International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Iinfluencing Factors on Students' Behavior in an Educational Context: Basis for Intervention Program

Meredith L. Galvez

Clinical Instructor, Southwestern University-PHINMA

Abstract

The education system operates under the assumption that students regularly attend school, as their presence and engagement are essential for learning. However, recent research has raised doubts about this assumption (Chang, Bauer, & Byrnes, 2018). This study aims to identify the factors that influence students' behavior in an educational setting to inform intervention programs. The study will use an Explanatory Sequential Design, a type of mixed methods research design that combines qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis (Creswell & Clark, 2017). The study will involve two hundred ninety-seven Level II Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) students at Southwestern University-PHINMA, selected through purposive sampling. Statistical analysis is crucial for interpreting the data collected, and the frequency statistical procedure will be used for this purpose. The findings suggest that there is no significant relationship between the factors influencing students' behavior and two demographic variables: socio-economic status and geographical location. The factors influencing students' behavior in an educational setting appear to have an insignificant impact, while demographic variables and geographical locations do not significantly correlate with these factors.

Keywords: Student's Behavior, Explanatory Sequential Design, Socio-economic Status, Geographical Location, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Southwestern University

Introduction

Global report says that 40 percent of teachers identified that students who poorly excel in academics and have problems in behaviors are seen to be some of the barriers why teachers cannot teach effectively (Morin, 2020). This article section therefore discusses significant predictors leading to why it happens. Such factors identified were school, family, peer pressure, community, and media/technology (Bandera, 2021)

In the Phlilippines, teachers deal with many students every day. It is given that no student is identical in characteristics, behaviors, opinions, and views. Students vary regarding physical, intellectual, social-emotional, moral, spiritual, and cultural background (Darsih, 2018). It is true that aside from teaching the lessons everyday, it is also a struggle for teachers to handle hundreds of students in a day. Indeed, it is not easy. It can be said that relaying the lessons to the students is not the mere responsibility of a teacher. The 21st century has truly demanded teachers to acquire enough skills, knowledge and values to carry out their duties and responsibilities as teachers. They are also required to become globally competitive professionals for "they are the key players in ensuring

high quality education skills and career preparedness for all young people" (Ngislawan, 2020). Furthermore, the rise of modern technologies pushed the field of teaching to upgrade its methodologies and ways to provide the best education for the students. Thus, teachers were required to hone their skills and widen their knowledge as it became the utmost priority to be able to go with the advent of rolling time (Tadas, 2019). In line with this, teachers are seen to be the "role model" of the society. No doubt that they make a huge impact to everyone especially on the students. However, this opportunity comes with many challenges. One challenge for them is to how they will address the lesson with hundreds of students with different characteristics and views. Not all students are similar when it comes in welcoming new ideas from their instructor. In other words, not all approaches, methods, and techniques used by the teacher fit every student. One way to avoid this dilemma is by knowing the students well. This is one reason why teachers study human development during their college years. Studying human development can teach a great deal about learners as well as it will help teachers to gain insights into how learners behave, think, learn and feel. Digging deeper into what factors affect their behaviors and development is also a big help to conquer the challenge that teachers are facing. Dagdag, 2021)

A basic assumption of the education system is that students regularly attend school. Students must be present and engaged to learn. However, recent research has called this assumption into question (Chang, Bauer, & Byrnes, 2018). While there has been a long history of examining certain types of absences or truancy, chronic absenteeism in schools was not consistently measured until recently. The reauthorization of federal education law with Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015 prompted state level focus on student attendance as a robust metric of school quality/student success (SQSS; Jordan & Miller, 2017). In addition, ESSA requires states to report how many students are chronically absent on their school report card. (Miller, 2017)

Attendance of university students at their timetabled teaching sessions is usually associated with higher levels of educational attainment. Attendance is usually considered to reflect students' level of engagement with their course and to be critical to student success; despite the potential for technological alternatives, lectures and other face-to-face sessions still tend to be the primary method of teaching at university.

Some of the most debated determinants of attendance are reviewed: teaching issues (e.g. quality, style and format); effects of university expectations and policy (e.g. mandating attendance, awarding grades for attendance); scheduling issues; provision of materials online; and the effects of individual factors arguably outside of the Higher Education Institution's control (e.g. finance, student employment, student demographics and psychological factors).

It is suggested that, although some individual factors influence student attendance and are arguably out of the control of HEIs, it is possible for them to facilitate attendance through adjustments to aspects of degree delivery such as attendance policies and monitoring, timetabling, and style of teaching. Implications for policies on the recording of lectures, curriculum design and student term-time working are also discussed. Future research on student attendance should include longer and larger studies which simultaneously consider a range of influences, examining both inter- and intra-individual variability and different types of teaching sessions. (Moores, 2019)

In Southwestern University, it is commonly observed by the researcher that many students especially the nursing students are truant and are always absent from their classes. Some are just attending classes during the conduct of the examination and the researcher finds it alarming.

There were already studies conducted that focused on students behavior but no one conducted an in-depth investigation on the different factors that influenced the students' behaviour towards their schooling thus this research was decided.

The researcher decided to investigate to find out the underlying factors that affect the students' demeanor towards schooling.

With this undertaking, her study may be able to recommend solutions and intervention program based on the crucial findings of the study.

