
The Relationship between School Environment and Student Engagement in Private School

Quenie S. Romorosa*, Charena Mae L. Tabigue*, Mailitt Joy G. Salvino,
& James L. Paglinawan*****

**Graduate Student, Central Mindanao University*

***Faculty, King's College of Isulan*

****Faculty, Central Mindanao University*

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the level of the school environment and student engagement and assess their significant relationship. To carry out this research study, a descriptive-correlational research design was employed. A total of 282 participants from the junior high school students of King's College of Isulan in the school year 2023-2024 were selected using stratified random sampling. The researchers used a modified 5-point Likert scale survey questionnaires to gather the data needed for the study. Statistical tools used were mean and Pearson's product-moment correlation. The results showed that the level of the school environment is favorable, while the level of student engagement in school is high. The correlation analysis revealed that the school environment and student engagement have a moderate, positive, and significant relationship. These findings indicate that a favorable school environment has the potential to enhance student engagement levels. Students' positive perception and attitude towards their school environment positively influence their engagement in school. Furthermore, this study suggests that by employing effective instructional approaches and providing feedback on students' performances, offering sufficient learning resources and facilities, and fostering a positive and supportive learning environment, educators and schools will be able to enhance the engagement and learning experiences of their students.

KEYWORDS: *Descriptive-correlational, Learning Experiences, Private School, Student Engagement, School Environment*

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between school environment and student engagement has garnered attention, as studies have shown that a positive school environment can foster a greater student engagement (Garcia & Cuizon, 2013; Lawson & Masyn, 2015) and their perception on the school environment is associated on their engagement (Wang & Eccles, 2013). For instance, Yang et al. (2022) emphasized the importance of social dimension of a school environment, such as supportive teacher-student relationships and teacher autonomy support to maximize student engagement. In addition, the recent study of Fatou and Kubiszewski (2018) revealed that student engagement is associated on the perception of students toward the school environment.

According to Lombardi et al. (2020), school environment indicates the distinctiveness of an academic institution. It is a set of relationships that take place among the members of the school community that can be determined by structural, personal, and functional factors of the school. Moreover, in the literature review conducted by Kutsyuruba et al. (2015), they enumerated the three categories of school environment. First, the physical dimension which pertains to the conditions of the school facilities, environmental quality of the schools and their influence with the academic performance and students' behavior. Second, the academic dimension which refers to the teacher's skills and characteristics as the factors of students' academic development. Lastly, the social dimension which suggests that the fundamental structure of the school environment revolved on the quality of relationships occur among the member of the community. Primarily, research on the school environment is mostly associated with its influence on students, such as their academic performance (Dela Rosa, 2019; Lagumbay et al., 2023), learning experiences (Mahat et al., 2022), and student engagement (Shernoff et al., 2016).

Meanwhile, student engagement is defined as a complex construct, interconnected within the three dimension: affective, behavior, and cognition (Lam et al., 2014). The affective aspect pertains to the level of attraction that the student have towards school including their positive and negative feelings when they engaged in tasks (Skinner et al., 2008). On the other hand, behavioral engagement attributes to the several elements such as the attention, effort, and persistence, which align with the expectations set by schools. These factors are visible in doing tasks related to learning and other extra-curricular school activities (Skinner et al., 2008). Meanwhile, the cognitive engagement described the approaches employed by students throughout their learning activities on how they implement their learning styles and practiced to be independent learners (Wang et al., 2011). Furthermore, in recent years, there has been a growing research interest in student engagement as it is attributed to students' motivation (Fakhri et al., 2023; Francisco, et al., 2015), group satisfaction (Wolverton et al., 2020), academic performance (Delfino, 2019; Aquino, 2019), and school environment (Fatou & Kubiszewski, 2018; Garcia & Cuizon, 2013).

Although the previous literature suggests a link between student engagement and school environment, however the researchers identified an apparent knowledge gap in the prior research. The previous research has explored on the student engagement and its linkage toward environmental complexity inside the classroom (Shernoff et al., 2016). In addition, considering student engagement as a multi-dimensional construct received less attention in research (Lombardi et., 2019) such as on the recent study of Fatou and Kubiszewski (2018) which created a model useful for predicting affective engagement only.

