

PSYCHO-SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT PROFILING OF SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN DISTRICT I OF BATAAN TOWARDS SCHOOL'S FRIENDLY INITIATIVES

Ryan S. De Leon¹, Ryan R. Pecson, MAEd²

¹ MAEd-Social Studies Student, Bataan Peninsula State University-Main Campus, Bataan, Philippines
ryandeleon198140@yahoo.com

² Graduate School, Bataan Peninsula State University, Bataan, Philippines
Master Teacher, DepEd-Division of Pampanga, Philippines
ryan.iamateacher@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The school as an educational institution provides a conducive environment for effective and meaningful learning to happen. As the DepEd's Mission statement states: Administrators and staff, as stewards of the institution, ensure an enabling and supportive environment for effective learning to happen. It is, therefore, the role of every school administrator and staff to provide a superb learning environment for learners to realize their full potentials. The study determined and analyzed the level of the psycho-social environment among selected public secondary schools in District I of Bataan, Philippines. Specifically, it focused on the profile of the schools described in terms of classification, number of personnel, number of students and performance in NAT (National Achievement Test); the profile of the teachers and administrators in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, length of experience, income / salary and relevant seminars and trainings attended; the psycho-social environmental profiling of selected secondary public schools described in terms of psychological, emotional and environmental; and the developed school friendly initiatives. Descriptive method of research was utilized, using simple random sampling technique in determining the needed respondents and survey questionnaire as the research instrument. In light of the findings, the researcher concluded that majority of the public secondary schools in District I of the division of Bataan were classified as autonomous, have more than 50 personnel, have a total number of students ranging from 1000 to 2000, and ranked 20th to 30th in the results of the NAT. Meanwhile, the teacher and administrator respondents are from the age range of 30 to 39 years old, females, married, in-progress of their master's degree, have rendered a service of 3 to 10 years, had earned within Php20,001.00 to 30,000.00 brackets and had training and seminars at the division level; all aspects of psycho-social environment provided to the learners were observed by teachers and administrators, particularly on the environmental assessment; and there was a limited significant difference in the psycho-social environment profiling when the profiles of the respondents are grouped accordingly as the data disclosed no significant difference when grouped according to age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, while a significant difference was found when grouped according to the length of experience, and a limited significant difference exists when grouped according to income or salary and relevant training and seminars attended.

Keywords: - *Psycho-social environment, Public Secondary Schools*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study and Review of Related Literature

The school lays the foundation of quality education for future generations. It is here where learners develop to the fullest and as humane as possible.

Schooling is one experience that most children worldwide have in common and the most common means by which societies prepare their young for the future. But schooling is not always a positive experience for children. It can mean: shivering in cold, unheated buildings or sweltering in hot, airless ones; being forced to stand in unfurnished classrooms, being hungry, thirsty or unwell; and being frightened by the threat of punishment, humiliation, bullying or even violence at the hands of teachers and fellow pupils. These conditions thwart learning. They are made worse when learners are without competent teachers to guide them, textbooks to learn from or exercise books to write in, or if they have textbooks of inferior quality that reinforce damaging stereotypes. Learning is further stymied when schools have no toilets, running water or electricity. But it is perhaps even more daunting to rectify the deplorable conditions endured by millions of children already in school, conditions that are antithetical to learning, children's well-being and their future livelihood [1].

Essentially, students are at best condition in school when they feel secured, unharmed, and well-taken care of. The school served as their second home and their teachers as the second parents. They spent most of their time in school than their own homes. This posed more concern as to how the schools as paragons of learning and educational opportunity maintained a child-friendly and learning-conducive environment.

In a nutshell, school environments vary greatly. Whereas some schools feel friendly, inviting, and supportive, others feel exclusionary, unwelcoming, and even unsafe. These feelings and attitudes constituted the school clientele that is a multidimensional construct including physical, social, and academic dimensions [2].

Meanwhile, the learning environment [3], is one of the basic components that makes teaching and learning events happen. It consists of an area where the physical structures are built for purposes of providing academic instruction to children.