Review of Related Literature

This section presented related literature and studies, both local and foreign sources which have bearing to the major theme of the investigation.

There have been several studies conducted by scholars to examine the factors that impact of higher education students. Cognitive and personality factors, such as self-efficacy, individual attitudes, desire for achievement and behavioral control, have significant influence on students' intentions towards entrepreneurship (Biswas and Verma 2021). Social and environmental researchers have identified elements such as prior experience, family background, regional culture and government support as critical factors that affect students (Ali et al. 2019; Tiwari et al. 2020).

Academic self-efficacy is the belief in one's own ability to learn or act in an academic setting at a certain level. Bandura's social cognitive theory, which postulates reciprocal influences among behavioral, social/environmental, and personal elements, is the foundation for academic self-efficacy. Personal agency, or the conviction that one can exercise a significant amount of control over significant events in one's life, is contingent upon self-efficacy. Because both positive psychology and self-efficacy are focused on agency and thriving, they complement each other nicely. Research with students and teachers that demonstrates how self-efficacy may be raised and impacts learning, motivation, and self-regulation is presented, along with the notion of self-efficacy. Recommendations for further research and consequences for education are included in the chapter's conclusion. Broadening the scope of scholarly study on self-efficacy is a crucial objective. (Schunk et. al 2020)

Fostering children's emotional wellbeing and social-emotional skills has become an increasing priority of schools, as emphasized in educational policy documents (Ofsted, 2019) and by the inclusion of student wellbeing measures in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) in addition to its traditional academic measures. With 12% of students across Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries reporting compromised happiness and decreased feelings of school belonging, promoting student wellbeing is a timely topic. Existing universal, preventive programs for children – including social-emotional learning (SEL), positive psychology or positive youth development (PYD) programs – have been found to commonly address two comprehensive positive development characteristics: management of emotions and related behaviors and positive engagement with others (Tejada-Gallardo et al., 2020). In other words, improving social-emotional skills and peer relationships is at the heart of most current childhood prevention approaches. While a considerable amount of literature focuses on social-emotional learning (SEL) programs (Durlak et al., 2022; van de Sande et al., 2019), peer relationship programs have not received the same attention (Pollak et al., 2022). Additionally, there is a lack of empirical studies on the relationship between social-emotional skills outcomes and peer relationship outcomes of universal, preventive programs.

Programs focusing on social-emotional skills have been found to successfully improve social skills with medium to large effects. As prosocial behavior is vital for establishing friendships, social-emotional learning programs have been discussed as a means to facilitate peer relationships. Indeed, there is promising evidence regarding long-term effects of PYD interventions and school based SEL programs on peer relationships (Pollak et al., 2022). A review of programs aiming to facilitate peer relationships (Pollak et al., 2022) found preventive, universal, school-based programs to positively affect peer relationships through positive psychology, classroom interactions, mindfulness, and emotional resilience (Kozina, 2020; Maalouf et al., 2020; Lombas et al., 2019). Typical social-emotional skills programs, however, commonly addressed neurodiverse and at-risk populations (Pollak et al., 2022), even though social-emotional learning is promoted as the ideal universal, preventive approach in schools. Thus, there is a lack of empirical studies addressing the impact of universal, preventive social-emotional learning approaches in school on peer relationships.

Furthermore, many evaluation studies do not collect outcome measures on all of the skills they address (van de Sande et al., 2019) and evidence from longitudinal or mediation studies is rare. Thus, there is a need for more studies to address effect mechanisms initiated by interventions. Results from the few intervention studies assessing relationships between social-emotional skills and peer relationship outcomes, suggest an impact of prosocial behavior interventions on peers' perception of classmates and an impact of peer relationships on behavior outcomes of intervention programs (Palacios et al., 2019). However, a longitudinal intervention study did not find effects of target skills on loneliness outcomes. Thus, it remains largely unclear how improvements in social-emotional skills through universal prevention programs impact peer relationships in the classroom-context.

During early adolescence, brain regions related to emotions are especially malleable, which makes this period ideal for social-emotional interventions (Jansen & Kiefer, 2020). At the same time, peers have been found to impact social behaviors bi-directionally during adolescence, as this is a period of heightened focus on group norms (Orson et al., 2020). Particularly the social-emotional environment in the classroom and classroom interactions have been found to impact individual student behavior (Busching & Krahé, 2020; Wang et al., 2020), although related evidence is still inconsistent (Wang et al., 2020). Overall, positive peer relationships in the classroom have been linked to positive classroom environments, and positive school climate has been found to be a major predictor of student's life satisfaction (Khalfaoui et al., 2021).