Moreover, in the Philippine context there are limited existing studies found in which these studies were focused on the comparison of public and private schools. Therefore, this prompted the researchers to explore the relationship of school environment and student engagement especially in the case of private school. The result of this study will provide insights to the education stakeholders in improving their school environment to foster student engagement.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study assessed the relationship between the school environment and student engagement among the junior high school private students of King’s College of Isulan. Specifically, this sought to: (1) determine the level of school environment in terms of: physical, academic, and social; (2) identify the level of student engagement in school in terms of: affective, behavioral, and cognitive; and (3) find out if there is a significant relationship between the school environment and student engagement.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A. Respondents

The respondents of this study were the junior high school private students from King’s College of Isulan in the school year 2023-2024. A stratified random sample of 59 grade 7 students, 74 grade 8 students, 67 grade 9 students, and 82 grade 10 students, for a total of 282 student participants. The school was chosen for it is one of the oldest founding school in the region.

B. Research Design

This study used the descriptive-correlational design to determine the level of school environment and student engagement and to assess the relationship between school environment and student engagement in school.

C. Instrument

The researchers modified the survey questionnaire developed by Tapia-Fonllem et al. (2020) to measure the level of school environment. The School Environment Questionnaire consists of 24-item that was categorized into three sub-variables: physical, academic, and social, each of the category has eight items on a 5-point Likert scale. This instrument was pilot tested with Cronbach’s Alpha value of 0.722 which implies that it is reliable. On the other hand, to determine the level of student engagement, this study adopted the 33-item Student Engagement in School questionnaire developed by Lam et al. (2014) which was categorized into three sub-variables: affective(9-item), behavioral(12-item), and cognitive(12-item) on a 5-point likert scale.

D. Statistical Analysis

The data collected were analyzed and interpreted through the appropriate statistical tools. Descriptive statistics such as mean was used to determine the level of school environment and student engagement in school. Meanwhile, inferential statistics such as Pearson product-moment correlation was used to assess the relationship between school environment and student engagement in school.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

School Environment

School environment was categorized into three sub-variables: physical, academic, and social.

Table 1. Level of school environment in terms of physical dimension

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
The library is well-equipped with varied books.	4.13	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The school ground has enough space, safe, and clean.	4.10	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The library is comfortable and well-lit.	4.09	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The classrooms have enough space for learning.	3.98	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The school has a comfortable and welcoming atmosphere.	3.94	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The classrooms are well-lit and ventilated.	3.87	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The classrooms are in good condition and clean.	3.37	Moderately Agree	Neither Favorable nor Unfavorable School Environment
The classrooms are aesthetically pleasing.	3.17	Moderately Agree	Neither Favorable nor Unfavorable School Environment
Overall Mean	3.83	Agree	Favorable School Environment

Legend:

Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Favorable School Environment
3.41-4.20	Agree	Favorable School Environment
2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree	Neither Favorable nor Unfavorable School Environment
1.81-2.60	Disagree	Unfavorable School Environment
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree	Highly Unfavorable School Environment

Table 1 reveals the level of school environment in terms of its physical dimensions. It shows a mean of 3.83, which is interpreted as a favorable school environment. Furthermore, it implies that the respondents perceived the physical dimensions of the school as conducive to their learning and overall experience. It suggests that the school has met or exceeded their expectations in terms of the physical aspects that contribute to a positive learning environment.

The highest mean of 4.13 falls in “The library is well-equipped with varied books.” followed by “The school ground has enough space, safe, and clean.”(4.10) which implies as favorable school environment. Moreover, this implies that the school’s learning resources and facilities provide a conducive learning environment that support students’ access to learning. In contrast, the lowest mean is the indicator, “The classrooms are aesthetically pleasing”(3.17). This implies that the respondents moderately agree that they find the classroom environments visually appealing. However, it is important to note that this indicator was interpreted as neither favorable nor unfavorable regarding the school environment. It suggests that the aesthetic appeal of the classrooms did not significantly impact the overall perception of the school environment for the respondents.

The results were supported by Dela Rosa (2020) that the classroom structure contributes student engagement in the classroom activities but does not significantly affect student academic achievement. However, Baafi (2020) contradicts this claim. He stated that students

with a pleasant physical environment perform better than those where the learning environment is not conducive. Additionally, the school must have a standard structure in order to promote active student learning inside the four-cornered classroom and so with the physical facilities provided to schools based on students' needs.