With the implementation of DepEd (Department of Education) Order No. 40, s. 2012 or the DepEd Child Protection Policy in the Philippines [4], any form of abuse to the learners were prohibited in order to foster a child-friendly and harm-free schools. In here, any act of violence and punishment proliferated to the learners have no place in school. As what the [5] have reiterated, physical punishment of children in schools is unnecessary and unacceptable for good mental health and sound education. Significantly, [6] emphasized the role of teachers in addressing emotional problems of learners. What teachers can do is to create an environment that helps alleviate the normal problems many students wrestle with and, at the very least.

It is for such matters that school's climate and environment can be considered as dynamic in school. There are many intervening factors and circumstances that affect the learning atmosphere in the school. Each aspect plays a significant role in molding and unlocking students' abilities and skills. But one thing is certain if the school's environment is conducive and inviting for the students to experience meaningful and optimal learning, the general welfare of the students is secured.

Hence, the overall school and/or classroom atmosphere have significant effects on learners' performances. This was also what [7] had pointed out that physical characteristics of learning environments can affect learners emotionally, with important cognitive and behavioral consequences.

There are many studies that explored the various dimensions of school learning environment such as classroom learning environments of resilient, average, and non-resilient minority students [8], actual and preferred classroom environments [9], engagement in classroom learning and perceptions of the classroom learning environment [10], helpful aspects of classroom environments in students' learning [11], and students' learning environment in relation to quality education [12]. It is, therefore, essential for schools to offer inviting and motivating learning environment for the learner to make them achieve the highest quality of learning outcomes in order to prepare them for the world ahead.

Among the schools in the country, students have also been exposed to and influenced badly by the vices and malpractices people in the community, leading some of them to commit juvenile and petty crimes. This shows how vulnerable students are, making them targets and victims of circumstances. There are students who have been caught selling and using drugs in school, drinking liquor, smoking, bullying, and many other deviant-related acts. These situations in school posed possible threats for the safety and welfare of the students in general.

Significantly, it was observed that when the psycho-social environment provided to the learners is conducive or able to cater their varying needs by means of considering various aspects of holistic development for them, optimum learning is realized. Such conducive learning environment in school means that learners are studying in a school promoting peace, collaboration, a higher form of learning, respect for others, and equality. Literally, learners performed best when they feel secure and safe within the school's premises. Such realizations raised the question in the mind of the researcher if the school is still capable of providing utmost security for the welfare of the learners. It is for such reasons that the researchers embarked on the study to determine how public secondary schools provide psycho-social learning environment supporting the well-being of the learners. The researchers personally believed

that a child-friendly school produces morally upright and productive learners who may become promoters of peace, justice, and equality in the future.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The general problem of the study was to assess the profiling of psycho-social environment among selected public secondary schools in District I of Bataan as basis for the development of school's friendly initiatives development. Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. How may the profile of the schools and the respondents be described in terms of:
 - 1.1 secondary public schools
 - 1.1.1 classification;
 - 1.1.2 number of personnel;
 - 1.1.3 number of students and
 - 1.1.4 performance in NAT?
 - 1.2 teachers and administrators
 - 1.2.1 age;
 - 1.2.2 sex;
 - 1.2.3 civil status;
 - 1.2.4 highest educational attainment;
 - 1.2.5 length of experience;
 - 1.2.6 income / salary; and
 - 1.2.7 relevant seminars and trainings attended?
2. How may the profiling of psycho-social environment be assessed among selected public secondary schools in terms of:
 - 2.1 psychological;
 - 2.2 emotional; and
 - 2.3 environmental?
3. Is there any significant difference in the psycho-social environment profiling of selected public secondary schools when their profiles are grouped accordingly?
4. Based on the findings of the study, what school friendly initiatives be developed?

2. METHOD

2.1 Research Design

A descriptive method approach of research was employed using survey questionnaire as the main gathering tool.

2.2 Respondents of the Study

The data reflected in this study were taken from 211 respondents that include 175 teachers and 36 administrators of selected public secondary schools in District I of Bataan.