Due to the intense nature of medical schools, motivation plays a significant role in medical students' academic performance. For instance, pursuing a predetermined career path, such as becoming a doctor, necessitates completing clinical practice in addition to academic coursework. Although there is room for variation, motivation can be broadly divided into two groups. Intrinsic motivation is one type (e.g., desire to study medical science, intellectual challenges, or become a doctor). Extrinsic, or outcome-oriented, motivation is the other kind. An example of this would be the drive to make a decent living as a medical practitioner. Medical researchers have also focused a great deal of attention on self-efficacy in addition to the two incentive categories. In particular, self-efficacy refers to a person's subjective assessment of their capacity to do a particular task. Self-efficacy in achievement-oriented educational environments refers to a student's perceived assurance of reaching particular objectives. How much pupils think they can succeed, how many choices they make, and how long they stick with a task are all influenced by their feeling of self-efficacy. Nevertheless, few studies have explicitly looked at the simultaneous effects of several motivating factors on medical students' performance using a sizable

sample size. Furthermore, motivation is a combined result of a person's personality and external surroundings, indicating that medical students' motivation should be assessed taking into account both their unique traits and the external circumstances or limitations they encounter. Our study aimed to clarify the mechanisms governing the many forms of motivation, such as intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and self-efficacy, that influence learning engagement and performance in medical education while taking into account the relevant external environmental elements, such as the ranking of educational institutions and the demographic characteristics of the students. (Wu,2020)

Students spend more time in school, so they do not get bored easily the class should have a fun design, comfortable to learn, and not monotonous . This is because the classroom is the element that most influences student progress and learning success. As happened in public elementary school of 002 Bangkinang Kota, in the classroom carpet was provided with the aim of giving freedom to students to choose where to study, sit on a bench or on a carpet. Even when feeling tired, students are allowed to study while lying down . In the elementary school Qur'ani Al-Ikhlash Rappang, Sidenreng Rappang District, provides a place for students to put their student's lunch boxes in the classroom, besides that there are also wall decoration, brooms, and other cleaning tools. Because school facilities are complete, it will cause student satisfaction, students are satisfied with electricity supply, ceiling finishes, windows/doors and furniture in their classrooms. However, they were not satisfied with the provision of air conditioning and internet facilities in the classroom. (Widiastuti et. al, 2020)

A need to address implementation aspects in an educational setting is emphasized by researchers (Green et al., 2021) and policy documents (Kankaraš et al., 2019). While the integration of universal, preventive social-emotional skills programs in school practices has been suggested due to cost-effectiveness and sustainability advantages, intervention effectiveness largely depends on high quality implementation. Specifically complex interventions, which address multiple interacting components – such as social-emotional learning programs – come with implementation and evaluation challenges relating to standardization, context sensitivity, and the complexity of the effect model of intervention outcomes (Craig et al., 2019). Thus, to increase implementation quality, two aspects need special consideration; (i) a well-defined intervention effect model and (ii) a "support system" providing infrastructure and training elements to create a common delivery context and decrease variability of implementation quality.

As the intervention model should feature core elements derived from theory and evidence-base, a model of social-emotional skills increases and their associations to outcome variables such as peer relationships and wellbeing was developed. Additionally, standardization and delivery aspects should be considered. Thus, evidence regarding timing and appropriate delivery methods (Pollak et al., 2022) was reviewed. To measure implementation fidelity of the delivery of this intervention model, adherence is fundamental. The support system should be tailored to the intervention deliverers. While universal school-based interventions have been found to be more effective when delivered by school-staff as compared to external trainers, teachers lack professional development opportunities and feel ill-equipped to address social-emotional or mental health needs (Bale et al., 2020). Implementation staff's self-efficacy seems to interact with intervention complexity in regard to student outcomes (Caron et al., 2020), emphasizing the importance of targeted support systems in complex interventions. However, a support system merely aids the implementation and needs to be understood as distinct from intervention strategies. Teacher training alone, for example, did not increase students' peer relationships. It is further unclear whether changing teachers' attitudes even impacts their behaviors in class, with some studies supporting such a relation (Wilson et al., 2022), while others do not (Garrote et al., 2020). However, a combination of

personal teacher effects and classroom setting effects were found to impact intervention results (Tolan et al., 2020). Thus, intervention complexity, facilitation strategies, quality of delivery, and participant responsiveness were identified as moderators of implementation fidelity.

Considering that children spend between 25% and 30% of their lives in schools, classrooms rank as the second most significant indoor environment for kids, behind their homes. Since indoor air can be up to ten times more polluted than outdoor air under real-world conditions, worries about the detrimental consequences of poor indoor air quality (IAQ) on children's health, well-being, and productivity are growing. Children's health and performance are impacted by low IAQ, particularly in the case of younger children, and might have negative psychological or physiological effects. Regulations are constructed on CO2 levels rather than other pollutants in order to provide sufficient IAQ. In buildings where individuals, breathed air, or bio-effluents are the primary sources of pollution, IAQ is frequently defined by CO2 concentrations. The most significant human bio-effluent is carbon dioxide (CO2), which is produced by (Korsavi, 2020)

Family structure also serves as a sign that evaluates social capital due to the influence of family structure relationships between parents and children. Previous research has revealed that. Two-parent households send more students to school compared to students from households with a single parent. The significant work-family strain of the time and energy that parents have may be limited by single parents invested in creating positive bonds with their kids. As a result, students from single-parent families could face greater disadvantages when it comes to family social capital in contrast to students from homes with two parents households. Family social capital is additionally impacted by the level of parental attention that youngsters receive. It is the standard of parent-child connections. Students might gain from the focus provided, when making decisions about their schooling, by their parents. (Xiao Li, 2019)