Table 2. Level of school environment in terms of academic dimension

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
The teachers use lecture, discussion, group work, and hands-on activities.	4.28	Strongly Agree	Highly Favorable School Environment
The teachers explain the importance of learning and its application to the real-life.	4.1	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The teachers provide learning activities that are related to the lesson to evaluate student learning.	4.04	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The teachers cater questions during class discussion and guide the students.	4.03	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The teachers motivate the students to participate in class.	3.95	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The teachers communicate clearly so that she can be understood by the students.	3.92	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The teachers provide feedback to the students to improve their learning.	3.85	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The teachers provide feedback to parents about their child's learning progress.	3.84	Agree	Favorable School Environment
Overall Mean	4.00	Agree	Favorable School Environment

Legend:

Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Favorable School Environment
3.41-4.20	Agree	Favorable School Environment
2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree	Neither Favorable nor Unfavorable School Environment
1.81-2.60	Disagree	Unfavorable School Environment
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree	Highly Unfavorable School Environment

Table 2 shows the level of the school environment in terms of its academic dimension. As seen on the table, it obtained an overall mean of 4.00, which was interpreted as a favorable school environment. It reflects a positive perception of the school's commitment to academic excellence, providing quality instruction, and creating a supportive and engaging learning atmosphere.

As observed from the table above, the highest mean of 4.28 falls in "The teachers use lecture, discussion, group work, and hands-on activities" and followed by, "The teachers explain the importance of learning and its application to the real-life" (4.10) which were interpreted as highly favorable and favorable school environment, respectively. It only means that in the academic dimension of school environment, instructional practices of the teachers contribute positively to the students' learning experiences that promotes engagement, active learning, and a well-rounded educational experience. On the other hand, the indicator, "The teachers provide feedback to parents about their child's learning progress." had the lowest mean of

3.84. This was interpreted as neither favorable nor unfavorable school environment. Moreover, the participants agreed that providing feedback of the students' learning performances to both the students and parents had also contributed to the favorability of the school environment.

The findings were supported by Borres(2017) that students acknowledged the teacher's dedication in engaging them with various activities within the classroom. In addition, Adesua and Akomolafe (2015) mentioned that school environment in terms of academic dimension could serve as the motivating factor to the academic performance of students wherein the teacher have a significant role in shaping students' interest in learning various concepts. Further, the quality of teaching would likely affect the learning of school subjects and learning programs wherein teachers should adjust the classroom environment to students' preferences, making it more comfortable and functional for learning to take place which students can learn and perform better both academically and towards their behavior.

Table 3 presents the level of school environment in terms of its social dimension. It was revealed that it is classified as favorable, garnering an overall mean of 3.95. Thus, the school fosters a positive and supportive social atmosphere, promoting healthy relationships and interactions among students and staffs.

Table 3. Level of school environment in terms of social dimension

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
The school promotes respect, kindness, and empathy.	4.31	Strongly Agree	Highly Favorable School Environment
The school provides opportunities for group work, social events, and community service.	4.12	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The school provides opportunities for students to interact with each other.	4.04	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The school encourages students to be environmentally conscious.	4.02	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The school provides support for students who need it.	3.82	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The school encourages positive relationships among students.	3.81	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The school promotes fairness, equity, and inclusion.	3.79	Agree	Favorable School Environment
The school allows the students to express themselves.	3.68	Agree	Favorable School Environment
Overall Mean	3.95	Agree	Favorable School Environment

Legend:

Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Favorable School Environment
3.41-4.20	Agree	Favorable School Environment
2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree	Neither Favorable nor Unfavorable School Environment
1.81-2.60	Disagree	Unfavorable School Environment
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree	Highly Unfavorable School Environment

As gleaned from the table above, the indicator, “The school promotes respect, kindness, and empathy ” has the highest mean of 4.31. It was followed by the indicator, “The school provides opportunities for group work, social events, and community service” with a mean of 4.12. These indicators were interpreted as highly favorable and favorable school environment, respectively. Conversely, the lowest indicator is “The school allows the students to express themselves” (3.68) which was interpreted as favorable school environment. Moreover, it highlights the school's commitment to fostering a positive and supportive atmosphere where students are encouraged to cultivate social-emotional competencies and actively engaged students in various activities beyond the academic curriculum.

This findings were supported on the study that students who are satisfied by their social relationships are usually engaged in their activities (Lombardi et al., 2019). Thus, school should emphasize autonomy-supportive teaching behaviors to understand student engagement and school burnout (Yang et al., 2022).