2.3 Research Instrument

The researchers utilized the survey-questionnaire as the instrument in gathering the data needed for the study. The questionnaire was adapted from "The Psycho-Social (PSE) Profile Questionnaire" contained in the "Information Series on School Health Document 10: Creating an Environment for Emotional and Social Well-Being" [5]. The questionnaire contained seven (7) areas. The areas are as follows:

- Quality Area 1. Providing a Friendly, Rewarding and Supportive Atmosphere
- Quality Area 2. Supporting Cooperation and Active Learning
- Quality Area 3. Forbidding Physical Punishment and Violence
- Quality Area 4. Not Tolerating Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination
- Quality Area 5. Valuing the Development of Creative Activities
- Quality Area 6. Connecting School and Home Life through Involving Parents
- Quality Area 7. Promoting Equal Opportunities and Participation in Decision-Making

Moreover, the researchers grouped into three (3) specific areas, namely: psychological (quality areas 3 and 4), emotional (quality areas 2, 5 and 7) and environmental (quality areas 1 and 6).

2.4 Statistical Treatment

The data gathered in this study were encoded and statistically analyzed using IBM SPSS. Statistical techniques used include descriptive statistics (frequency counts, percentage, weighted mean and standard deviation), as well as inferential statistics (Independent Samples t-test and Analysis of Variance or ANOVA).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Profile of the Selected Secondary Public Schools and the Respondents

Table -1: Profile of the Selected Secondary Public Schools

1. Classification	<i>f</i>	%	3. Number of Students	<i>f</i>	%
Autonomous	9	60.0	Less than 1000	5	33.3
Non-Autonomous	6	40.0	1000-2000	9	60.0
Total	15	100.0	More than 2000	1	6.7
			Total	15	100.0
2. Number of Personnel	<i>f</i>	%	4. Overall Performance in NAT	<i>f</i>	%
Below 20	2	13.3	Rank 1-5	2	13.3
21-50	5	33.3	Rank 6-10	1	6.7
More than 50	8	53.3	Rank 11-15	3	20.0
Total	15	100.0	Rank 20-30	8	53.3
			Rank More than 30	1	6.7
			Total	15	100.0

In terms of classification of schools, 60.0% of the selected schools are autonomous and 40% are considered non-autonomous. Meanwhile, the total number of employees indicates that 53.3% of the selected schools are having more than 50 personnel while the rest are having less than 50 personnel. Most of the selected schools are with a total number of students of 1000 to 2000 or 60% of the locale. In addition, 53.3% of the select schools are in ranked of 20th to 30th on the results of the NAT. Lastly, in terms of locality of public secondary schools, the settings of the schools were considered via the zonal market center of its municipalities, nearby to the market and trade centers that are accessible to public transportations.

Table -2: Respondents' Profile

1. Respondents	<i>f</i>	%	6. Length of Experience	<i>f</i>	%
Teachers	175	82.9	1 year below	22	10.4
Heads	36	17.1	1 to 3 years	40	19.0
Total	211	100.0	3 to 10 years	104	49.3
2. Age	<i>f</i>	%	10 to 20 years	37	17.5
20-29 years old	59	28.0	More than 20 years	8	3.8
30-39 years old	97	46.0	Total	211	100.0
40-49 years old	40	19.0			
50-59 years old	13	6.2	7. Income	<i>f</i>	%
60 years old and above	2	.9	Below Php20,000.00	17	8.1
Total	211	100.0	Php20,001.00-30,000.00	171	81.0
3. Sex	<i>f</i>	%	Php30,001.00-40,000.00	23	10.9
Male	49	23.22	Total	211	100.0
Female	162	76.78			
Total	211	100.0	4. Civil Status	<i>f</i>	%
			Single	78	36.97
			Married	133	63.03
			Total	211	100.0
5. Highest Education Attainment	<i>f</i>	%	8. Relevant Trainings and Seminars	<i>f</i>	%
College Graduate	62	29.4	School	23	10.9
			District	22	10.4
			Division	66	31.3

Master's Degree with Earned Units	101	47.9	Regional	53	25.1
Masters' Degree	42	19.9	National	28	13.3
Doctorate Degree with Earned Units	6	2.8	International	19	9.0
Total	211	100.0	Total	211	100.0