The term "academic" or "learning engagement" describes a child's diligent actions and mindset that encourage and support learning, such as persistent work habits, task orientation, and active participation in the classroom. High expectations for their children's academic performance can help parents foster academic engagement by rewarding their children's efforts to learn new skills and pushing them to keep trying, which will raise their school attainment. Even after adjusting for cognitive capacity, multiple studies have demonstrated that child engagement remains a reliable indicator of academic performance. Parental expectations and child participation may act as mediators for parental involvement, according to findings from other studies. This is due to the fact that parental expectations serve as external supports in the classroom, where academic support and involvement help kids develop the learning attitudes and behaviors—like active participation in class and task orientation—that they need to become more involved in their education. This interpretation was founded on the framework of the social learning theory, which held that parental involvement led to increased children's learning engagement, which was shaped through observed learning. (Chaudhry,2020)

Framework of the Study

This study is anchored on Behaviorism that was first introduced in the 19th century as a reaction against mentalism. At the time, the study of the mind mostly relied on first-person accounts of people’s thoughts and feelings. Some psychologists didn’t think that unconscious thoughts and urges were objective or measurable. It was too subjective, which could lead to findings that were contradicting. Worse, they might not even be able to reproduce the same results.

Behavior, on the other hand, could be observed objectively, systematically studied, and empirically measured. Moreover, behaviorists believe that people can be trained to perform any task regardless of their genetic background or personality as long as you apply the right conditioning. In layman's terms, we're all blank slates when we're born. And all our behavior is learned from our interaction with our environment.

According to Classical Conditioning, a human or animal can learn new behavior by associating a neutral stimulus with another stimulus that causes a natural response. Once associated, the neutral stimulus can now trigger the learned response.

To explain this more clearly, let's look at an experiment conducted by Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov. You've heard of Pavlov's dogs, right? In his experiments, he was able to teach dogs to associate the ringing of a bell (a neutral stimulus) with the arrival of food (the second stimulus). The smell of the food automatically triggers the dogs' hunger, which includes physical signs such as salivation. Through conditioning, just hearing the ringing of the bell could cause the dogs to salivate, even if they no longer smelled the food.

Operant Conditioning

Most of us are very familiar with Operant Conditioning because this learning technique is based on the idea of reward and punishment. According to Operant Conditioning, consequences can control the behavior of an individual. A behavior is more likely to occur if the person knows that they'll get something good out of it. It is less likely to occur if the person knows they'll get punished.

Operant conditioning can be done using positive and negative reinforcement and positive and negative punishment:

Positive reinforcement: The presence of an added stimulus after you get the desired behavior can increase the likelihood of the individual repeating the behavior or, to put it more simply, giving a person something good to reinforce the behavior. For example, the teacher gives preschool kids a stamp if they are on good behavior in class at the end of the day. This makes them more likely to behave during class on the following days.

Negative reinforcement: Taking away something unpleasant after the desired behavior takes place. Over time, the desired behavior occurs more often with the expectation that the negative stimuli will be removed. For example, the beeping sound you hear when you don't put on your seatbelt. We are motivated to put on our seatbelt quickly to stop the annoying beeps.

Positive punishment: Adding an undesirable stimulus after a behavior to discourage it from occurring in the future. For example, a student will get detention for misbehaving in class.

Negative punishment: Removing a positive stimulus after a behavior to discourage the person from doing it again. For example, removing a child's internet privileges if he doesn't do his homework. (Holt, 2023)

Methodology

This chapter introduced the methodological aspects of the study, encompassing the research design, respondents of the study, research instrument, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques, statistical treatment and ethical considerations.

Descriptive statistics is the term given to the analysis of data that helps describe, show or summarize data in a meaningful way such that, for example, patterns might emerge from the data. Descriptive

statistics do not, however, allow us to make conclusions beyond the data we have analysed or reach conclusions regarding any hypotheses we might have made. They are simply a way to describe our data. Descriptive statistics are very important because if we simply presented our raw data it would be hard to visualize what the data was showing, especially if there was a lot of it. Descriptive statistics therefore enables us to present the data in a more meaningful way, which allows simpler interpretation of the data. For example, if we had the results of 100 pieces of students' coursework, we may be interested in the overall performance of those students. We would also be interested in the distribution or spread of the marks. Descriptive statistics allow us to do this. How to properly describe data through statistics and graphs is an important topic and discussed in other Laerd Statistics guides. Laerd Statistics)

Results and Discussions:

This chapter presents the findings, analysis, and discussion of this investigation. This chapter's entries are arranged in the same sequence as the Statement of the Problem.

Demographic Profile of Students according to Socio-Economic Status

Table 2

n=297

Socio-economic status	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low income (9,100-36,400)	89	29.97
2. Middle income (36,401-109,200)	110	37.03
3. High income (109, 201-above)	98	33.00
Total	**297**	**100**

The data provided an overview of the socio-economic status of 297 students, categorized into low, middle, and high-income brackets. Low-income students, constituted 29.97% of the sample, have incomes ranging from P9,100 to P36,400. Middle-income students form the largest group, comprised 37.03% of the sample, with incomes between P36,401 and P109,200. High-income students, represented 33% of the sample, have incomes of P109,201 and above. This distribution highlighted the diverse socio-economic backgrounds of the student population, with a majority falling into the middle-income bracket.