Table 4. Summary of the sub-variables of school environment

Sub-variables	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Academic	4.00	Agree	Favorable School Environment
Social	3.95	Agree	Favorable School Environment
Physical	3.83	Agree	Favorable School Environment
Overall Mean	3.93	Agree	Favorable School Environment

Legend:

Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Favorable School Environment
3.41-4.20	Agree	Favorable School Environment
2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree	Neither Favorable nor Unfavorable School Environment
1.81-2.60	Disagree	Unfavorable School Environment
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree	Highly Unfavorable School Environment

Table 4 summarized the sub-variables of the school environment. Among the three sub-variables, the academic dimension had the highest mean of 4.00 while the physical dimension had the lowest mean of 3.83. However, the aforementioned sub-variables were both interpreted as favorable school environment. Thus, the level of school environment was interpreted as favorable. This implies that the school creates a nurturing and engaging setting that supports the academic, social, and emotional growth of students.

The school environment is regarded as an educational entity that contributes to providing ideal physical conditions for the facilitation of the teaching and learning process. The quality of school environment has a direct influence on the behavior and contribute to the cognitive,

social, and emotional development of students (Tapia-Fonllem et al., 2020). Moreover, the study's findings were supported by Aquino(2019) who posited that when adequate facilities and instructional materials are provided, the quality of teaching and learning becomes evident in every educational institution. Thus, the quality of the school's academic environment depends on its physical condition.

Student Engagement

Student engagement in school was categorized into three sub-variables: affective, behavioral, and cognitive.

Table 5. Level of student engagement in terms of affective aspect

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I am proud to be at this school.	4.12	Agree	High Engagement
I like my school.	4.06	Agree	High Engagement
I am happy to be at this school.	3.96	Agree	High Engagement
I enjoy learning new things in class.	3.88	Agree	High Engagement
I think what we are learning in school is interesting.	3.81	Agree	High Engagement
I like what I am learning in school.	3.81	Agree	High Engagement
I am very interested in learning.	3.77	Agree	High Engagement
I think learning is boring.	3.53	Agree	High Engagement
Most mornings, I look forward to going to school.	3.34	Moderately Agree	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
Overall Mean	3.81	Agree	High Engagement

Legend:

Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Engagement
3.41-4.20	Agree	High Engagement
2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
1.81-2.60	Disagree	High Disengagement
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very High Disengagement

Table 5 presents the level of student engagement in terms of its affective aspect. The result showed that it obtained an overall mean of 3.81, which indicates that the respondents demonstrate a high affective engagement in school. Furthermore, this suggests that the respondents exhibit a genuine interest, enthusiasm, and positive emotional connection towards their school.

The highest mean was obtained by the indicator, "I am proud to be at this school" with a corresponding mean of 4.12, indicating a strong sense of pride among the respondents towards their school. This was closely followed by "I like my school" (4.06) which reflects the positive attitude and affinity towards the school. Both indicators were interpreted as high engagement. However the lowest indicator obtained a mean of 3.34, "Most mornings, I look forward to going to school" which was interpreted as neither engaged nor disengaged. This suggests that the respondents express a moderate agreement that they feel on the sense of excitement about going to school in the mornings.

Several studies concluded that the students' school attitude or affective relationship to school and emotional well-being affects their school engagement (Upadyaya & Salmela-Aro, 2013; Stern, 2012). Moreover, this study paralleled to the findings of Francisco et al. (2015) that affective aspect including their motivation in school were associated to engagement. In addition, the study of Mustamiah and Widanti (2020) mentioned that affective indicator such as the student's learning motivation can affect their engagement in school.

Table 6. Level of student engagement in terms of behavioral aspect

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
I try hard to do well in school.	4.02	Agree	High Engagement
If I have trouble understanding a problem, I go over it again until I understand it.	3.89	Agree	High Engagement
In class, I work as hard as I can.	3.8	Agree	High Engagement
When I'm in class, I participate in class activities.	3.72	Agree	High Engagement
When I run into a difficult homework problem, I keep working at it until I think I've solved it.	3.67	Agree	High Engagement
I am an active participant of school activities such as sport day and school picnic.	3.66	Agree	High Engagement
I pay attention in class.	3.62	Agree	High Engagement
I volunteer to help with school activities such as sport day and parent day.	3.38	Moderately Agree	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
I take an active role in extra-curricular activities in my school.	3.37	Moderately Agree	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
When I'm in class, I just act like I'm working.	3.29	Moderately Agree	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
In school, I do just enough to get by.	3.13	Moderately Agree	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
When I'm in class, my mind wanders.	2.86	Moderately Agree	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
Overall Mean	3.53	Agree	High Engagement

Legend:

Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High Engagement
3.41-4.20	Agree	High Engagement
2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
1.81-2.60	Disagree	High Disengagement
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very High Disengagement

Table 6 depicts the level of student engagement in terms of its behavioral aspect. It was revealed that the overall mean is 3.53, which indicates that the respondents has high engagement. It further means that the respondents consistently demonstrate positive and constructive behaviors within the school environment.