On the number of respondents, most of them are teachers than administrators with 82.9% versus 17.1%. Meanwhile, the majority of the respondents are in the 30 to 39 years old bracket or 46.0%. In addition, the majority of the respondents are females than males with 76.78% and 23.22%, respectively. Considering the civil status of the respondents, most of them are married than single with 63.03% versus 36.97 percent. Meanwhile, majority or 47.9% of the respondents are in-progress of their master's degree and 19.9 percent are master's degree holder and only 2.8% are currently enrolled with doctorate degrees. On the length of service, the majority which is 49.3% of the respondents are having 3 to 10 years in the service. In terms of their income, most of the respondents are earning within Php20,001.00 to 30,000.00 brackets or 81.0% of them. Lastly, relevant training and seminars attended by the respondents in relation to this study were taken mostly from division level or 31.3%.

3.2 Environmental Profiling of Selected Secondary Public Schools

Table -2: Environmental Profiling of Selected Secondary Public Schools

Areas	Mean	SD	Rating	Rank
Psychological				
Quality Area 3. Forbidding Physical Punishment and Violence	3.2924	0.73854	Observed	
Quality Area 4. Not Tolerating Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination	3.3173	0.70931	Observed	
Sub-total	3.3049	0.72393	Observed	Rank 2
Emotional				
Quality Area 2. Supporting Cooperation and Active Learning	3.2666	0.69982	Observed	
Quality Area 5. Valuing the Development of Creative Activities	3.1806	0.7373	Observed	
Quality Area 7. Promoting Equal Opportunities and Participation in Decision-Making	3.3631	0.6887	Observed	
Sub-total	3.2701	0.70861	Observed	Rank 3
Environmental				
Quality Area 1. Providing a Friendly, Rewarding and Supportive Atmosphere	3.2941	0.66743	Observed	
Quality Area 6. Connecting School and Home Life through Involving Parents	3.3869	0.70193	Observed	
Sub-total	3.3405	0.68468	Observed	Rank 1
Total	3.3001	0.70615	Observed	

The summary table on psycho-social environmental profiling of selected secondary public schools be described in terms psychological, emotional and environmental with its respective rank revealed that sub-total mean value of psychological is 3.3049 and standard deviation of .72393, emotional is 3.2701 and standard deviation of .70861, and environmental is 3.3405 and standard deviation of .68468. The overall mean in assessing the psycho-social environmental profiling is 3.3001 and standard deviation of .70615.

On the other hand, the environmental assessment was ranked first among the three variables of the psycho-social environmental profiling, followed by psychological and emotional came last.

The data also indicate that all aspects of psycho-social environment provided to the learners at public secondary schools were observed by teachers and administrators, particularly on the environmental assessment. This exposed further the important role of conducive environment in providing optimum and holistic learning to the students.

3.3 Differences in the Psycho-social Environmental Profiling of Selected Secondary Public Schools as Perceived by the Respondents

Table -3: Differences in the Psycho-social Environmental Profiling of Selected Secondary Public Schools as Perceived by the Respondents in terms of the Respondents' Age

Psycho-social Environmental Profile	Age Group	Mean	SD	F-value	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Psychological	20-29 years old	3.3051	.58413	.002	.900	Accepted	Not Significant
	30-39 years old	3.3057	.45238				
	40-49 years old	3.3063	.58532				
	50-59 years old	3.3085	.41964				
	60-65 years old	3.2700	.29698				
Emotional	20-29 years old	3.1578	.47935	.114	.977	Accepted	Not Significant
	30-39 years old	3.1084	.45061				
	40-49 years old	3.1333	.56856				
	50-59 years old	3.1515	.42296				
	60-65 years old	3.1950	.40305				
Environmental	20-29 years old	3.3188	.54460	.066	.992	Accepted	Not Significant
	30-39 years old	3.3430	.46666				
	40-49 years old	3.3698	.51658				
	50-59 years old	3.3346	.48302				
	60-65 years old	3.3000	.26870				

The table above shows the statistical values presenting the differences in the in the psycho-social environmental profiling of selected secondary public schools as perceived by the teachers and administrators. In terms of the respondents' age, it is shown in the table that all indicators of the psycho-social environmental profiling are not significant. The F-test value and significance value of the psychological ($F=.002$; $p=.900$), emotional ($F=.114$; $p=.977$), and environmental ($F=.066$; $p=.992$).