Demographic Profile of Students according to Geographical Location

Table 3

n=297

Geographical location	Frequency	Percentage
1. Near the school	128	43.1
2. Moderate	109	36.70
3. Far from school	60	20.20
Total	**297**	**100**

The data revealed the geographical distribution of 297 students based on their proximity to the school, classified into three categories: near, moderate, and far. Approximately 43.1% of students live near the

school, suggesting they have easier access to school facilities and shorter commuting times. In contrast, 36.70% live at a moderate distance, requiring a bit more commuting but still enjoying convenient access to school resources. The remaining 20.20% live far from the school, likely facing longer commutes and potential challenges in accessing school facilities. This balanced distribution underscored the importance of understanding students' geographical locations in planning transportation services and ensuring equitable access to resources for all students.

Factors Influencing the Students' Behavior in an Educational Context

Table 4. Family Factor

n=297

PROBLEMS	3		2		1		Total		Wx	I
	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1. Supportive Parents	292	98.32	5	1.68	0	0	297	100	2.98	A
2. Harmonious relationship within the family	265	89.22	10	3.37	22	7.41	297	100	2.82	A
3. Subjective norms and attitudes	291	97.98	6	2.02	0	0	297	100	2.98	A
Total/General Wx	**848**		**21**		**22**		**891**	**100**	**2.93**	**A**

Legend:

Scale		Mean Range		Interpretation		
3	-	2.34-3.00	-	Agree (A)	wx= weighted mean	
2	-	1.67-2.33	-	Undecided (U)	f =	frequency
1	-	1.00-1.66	-	Disagree (DA)	I =	Interpretation

The data from Table 4 on the family factor influencing students' behavior in an educational context reveals several key insights. Nearly all students (98.32%) perceive that having supportive parents positively affects their behavior, indicating a strong belief in the impact of parental support. Similarly, a majority of students (89.22%) recognize the importance of a harmonious relationship within the family, suggesting that family dynamics significantly influence their behavior. Additionally, almost all students (97.98%) acknowledge that subjective norms and attitudes play a role in shaping their behavior. These findings highlight the pivotal role of family-related factors in shaping students' behavior, emphasizing the need for supportive family environments to promote positive behavior among students.

Factors Influencing the Students' Behavior in an Educational Context

Table 5. Self-Identity Factor

n=297

PROBLEMS	3		2		1		Total		Wx	I
	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1. Self-assessment	197	66.33	86	28.96	14	4.71	297	100	2.62	A
2. Attitudes towards learning	259	87.21	31	10.44	7	2.35	297	100	2.85	A
3. Problem-solving appraisal	160	53.87	105	35.35	32	10.78	297	100	2.43	A
4. Age, experience, and academic performance type	103	34.68	115	38.72	79	26.60	297	100	2.08	A

5. Task approach, negative emotions; task/thinking involvement; and self-control	243	81.82	10	3.37	44	14.81	297	100	2.67	A
6. Prior knowledge, motivation	274	92.26	23	7.74	0	0	297	100	2.92	A
Total/General Wx	**1236**		**370**		**176**		**1782**	**100**	**2.59**	**A**

Legend:

Scale		Mean Range	Interpretation		wx= weighted mean
3	-	2.34-3.00	- Agree (A)		f = frequency
2	-	1.67-2.33	- Undecided (U)	I =	Interpretation
1	-	1.00-1.66	- Disagree (DA)		

Table 5 provides insights into the self-identity factors influencing students' behavior in an educational context. The data reveals that a majority of students perceive self-assessment (66.33%), attitudes towards learning (87.21%), problem-solving appraisal (53.87%), age, experience, and academic performance type (34.68%), task approach, negative emotions, task/thinking involvement, and self-control (81.82%), as well as prior knowledge and motivation (92.26%), to influence their behavior. These findings underscore the complex interplay of internal factors in shaping students' behavior, highlighting the importance of self-perception, attitudes, problem-solving skills, emotional regulation, and motivation in educational settings. Understanding these factors can help educators tailor their approaches to better support students in their academic endeavors.

Factors Influencing the Students' Behavior in an Educational Context

Table 6. Self-Efficacy Factor

n=297

PROBLEMS	3		2		1		Total		Wx	I
	F	%	f	%	f	%	F	%		
1. E-learning system quality and technology readiness	197	66.33	100	33.67	0	0	297	100	2.66	A
2. Self-efficacy and academic ability	181	60.94	49	16.50	67	22.56	297	100	2.38	A
3. Learning styles	230	77.44	67	22.56	0	0	297	100	2.77	A
4. Prior knowledge and motivation	274	92.26	23	7.74	0	0	297	100	2.92	A
Total/General Wx	**882**		**239**		**67**		**1182**	**100**	**2.67**	**A**

Legend:

Scale		Mean Range	Interpretation		wx= weighted mean
3	-	2.34-3.00	- Agree (A)		f = frequency
2	-	1.67-2.33	- Undecided (U)	I =	Interpretation
1	-	1.00-1.66	- Disagree (DA)		

Table 6 sheds light on the self-efficacy factors that influence students' behavior in an educational context. The data indicates that a majority of students perceive the quality of e-learning systems and their readiness for technology (66.33%), self-efficacy and academic ability (60.94%), learning styles (77.44%), and prior knowledge and motivation (92.26%) as influencing their behavior. These findings

underscore the importance of students' belief in their own abilities, their learning styles, and the quality of the educational technology they use. Understanding and addressing these factors can help educators create more effective learning environments that cater to students' individual needs and enhance their learning experiences.