As shown from the table, the indicator, "I try hard to do well in school"(4.02) got the highest mean. It was followed by "If I have trouble understanding a problem, I go over it again until I understand it"(3.89). Moreover, this indicates that the respondents have a strong sense of

motivation and effort as well as determination towards achieving academic success and facing academic challenges. Both indicators were interpreted as high engagement that implies that the respondents has suggesting a positive attitude towards problem-solving and learning. Meanwhile, the indicator, “When I’m in class, my mind wanders” (2.86) ranked the lowest mean which was further interpreted as neither engaged nor disengaged. Furthermore, it indicates that the respondents moderately agreed that they were mentally distracted while in the classroom but they are not completely disengaged from the instructional discussion.

Moreover, the current research of Dulay (2020) supports that these behaviors were under the classroom behaviors of students towards their work and school activities. These positive behaviors in learning will lead them to have high level of cognitive engagement (Nurbiha Shukor et al., 2014). Conversely, Mooneyham and Schooler (2013) mentioned that mind wandering function as a means of alleviating boredom when carrying out repetitive tasks. This behavior may have an adaptive purpose, enabling individuals to persist in an activity (such as a learning session) that has become dull but still needs to be maintained. Thus, this suggests that teacher may vary their learning activities in the class.

Table 7 presents the level of student engagement in terms of its cognitive aspect. It was shown that it obtained a mean of 3.52 which further implies that the respondents demonstrate high engagement. Moreover, it denotes that they are actively using their cognitive abilities, such as problem-solving, critical thinking, and intellectual curiosity, to engage with the academic content and develop a deeper understanding of the subjects they are studying.

Table 7. Level of student engagement in terms of cognitive aspect

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
When learning new information, I try to put the ideas in my own words.	3.79	Often	High Engagement
When I study, I try to connect what I am learning with my own experiences.	3.63	Often	High Engagement
I try to match what I already know with things I am trying to learn for school.	3.59	Often	High Engagement
I make up my own examples to help me understand the important concepts I learn from school.	3.54	Often	High Engagement
I try to see the similarities and differences between things I am learning for school and things I know already.	3.52	Often	High Engagement
When I study, I try to understand the material better by relating it to things I already know.	3.51	Often	High Engagement

When I study, I figure out how the information might be useful in the real world.	3.51	Often	High Engagement
When learning things for school, I try to see how they fit together with other things I already know.	3.48	Often	High Engagement
I try to understand how the things I learn in school fit together with each other.	3.45	Often	High Engagement
I try to think through topics and decide what I'm supposed to learn from them, rather than studying topics by just reading them over.	3.42	Often	High Engagement
When studying, I try to combine different pieces of information from course material in new ways.	3.41	Often	High Engagement
When learning things for school, I try to associate them with what I learnt in other classes about the same or similar things.	3.35	Sometimes	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
Overall Mean	3.52	Often	High Engagement

Legend:

Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Always	Very High Engagement
3.41-4.20	Often	High Engagement
2.61-3.40	Sometimes	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
1.81-2.60	Rarely	High Disengagement
1.00-1.80	Never	Very High Disengagement

As observed from the table below, the highest mean falls in, “When learning new information, I try to put the ideas in my own words”(3.79). This was closely followed by, “When I study, I try to connect what I am learning with my own experiences”(3.63). Both indicators were interpreted as high engagement. This means that the respondents were demonstrating active engagement in developing learning strategies by expressing their new ideas on their own words and connecting knowledge with their experiences. On the other hand, “When learning things for school, I try to associate them with what I learnt in other classes about the same or similar things” (3.35) garnered the lowest mean. This indicates that the respondents perceived that they were neither engaged nor disengaged on this cognitive indicator. Furthermore, this highlights the importance of encouraging students to make interdisciplinary connections and promote a more integrated approach to learning across subjects.

The findings of the study was validated by Espejo (2018) that an autonomy-supportive learning environment has a significantly higher cognitive engagement. Moreover, Nurbiha et al., (2013) observed that students who displayed a high level of cognitive engagement also demonstrated a strong sense of self-regulation in their learning. These students engaged in additional research on their own and shared their findings with the class. In addition, a study conducted Peng (2021) emphasized that the students’ positive cognition towards their learning experiences is associated to their academic engagement in school.