The data revealed further that age of the respondents is not an indicator of the difference of their psycho-social environment provided to the learners that described in terms of psychological, emotional, and environmental; that their practices did not differ significantly despite their varying ages. Hence, there is no sufficient evidence to establish that teachers and administrators' practices on psycho-social environment vary when they are grouped according to their age. Meaning to say, teachers and administrators, irrespective of their ages, have considerably the same level of providing a conducive psycho-social environment in their respective schools.

Table -4: Differences in the Psycho-social Environmental Profiling of Selected Secondary Public Schools as Perceived by the Respondents in terms of the Respondents' Sex

Psycho-social Environmental Profile	Sex Group	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Psychological	Male	3.3026	.51954	.171	.864	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.3169	.49356				
Emotional	Male	3.1998	.45055	1.01	.310	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.1202	.47307				
Environmental	Male	3.2809	.51715	1.01	.312	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.3630	.47548				

The table reflects the statistical values presenting the differences in the in the psycho-social environmental profiling of selected secondary public schools as perceived by the teachers and administrators. In terms of the respondents' sex, it is shown in the table that all indicators of the psycho-social environmental profiling are not significant. The t-test value and significance value of the psychological is ($t=.171$; $p=.864$), emotional ($t=1.01$; $p=.310$), and environmental ($t=1.01$; $p=.312$).

The data indicate further that sex of the respondents is not an indicator of the difference of their psycho-social environment provided to the learners described in terms of psychological, emotional, and environmental; that their practices did not differ significantly according to sexes, being male and female employees. Hence, there is no sufficient evidence to establish that teachers and administrators' practices on psycho-social environment vary when they are grouped according to their sexes. Meaning to say, teachers and administrators, irrespective of their sexes, have considerably the same level of providing a conducive psycho-social environment in their respective schools.

Table -5: Differences in the Psycho-social Environmental Profiling of Selected Secondary Public Schools as Perceived by the Respondents in terms of the Respondents' Civil Status

Psycho-social Environmental Profile	Group	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Psychological	Single	3.2722	.60675	.919	.359	Accepted	Not Significant
	Married	3.3401	.44325				
Emotional	Single	3.1175	.53255	.425	.671	Accepted	Not Significant
	Married	3.1469	.43895				
Environmental	Single	3.2703	.56305	1.81	.071	Accepted	Not Significant
	Married	3.3982	.43361				

The table above shows the statistical values presenting the differences in the in the psycho-social environmental profiling of selected secondary public schools as perceived by the teachers and administrators. In terms of the respondents' civil status, it is shown in the table that all indicators of the psycho-social environmental profiling are not significant. The t-test value and significance value of the psychological ($t=.919$; $p=.359$), emotional ($t=.425$; $p=.671$), and environmental ($t=1.81$; $p=.071$).

The data expose further that civil status of the respondents is not an indicator of the difference of their psycho-social environment provided to the learners described in terms of psychological, emotional, and environmental; that their practices did not differ significantly despite their varying civil statuses as single, married, and separated. Hence, there is no sufficient evidence to establish that teachers and administrators' practices on psycho-social environment vary when they are grouped according to their civil statuses. Meaning to say, teachers and administrators, irrespective of their civil statuses, have considerably the same level of providing a conducive psycho-social environment in their respective schools.

Table -6: Differences in the Psycho-social Environmental Profiling of Selected Secondary Public Schools as Perceived by the Respondents in terms of the Respondents' Highest Educational Attainment

Psycho-social Environmental Profile	Highest Educational Attainment	Mean	SD	F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Psychological	College Graduate	3.2695	.60806	.810	.489	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's Degree with Earned Units	3.2845	.50929				
	Masters' Degree	3.3771	.36749				
	Doctorate Degree with Earned Units	3.5283	.25880				
Emotional	College Graduate	3.0874	.56564	1.387	.248	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's Degree with Earned Units	3.1105	.45031				
	Masters' Degree	3.1962	.40512				
	Doctorate Degree with Earned Units	3.4483	.27382				
Social	College Graduate	3.2632	.57568	.964	.411	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's Degree with Earned Units	3.3508	.47659				
	Masters' Degree	3.4074	.42816				
	Doctorate Degree with Earned Units	3.4933	.24476				