Factors Influencing the Students' Behavior in an Educational Context

Table 7. Peers Factor

n=297

PROBLEMS	3		2		1		Total		Wx	I
	F	%	f	%	f	%	F	%		
1.Supportive classmates/colleagues	199	67.00	98	33.00	0	0	297	100	2.67	A
2.Peer pressure	85	28.62	23	7.74	189	63.64	297	100	1.65	U
Total/General Wx	**284**		**121**		**189**		**594**	**100**	**2.16**	**U**

Legend:

Scale		Mean Range		Interpretation		
3	-	2.34-3.00	-	Agree (A)	wx= weighted mean	
2	-	1.67-2.33	-	Undecided (U)	f =	frequency
1	-	1.00-1.66	-	Disagree (DA)	I =	Interpretation

Table 7 presents data on the influence of peers on students' behavior in an educational context. The majority of students (67.00%) acknowledge that having supportive classmates or colleagues influences their behavior. This highlights the positive impact of a supportive peer environment on students' attitudes and actions. However, when it comes to peer pressure, opinions are more divided. Only 28.62% of students agree that peer pressure affects their behavior, while a significant portion (63.64%) disagree. This suggests that while some students may feel influenced by their peers, many others are able to resist or are not significantly impacted by peer pressure. Overall, the data underscores the importance of fostering supportive peer relationships in educational settings while also recognizing the diversity in students' responses to peer influence.

Factors Influencing the Students' Behavior in an Educational Context

Table 8. Classroom Factor

n=297

PROBLEMS	3		2		1		Total		Wx	I
	F	%	F	%	f	%	F	%		
1. Learning needs, interest in learning, and ways of learning	199	67.00	98	33.00	0	0	297	100	2.67	A
2. Student-oriented and supportive teaching styles	239	80.47	51	17.17	7	2.36	297	100	2.78	A
3. Instructors' Educational background and teaching methods	275	75.76	72	24.24	0	0	297	100	2.76	A

4. General cognitive abilities and school achievement	198	66.67	99	33.33	0	0	297	100	2.67	A
5. Learning strategies and cognitive styles	282	94.95	15	5.05	0	0	297	100	2.95	A
Total/General Wx	**1143**		**335**		**7**		**1485**	**100**	**2.76**	**A**

Legend:

Scale		Mean Range	Interpretation		wx= weighted mean
3	-	2.34-3.00	- Agree (A)		f = frequency
2	-	1.67-2.33	- Undecided (U)	I =	Interpretation
1	-	1.00-1.66	- Disagree (DA)		

Table 8 provides insights into the classroom factors that influence students' behavior in an educational context. The data reveals that a majority of students perceive their learning needs, interest in learning, ways of learning (67.00%), student-oriented and supportive teaching styles (80.47%), instructors' educational background and teaching methods (75.76%), general cognitive abilities, and school achievement (66.67%), as well as learning strategies and cognitive styles (94.95%), to influence their behavior. These findings underscore the importance of classroom environments that cater to students' individual needs, promote supportive teaching styles, and consider diverse learning strategies. Educators can use this information to create more effective and engaging learning experiences that positively impact students' behavior and academic performance.

Factors Influencing the Students' Behavior in an Educational Context

Table 9. Community Factor

n=297

PROBLEMS	3		2		1		Total		Wx	I
	F	%	f	%	f	%	F	%		
1. Rapport with the community	249	83.84	48	16.16	0	0	297	100	2.84	A
2. Supportive neighbors	109	36.70	126	42.42	62	20.88	297	100	2.16	U
3. Community that provides positive influence	111	37.37	132	44.45	54	18.18	297	100	2.19	U
Total/General Wx	**469**		**306**		**116**		**891**	**100**	**2.40**	**A**

Legend:

Scale		Mean Range	Interpretation		wx= weighted mean
3	-	2.34-3.00	- Agree (A)		f = frequency
2	-	1.67-2.33	- Undecided (U)	I =	Interpretation
1	-	1.00-1.66	- Disagree (DA)		

Table 9 presents data on the community factors that influence students' behavior in an educational context. The majority of students (83.84%) agree that their rapport with the community influences their behavior, indicating the significance of community connections in shaping student attitudes and actions. However, opinions are more divided when it comes to the influence of supportive neighbors and a community that provides positive influence. Only 36.70% of students agree that supportive neighbors influence their behavior, and 37.37% agree that a community providing positive influence affects their

behavior. These findings suggest that while students value their relationships with the community, they may not perceive their neighbors or the broader community as significant influences on their behavior. Educators and community leaders can use this information to foster stronger community ties that positively impact students' behavior and overall well-being.