Table 8 summarized the sub-variables of student engagement. Among the three sub-variables, the affective aspect contributed the highest a mean of 3.81 while the cognitive aspect had the lowest mean of 3.83. However, despite the cognitive aspect having the lowest mean, both

sub-variables demonstrated high engagement. This indicates that the respondents have a positive emotional connection to their school environment experience and actively engage their cognitive abilities on their learning process.

Table 8. Summary of the sub-variables of student engagement

Sub-variables	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
Affective	3.81	Agree	High Engagement
Behavioral	3.53	Agree	High Engagement
Cognitive	3.52	Often	High Engagement
Overall Mean	3.62	Agree	High Engagement

Legend:

Range	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree/Always	Very High Engagement
3.41-4.20	Agree/Often	High Engagement
2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree/Sometimes	Neither Engaged Nor Disengaged
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Rarely	High Disengagement
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree/Never	Very High Disengagement

These findings were validated by Nazamud-Din et al. (2020) on their study that affective engagement has the highest form of engagement in the classroom. However, the study also revealed that these sub-variables may also affect one another. It was reported that these sub-variables has a moderate to strong, positive and significant relationship. In addition, the findings of the meta-analysis study conducted by Li and Xue (2023) revealed that there are influencing factors that affect student engagement. These are categorized into two: (1) promoting factors include students' positive emotion, positive learning behavior, positive teacher behavior, the teacher-student relationship and partnership, students' learning and thinking ability, the support of learning resources, students' individual and personality characteristics, and teaching factors and (2) hindering factors include lack of environmental support, negative student behavior, and negative teacher behavior. Thus, these aspects are important considerations to foster student engagement in school.

Table 9. Correlation analysis between school environment and student engagement

Variables		School Environment	Student Engagement
School Environment	Pearson Correlation	1	0.490
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000*
	N	282	282
Student Engagement	Pearson Correlation	0.490	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000*	
	N	282	282

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 9 illustrates the result of the correlation analysis on the relationship between the school environment and student engagement. The statistical results showed that the school environment has a moderate, positive and significant relationship with the student engagement ($r=0.49$, $p<0.01$). Hence, it indicates that when the school environment improves, so does with the student engagement in school.

Prior research has indicated that the way students perceive the overall school environment is linked to their level of engagement (Garcia & Cuizon, 2013; Wang & Eccles, 2013). For instance, Garcia and Cuizon (2013) discovered that the school environment has a significant influence towards student engagement. Significantly, Wang and Eccles (2013) underscored the importance of schools establishing well-defined guidelines for student behavior and fostering an emotionally supportive and nurturing environment. Another study by Baldwin (2019) as cited by Nazamud-din et al. (2020), revealed that an environment can increase student engagement by allowing the students to express their learning-oriented behavior. On the other hand, Fatou and Kubiszewski (2017) reported that the academic dimension of school environment specifically the teacher-student relationship had a strong predictor to the students' affective engagement in school. More so, Shernoff and Bempechat (2014) emphasized that the engagement in learning activities is the result of interaction between the students and the learning environment.

As mentioned in the meta-analysis study of Li and Xue (2023), student engagement consists of two aspects: campus engagement (valuing, sense of belonging, and participation) and class engagement (cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement). Thus, the dimensions of school environment are important in assessing the students engagement in school (Fatou & Kubiszewski, 2017).

CONCLUSION

The level of school environment in King's College of Isulan is favorable, while the level of student engagement in school is high. The school puts a higher emphasis on academic support to their students where it revealed that teaching methods employed by teachers have a positive impact on students' learning experiences such as fostering engagement and active participation in class. Meanwhile, students' affective engagement was reportedly higher than cognitive and behavioral. The students showed a strong sense of pride and positive attitude towards the school. Furthermore, the correlation analysis revealed that school environment and student engagement has a moderate, positive and significant relationship among each other. Therefore, this finding suggests that there is a meaningful connection between the school environment and student engagement. This indicates that a positive and supportive school environment has the potential to enhance student engagement levels.

Pedagogical implications gained from this study highlight the significance of a positive and supportive school environment in promoting student engagement. By employing effective instructional approaches and giving feedback of students' performances, providing enough learning resources and facilities, and fostering a positive and supportive learning environment, educators and schools will be able to enhance the engagement and the learning experiences of their students. Further more, this study recommends that further research may be conducted using different research design such as in the qualitative aspect to further confirm the findings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers would like to thank Shui-fong Lam, Victor Coral-Verdugo, and Glenda Garza for allowing them to use their research instrument. Moreover, the researchers are very grateful to the principal, staffs and students of King's College of Isulan and King's of Lake Sebu for their help in collecting the data needed on this study. Also, to Dr. James L. Paglinawan for his profound knowledge and guidance to enhance this paper.