The table above shows the statistical values presenting the differences in the in the psycho-social environmental profiling of selected secondary public schools as perceived by the teachers and administrators. In terms of the respondents' highest educational attainment, it is shown in the table that all indicators of the psycho-social environmental profiling are not significant. The F-test value and significance value of the psychological ($F=.810$; $p=.489$), emotional ($F=1.387$; $p=.248$), and environmental ($F=.964$; $p=.411$).

The data expose further that highest educational attainment of the respondents is not an indicator of the difference of their psycho-social environment provided to the learners described in terms of psychological, emotional, and environmental; that their practices did not differ significantly despite their varying highest educational attainment. Hence, there is no sufficient evidence to establish that teachers and administrators' practices on psycho-social environment vary when they are grouped according to their highest educational attainment. Meaning to say, teachers and administrators, irrespective of their educational attainment, have considerably the same level of providing a conducive psycho-social environment in their respective schools.

Table -7: Differences in the Psycho-social Environmental Profiling of Selected Secondary Public Schools as Perceived by the Respondents in terms of the Respondents' Length of Experience

Psycho-social Environmental Profile	Length of Experience	Mean	SD	F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Psychological	1 year below	3.0845	.60612	4.944	.001	Rejected	Significant
	1 to 3 years	3.0950	.58047				
	3 to 10 years	3.4424	.40841				
	10 to 20 years	3.2822	.46905				
	More than 20 years	3.2925	.77715				
Emotional	1 year below	2.9400	.43415	4.436	.002	Rejected	Significant
	1 to 3 years	2.9460	.59324				
	3 to 10 years	3.2529	.40369				
	10 to 20 years	3.1189	.44159				
	More than 20 years	3.0363	.60460				
Environmental	1 year below	3.1223	.51131	5.135	.001	Rejected	Significant
	1 to 3 years	3.1265	.62726				
	3 to 10 years	3.4684	.39940				
	10 to 20 years	3.3211	.45531				
	More than 20 years	3.4350	.54248				

The table shows the statistical values presenting the differences in the in the psycho-social environmental profiling of selected secondary public schools as perceived by the teachers and administrators. In terms of the respondents' length of experience, it is shown in the table that all indicators of the psycho-social environmental profiling are significant. The F-test value and significance value of the psychological ($F=4.944$; $p=.001$), emotional ($F=4.436$; $p=.002$), and environmental ($F=5.135$; $p=.001$).

The data reveal further that length of experience earned by the respondents is an indicator of the difference of their psycho-social environment provided to the learners described in terms of psychological, emotional, and environmental; that their practices differ significantly considering the varying years of their service. Hence, there is a sufficient evidence to establish that teachers and administrators' practices on psycho-social environment vary when they are grouped according to their length of experience. Meaning to say, teachers and administrators, with their length of experience, have varying level of providing the conducive psycho-social environment in their respective schools. Thus, it can be deduced further that the higher the year of experience, the higher the level of conducive psycho-social environment provided; that teachers and administrators with the higher years of stay in the public school system have better performance in providing conducive psycho-social environment to the learners than those who are currently staying only for few years.

Table -8: Differences in the Psycho-social Environmental Profiling of Selected Secondary Public Schools as Perceived by the Respondents in terms of the Respondents' Income

Psycho-social Environmental Profile	Income	Mean	SD	F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Psychological	Below Php20,000.00	2.9571	.39214	4.427	.013	Rejected	Significant
	Php20,001.00-30,000.00	3.3350	.52696				
	Php30,001.00-40,000.00	3.3435	.37474				

Emotional	Below Php20,000.00	2.9382	.34301	1.508	.224	Accepted	Not Significant
	Php20,001.00- 30,000.00	3.1481	.49752				
	Php30,001.00- 40,000.00	3.1409	.38113				
Environmental	Below Php20,000.00	3.1859	.46924	.911	.404	Accepted	Not Significant
	Php20,001.00- 30,000.00	3.3519	.50209				
	Php30,001.00- 40,000.00	3.3687	.45864				

The table shows the statistical values presenting the differences in the in the psycho-social environmental profiling of selected secondary public schools as perceived by the teachers and administrators. In terms of the respondents' length of experience, it is shown in the table that all indicators of the psycho-social environmental profiling are not significant except for the psychological assessment. The F-test value and significance value of the psychological (F=4.427; p=.013), emotional (F=1.508; p=.224), and environmental (F=.911; p=.404).