Summary of the Factors Influencing the Students' Behavior in an Educational Context

Table 10

n=297

FACTORS	3		2		1		Total		Wx	I
	F	%	f	%	f	%	F	%		
1. Family	848	95.17	21	2.36	22	2.47	891	100	2.93	A
2. Self-Identity	1236	69.36	370	20.76	176	9.88	782	100	2.59	A
3. Self-Efficacy	887	74.24	239	20.12	67	5.64	1188	100	2.70	A
4. Peers	284	47.81	121	20.37	189	31.82	594	100	2.16	U
5. Classroom	1143	76.97	335	22.56	7	0.47	1485	100	2.76	A
6. Community	469	52.64	306	34.34	116	13.02	891	100	2.40	A
Total/General Wx	**4862**		**1392**		**577**		**6831**	**100**	**2.63**	**A**

Legend:

Scale		Mean Range	Interpretation		
3	-	2.34-3.00	-	Agree (A)	wx= weighted mean
2	-	1.67-2.33	-	Undecided (U)	f = frequency
1	-	1.00-1.66	-	Disagree (DA)	I = Interpretation

Table 10 summarizes the factors influencing students' behavior in an educational context, highlighting the varying degrees of influence each factor has according to student responses. Family factors are perceived as highly influential, with 95.17% of students agreeing on their impact. Self-identity factors follow closely behind, with 69.36% agreement, indicating the importance of how students perceive themselves in shaping their behavior. Self-efficacy factors also play a significant role, with 74.24% agreement among students. Peers, classroom, and community factors exhibit lower levels of agreement, suggesting that while these factors are perceived to influence behavior, they may not be as universally acknowledged as family, self-identity, and self-efficacy factors. Overall, the data underscores the multifaceted nature of factors influencing student behavior, highlighting the need for educators to consider a range of influences when designing educational interventions and support systems.

Significant Relationship between the Factors the Students' Behavior and the Demographic Profile

Table 11

Ho	rxy	I	Z-test		Decision	Remark
			C.V	T.V		
There is no significant relationship between the factors influencing the students' behavior and the demographic	0.10 -0.98	Very low relationship Very high	1.720 16.86	1.960	Accept Ho Reject	Not significant significant

profile such as: a. socio-economic status b. geographical location		relationship		1.960	Ho	

n=297

0.05 level of significance -1 degree of freedom

Table 11 presents a hypothesis test regarding the relationship between factors influencing students' behavior and demographic profiles such as socio-economic status and geographical location. The null hypothesis (Ho) states that there is no significant relationship between these factors. The test compares the calculated Z-test value (-0.98) with the critical value (1.960) at a 0.05 level of significance, using a degree of freedom of n-1=296.

Since the calculated Z-test value (-0.98) is less than the critical value (1.960), the decision is to accept the null hypothesis (Ho). This means that there is not a significant relationship between the factors influencing students' behavior and the demographic profiles of socio-economic status and geographical location. The remark indicates that the relationship between these factors is very low.

This result suggests that, according to the data analyzed, socio-economic status and geographical location do not play a significant role in influencing students' behavior in an educational context.

Conclusion

The study's findings provided answers to the following questions:

1. **What are the factors influencing the students' behavior in an educational context?**

The majority of factors are thought to have an insignificant influence, according to findings on what influences students' behavior in a learning environment. The community's attitude toward education, the lack of expectations for education, the dislike of school and lessons, peer pressure, bad weather, low income, unsupportive school environment, drug and alcohol use, and poor health are all factors that receive low ratings. On the other hand, it is believed that social media addiction and family issues have a greater influence.

According to these results, social media use and family dynamics had a big impact on students' conduct even if external influences generally had less of an impact.

2. **Is there a significant relationship between the demographic variables and the factors influencing the students' behavior?**

The findings showed that the demographic variables and geographical locations do not significantly correlate with the factors influencing students' behavior. The two variables' extremely low correlation coefficients (rxy), which are -0.06 and -0.12, respectively, indicate that there is little to no link. The null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted since the Z-test results of 1.9690 for both variables are less than the crucial value of 0.05. This suggested that the variables impacting students' behavior and these demographic ones do not statistically significantly correlate.

3. **Is there a significant relationship between the socio-economic status and the geographical location of the respondents?**

Recommendation

In light of the study's results and conclusions, the following recommendations up for consideration include:

1. Since majority of the students are in the middle bracket, attention must be given to this … the entire populace.
2. Since that many fell in the "far from school" category, the administration shed … implementations to address this distance problem.
3. Concern with family matters must be taken into consideration since it has the highest rate of response amongst all the other indicators. These findings suggested that although outside influences on students' conduct are usually minimal, family dynamics and social media use have a big impact and should be taken into account when developing instructional plans and support systems.
4. Since the 2 variables namely the factors influencing students' behavior and 2 demographic variables, socio-economic and geographical location are not significantly correlated, it is suggested that a follow up study will be conducted to … find out the root cause/s of the problem.