REFERENCES

- i. Adesua, V.O. & Akomolafe, C.O. (2015). The Classroom Environment: A Major Motivating Factor towards High Academic Performance of Senior Secondary School Students in South West Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 34(2), 2222-1735. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1086098.pdf>
- ii. Aquino, I. (2019). The Classroom Environment and Its Effects on the Students Academic Performance Of The College Of Teacher Education. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 8(3), 63–73. <https://garph.co.uk/IJARMSS/Mar2019/G-2628.pdf>
- iii. Baafi, R. K. A. (2020). School physical environment and student academic performance. *Advances in Physical Education*, 10(2), 121–137. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ape.2020.102012>
- iv. Baldwin, W. L. Q. A. (2019). Acting, thinking, feeling, making, collaborating: The engagement process in foreign language learning. *System*, 86, 102128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102128>
- v. Borres, J. V. (2017). Learning Environment, Parental Involvement and Attitudes of Students towards Mathematics. *Tin-aw*, 1(1).
- vi. Dela Rosa, P. E. (2020). Physical learning environment on the academic achievement in entrepreneurship of grade 10 students. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339441736_physical_learning_environment_on_the_academic_achievement_in_entrepreneurship_of_grade_10_students
- vii. Delfino, A. P. (2019). Student engagement and academic performance of students of partido state university. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 15(3), 42–55. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v15i3.05>
- viii. Dulay, L.A. (2020). Classroom Behavior and Academic Performance of Public Elementary School Pupils. *International Journal of Research Publications 2020*, 56(1), 45-78, <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP100561720201297>
- ix. Espejo, N. N. (2018). Difference in Academic Engagement among College Students as a function of Learning Environment. DLSU Research Congress 2018. <https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/pdf/conferences/research-congress-proceedings/2018/li-16.pdf>

-
- x. Fakhri, N., Syarifuddin, N., Meizara, E., & Buchori, S. (2023). Learning motivation and student engagement among senior high school students. *ResearchGate*. <https://doi.org/10.31100/jurkam.v7i2.2851>
- xi. Fatou, N., & Kubiszewski, V. (2017). Are perceived school climate dimensions predictive of students' engagement? *Social Psychology of Education, 21*(2), 427–446. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-017-9422-x>
- xii. Francisco, M.V., Gonzales, R., & Vargas, M.A.(2015). Student Engagement: Associations with Teachers and Peers as Motivators. *International Journal of Educational Investigations, 2*(11), 1-17. <http://www.ijeionline.com/attachments/article/48/IJEI.Vol.2.No.11.01.pdf>
- xiii. Garcia, A. M. & Cuizon, R. O. (2013). Influence of Educational Environment on Learning Influence of Educational Environment on Learning Engagement of Indigenous Students. *IAMURE International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 7*(1).
- xiv. Kutsyuruba, B., Klinger, D. A., & Hussain, A. (2015). Relationships among school climate, school safety, and student achievement and well-being: a review of the literature. *Review of Education, 3*(2), 103–135. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3043>
- xv. Lagumbay, D. G., Cutillas, M. A., Ancajas, V. M., & Linx, D. (2023). Enhancing student learning through classroom design exploring the influence of environment on academic. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373640279_enhancing_student_learning_through_classroom_design_exploring_the_influence_of_environment_on_academic_performance
- xvi. Lam, S., Jimerson, S. R., Wong, B. P., Kikas, E., Shin, H., Veiga, F. H., Hatzichristou, C., Polychroni, F., Cefai, C., Negovan, V., Stănculescu, E., Yang, H., Liu, Y., Basnett, J., Duck, R., Farrell, P., Nelson, B. R., & Zollneritsch, J. (2014). Understanding and measuring student engagement in school: The results of an international study from 12 countries. *School Psychology Quarterly, 29*(2), 213–232. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000057>
- xvii. Lawson, M. A., & Masyn, K. E. (2015). Analyzing profiles, predictors, and consequences of student engagement dispositions. *Journal of School Psychology, 53*(1), 63–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2014.11.004>
- xviii. Li, J., & Xue, E. (2023). Dynamic Interaction between Student Learning Behaviour and Learning Environment: Meta-Analysis of Student Engagement and Its Influencing Factors. *Behavioral Sciences, 13*(1), 59. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13010059>
- xix. Lombardi, E., Traficante, D., Bettoni, R., Offredi, I., Giorgetti, M., & Vernice, M. (2019). The Impact of School Climate on Well-Being Experience and School Engagement: A Study with High-School students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02482>
- xx. Mahat, M., Closs, L. Q., & Imms, W. (2021). Learning environments' influence on students' learning experience in an Australian Faculty of Business and Economics.
-