The data indicate further that there is a limited evidence to establish that the income of the respondents is an indicator of the difference of their psycho-social environment provided to the learners described in terms of psychological, emotional, and environmental; that their practices partially vary considering their income or salary. Hence, teachers and administrators' practices on providing a conducive psycho-social environment to the learners vary significantly in terms of psychological aspect, while did not vary in terms of emotional and environmental aspects. Interestingly, it can be noted that the higher the income of teachers and administrators are, the higher the level of their practices of providing a conducive psycho-social environment to the learners.

Table -9: Differences in the Psycho-social Environmental Profiling of Selected Secondary Public Schools as Perceived by the Respondents in terms of the Respondents' Relevant Seminars and Trainings Attended

Psycho-social Environmental Profile	Relevant Trainings and Seminars	Mean	SD	F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Psychological	School	3.2339	.53945	2.132	.063	Accepted	Not Significant
	District	3.0832	.53079				
	Division	3.3098	.51154				
	Regional	3.2762	.55752				
	National	3.4211	.40160				
	International	3.5453	.36802				
Emotional	School	3.0774	.51489	2.530	.030	Rejected	Significant
	District	2.8577	.42045				
	Division	3.1867	.47313				
	Regional	3.0857	.54222				
	National	3.2339	.36441				
	International	3.2868	.34093				
Environmental	School	3.2978	.50709	2.897	.015	Rejected	Significant
	District	3.1214	.51934				
	Division	3.3162	.50139				
	Regional	3.3085	.52428				
	National	3.4529	.37899				
	International	3.6526	.35157				

The table shows the statistical values presenting the differences in the in the psycho-social environmental profiling of selected secondary public schools as perceived by the teachers and administrators. In terms of the respondents' length of experience, it is shown in the table that all indicators of the psycho-social environmental profiling are significant except for the psychological assessment. The F-test value and significance value of the psychological (F=2.132; p=.063), emotional (F=2.530; p=.030), and environmental (F=2.897; p=.015).

The data indicate further that there is a limited evidence to establish that the relevant seminars and trainings attended by the respondents is an indicator on the difference of their psycho-social environment provided to the learners described in terms of psychological, emotional, and environmental; that their practices partially vary considering their relevant seminars and trainings attended. Hence, teachers and administrators' practices on providing conducive psycho-social environment to the learners vary significantly in terms of emotional and environmental aspects, while did not vary in terms of psychological aspect. Interestingly, it can be noted that the higher the seminars and trainings attended by teachers and administrators are, the higher the level of their practices of providing conducive psycho-social environment to the learners.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusions

In the light of the findings of the study, the researchers arrived at the listed conclusions:

1. Majority of the public secondary schools in District I of the division of Bataan classified as autonomous, have more than 50 personnel, have a total number of students ranging from 1000 to 2000, and ranked 20th to 30th in the results of the National Achievement Test (NAT) during the S.Y. 2014-2015. Meanwhile, the teacher and administrator respondents are from the age range of 30 to 39 years old, females, married, in-progress of their master's degree, have rendered a service of 3 to 10 years, had earned within Php20,001.00 to 30,000.00 bracket, and had trainings and seminars within the division level.
2. All aspects of psycho-social environment provided to the learners at public secondary schools were observed by teachers and administrators, particularly on the environmental assessment aspect.
3. There is a limited significant difference in the psycho-social environment profiling of selected secondary public schools when their profiles are grouped accordingly as the data disclosed no significant difference when grouped according to age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, while a significant difference was found when grouped according to their length of experience, and a limited significant difference exists when grouped according to income or salary and relevant trainings and seminars attended.
4. Evidently, the public secondary schools needed to re-focus on the following areas: forbidding physical punishment and violence; not tolerating bullying, harassment and discrimination; supporting cooperation and active learning; valuing the development of creative activities; promoting equal opportunities and participation in decision-making; providing a friendly, rewarding and supportive atmosphere; connecting school and home life through involving parents, to ensure that learners are provided with conducive and optimum learning environment in school.

