/00001888-198709000-00015