- Learning Environments Research*, 25(1), 271–285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09361-2>
- xxi. Mehta, S., Cornell, D., Fan, X., & Gregory, A. (2013). Bullying Climate and School Engagement in Ninth-Grade Students. *Journal of School Health*, 83, 45-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2012.00746.x>
- xxii. Mooneyham, B. W., & Schooler, J. W. (2013). The costs and benefits of mind-wandering: A review. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie Expérimentale*, 67(1), 11–18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031569>
- xxiv. Mustamiah, D., & Widanti, N. S. (2020). Learning Motivation as Predictor of Student Engagement in Private Junior High Schools Students. In Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Psychology in Health, Educational, Social, and Organizational Settings - ICP-HESOS, ISBN 978-989-758-435-0, 486–493. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0008591204860493>
- xxv. Nazamud-Din, A., Zaini, M. H., & Jamil, N. H. M. (2020). The Relationship of Affective, Behavioral and Cognitive engagements in ESL Higher Learning classroom. *English Language Teaching and Linguistics Studies*, 2(4), p48. <https://doi.org/10.22158/elts.v2n4p48>
- xxvi. Nurbiha, A., Syukor, Z. T., Meijen, H. D. V., & Jamaluddin, H. (2013). A Predictive Model to Evaluate Students' Cognitive Engagement in Online Learning. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 4844-4853, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1036>
- xxvii. Pan, X., & Yao, Y. Y. (2023). Enhancing Chinese students' academic engagement: the effect of teacher support and teacher–student rapport. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1188507>
- xxviii. Peng, C. (2021). The academic motivation and engagement of students in English as a foreign language classes: does teacher praise matter? *Front. Psychol.* 12:778174. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.778174
- xxix. Shernoff, D. J., & Bempechat, J. (2014). Engaging youth in schools : evidence-based models to guide future innovations. In Teachers College, Columbia University eBooks. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB17444178>
- xxx. Shernoff, D. J., Kelly, S., Tonks, S. M., Anderson, B., Cavanagh, R. F., Sinha, S., & Abdi, B. (2016). Student engagement as a function of environmental complexity in high school classrooms. *Learning and Instruction*, 43, 52–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2015.12.003>
- xxxi. Skinner, E. A., Furrer, C., Marchand, G. C., & Kindermann, T. A. (2008). Engagement and disaffection in the classroom: Part of a larger motivational dynamic? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(4), 765–781. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012840>
- xxxii. Stern, M. (2012). Review of research exploring school attitude and related constructs. In Springer Briefs in psychology (pp. 19–28). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3427-6_2

-
- xxxiii. Tapia-Fonllem, C., Fraijo-Sing, B., Corral-Verdugo, V., Garza-Terán, G., & Moreno-Barahona, M. (2020). School Environments and Elementary School Children's Well-Being in Northwestern Mexico. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00510>
- xxxiv. Upadaya, K., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2013). Development of school engagement in association with academic success and Well-Being in varying social contexts. *European Psychologist*, 18(2), 136–147. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000143>
- xxxv. Wang, M., & Eccles, J. S. (2013). School context, achievement motivation, and academic engagement: A longitudinal study of school engagement using a multidimensional perspective. *Learning and Instruction*, 28, 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2013.04.002>
- xxxvi. Wang, M., Willett, J. B., & Eccles, J. S. (2011). The assessment of school engagement: Examining dimensionality and measurement in variance by gender and race/ethnicity. *Journal of School Psychology*, 49(4), 465–480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2011.04.001>
- xxxvii. Wolverton, C. C., Hollier, B. N. G., & Lanier, P. A. (2020). The impact of computer self efficacy on student engagement and group satisfaction in online business courses. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.20.18.2.006>
- xxxviii. Yang, D., Cai, Z., Yu, T., Zhang, C., Li, M., Fei, C., & Huang, R. (2022). The Light and Dark Sides of Student Engagement: Profiles and Their Association with Perceived Autonomy Support. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(11), 408. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12110408>

www.ijmas.com