4.2 Recommendations

In light of the findings, the following recommendations are hereby proposed:

1. The developed school friendly initiative must be applied in various schools by the school administrators taking into considerations the different ways on how to use aspects of the performance in the NAT, the years of experience and the seminars and trainings attended by personnel that may affect the prevalent school environment fostered in their respective schools to initiate more adaptive and responsive programs to the clientele.
2. The schools must intensify further the application of principles of the school environment, focusing on psycho-social, emotional, and environmental aspects to make them highly observable within the school's premises. Monitoring and evaluation schemes can be made feasible to help in the supervision of such initiatives.
3. Other variables that may posit significance in determining the psycho-social environment in school must be explored to enrich the application of its principles in public and private schools, without compromising the quality of education and the nurturing aspects of its operation to the clientele.
4. The proposed school friendly initiatives in the study are disseminated and shared through seminars and symposia to help schools to have synchronized practice on providing a conducive school environment that is research and outcome-based. Such initiatives should be addressed to the Schools Division Superintendent and administrators of various schools.
5. The future researcher may explore other variables they deemed significant to make the study more relevant to future research endeavor significant to the field and in making more school-friendly initiatives that catered learners' differences.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors extended their gratitude to the President of BPSU, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the teachers and administrators of selected public secondary schools in District I of Bataan for materializing this research endeavor.

6. REFERENCES

- [1]. UNICEF (2009). Child friendly schools. United Nations Children's Fund, March 2009. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/Child_Friendly_Schools_Manual_EN_040809.pdf
- [2]. Loukas, A. (2007). What is school climate? *Leadership Compass*, 5(1), Fall.
- [3]. Salandanan, G. G. (2012). *Teaching and the teacher*, revised edition. Quezon City, Phl: Lorimar Publishing, Inc.
- [4]. Department of Education (2012). DO 40, s. 2012 - DepEd child protection policy. May 14, 2012. Retrieved from http://www.deped.gov.ph/sites/default/files/order/2012/DO_s2012_40.pdf
- [5]. WHO (2003). Information series on school health document 10: Creating an environment for emotional and social well-being. World Health Organization, May 9, 2003. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/school_youth_health/media/en/sch_childfriendly_03.pdf
- [6]. Phillips, M. (2014). Creating an emotionally healthy classroom environment. Article published 25 June 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/creating-emotionally-healthy-classroom-environment-mark-phillips>
- [7]. Graetz, K. A. Chapter 6. The psychology of learning environments. EDUCAUSE. Retrieved from <http://www.educause.edu/research-and-publications/books/learning-spaces/chapter-6-psychology-learning-environments>
- [8]. Padrón, Y. N., Waxman, H. C. & Lee, Y-H (2014). Classroom learning environment differences between resilient, average, and nonresilient middle school students in reading. *Education and Urban Society*, 46(2), 264-283, March.
- [9]. Lai, H-R, Chou, W-L, Miao, N-F, Wu, Y-P, Lee, P-H & Jwo, J-C (2015). A comparison of actual and preferred classroom environments as perceived by middle school students. *Journal of School Health*, 85(6), 388-397, June.
- [10]. Cavanagh, R. F. (2015). A unified model of student engagement in classroom learning and classroom learning environment: One measure and one underlying construct. *Learning Environments Research*, 18(3), 349-361, October.
- [11]. MSingh, M. & McNeil, J. T. (2014). Do learning environments differ across subjects and nations: Case studies in Hawaii and Singapore using the WIHIC questionnaire. *Learning Environments Research*, 17(2), 173-189, July.
- [12]. Keshavarz, M., Vaziri, S. A., Jafari, A. & Alizadeh, H. (2013). Students' learning environment and education quality in faculty of education of University of Tehran. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8(13), 980-985, July.