References:

1. Bale, J., Grové, C., & Costello, S. (2020). Building a mental health literacy model and verbal scale for children: Results of a Delphi study. Children and Youth Services Review, 109, 104667 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.104667.
2. Busching, R., & Krahé, B. (2020). With a little help from their peers: The impact of classmates on adolescents' development of prosocial behavior. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 49(9), 1849–1863. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01260-8.
3. Caron, E. B., Drake, K. L., Stewart, C. E., Muggeo, M. A., & Ginsburg, G. S. (2020). Intervention adherence and self-efficacy as predictors of child outcomes in school nurse–delivered interventions for anxiety. Journal of School Nursing, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059840520925522.
4. Craig, P., Dieppe, P., Macintyre, S., Michie, S., Nazareth, I., & Petticrew, M. (2019). Developing and evaluating complex interventions. Medical Reserach Council. www.mrc.ac.uk/complexinterventionsguidance.
5. Durlak, J. A., Mahoney, J. L., & Boyle, A. E. (2022). What we know, and what we need to find out about universal, school-based social and emotional learning programs for children and adolescents: A review of meta-analyses and directions for future research. Psychological Bulletin, 148(11–12), 765–782. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000383.
6. Garrote, A., Felder, F., Krähenmann, H., Schnepel, S., Sermier Dessemontet, R., & Moser Opitz, E. (2020). Social acceptance in inclusive classrooms: The role of teacher attitudes toward inclusion and classroom management. Frontiers in Education, 5(Oct), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.582873.
7. Green, A. L., Ferrante, S., Boaz, T. L., Kutash, K., & Wheeldon-Reece, B. (2021). Social and emotional learning during early adolescence: Effectiveness of a classroom-based SEL program for middle school students. Psychology in the Schools, 58(6), 1056–1069. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22487.
8. Jansen, K., & Kiefer, S. M. (2020). Understanding brain development: Investing in young adolescents' cognitive and social-emotional development. Middle School Journal, 51(4), 18–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2020.1787749.
9. Jordan, P. (2023). Who's In: Chronic Absenteeism Under ESSA - FutureEd. FutureEd. https://www.future-ed.org/whos-in-chronic-absenteeism-under-the-every-student-succeeds-act/

10. Kankaraš, M., Suarez-Alvarez, J., & (France), O. for E. C. and D. (OECD). (2019). Assessment framework of the OECD study on social and emotional skills. In OECD Education Working Papers No. 207 (Issue 207). http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED601034&site=ehost-live%0Ahttps://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5007adef-en.
11. Khalfaoui, A., García-Carrión, R., & Villardón-Gallego, L. (2021). A Systematic Review of the Literature on Aspects Affecting Positive Classroom Climate in Multicultural Early Childhood Education. Early Childhood Education Journal, 49(1), 71–81. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-020-01054-4.
12. Kozina, A. (2020). School-based prevention of anxiety using the "My FRIENDS" emotional resilience program: Six-month follow-up. International Journal of Psychology: Journal International de Psychologie, 55(Suppl 1), 70–77. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12553.
13. Lombas, A. S., Jiménez, T. I., Arguís-Rey, R., Hernández-Paniello, S., Valdivia-Salas, S., & Martín-Albo, J. (2019). Impact of the happy classrooms programme on psychological well-being, school aggression, and classroom climate. Mindfulness, 10(8), 1642–1660. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-019-01132-8.
14. Maalouf, F. T., Alrojolah, L., Ghandour, L., Afifi, R., Dirani, L. A., Barrett, P., Nakkash, R., Shamseddeen, W., Tabaja, F., Yuen, C. M., & Becker, A. E. (2020). Building emotional resilience in youth in lebanon: A school-based randomized controlled trial of the friends intervention. Prevention Science, No-Specified. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-020-01123-5.
15. Mackenzie, K., & Williams, C. (2018). Universal, school-based interventions to promote mental and emotional well-being: what is being done in the UK and does it work? A systematic review. BMJ Open, 8(9), e022560 https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-022560.
16. Minnesota Department of Education. (2018a). Implementing ESSA: Consistent attendance summary. Retrieved from https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/ESSA/Imp/MDE072612.
17. Minnesota Department of Education. (2018b). Supporting indicators: Chronic absenteeism. [Interactive data table]. Retrieved from https://mn.gov/mmb/results-forchildren/supporting-indicators/learning-environments/chronic-absenteeism.jsp.
18. Nievar, A., Brown, A. L., Nathans, L., Chen, Q., & Martinez-Cantu, V. (2018). Home visiting among inner-city families: Links to early academic achievement. Early Education and Development, 29, 1115-1128. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2018.1506229.
19. Ofsted. (2019). The education inspection framework. Gov.UK, 2005(September 2019). www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2014/3283/contents/made.
20. Orson, C. N., McGovern, G., & Larson, R. W. (2020). How challenges and peers contribute to social-emotional learning in outdoor adventure education programs. Journal of Adolescence, 81(Feb), 7–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.02.014.
21. Palacios, D., Berger, C., Luengo Kanacri, B. P., Veenstra, R., & Dijkstra, J. K. (2019). The interplay of adolescents' aggression and victimization with friendship and antipathy networks within an educational prosocial intervention. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 48(10), 2005–2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01105-z.
22. Pollak, I., Mitic, M., Birchwood, J., Dörfler, S., Krammer, I., Rogers, J. C., Schek, E. J., Schrank, B., Stiehl, K. A. M., & Woodcock, K. A. (2022). A systematic review of intervention programs

promoting peer relationships among children and adolescents: Methods and targets used in effective programs. Adolescent Research Review. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-022-00195-4.

23. Rogers, T. & Feller, A. (2016). Reducing student absences at scale. Working paper. Retrieved from http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/todd_rogers/files/02292016.pdf.
24. Rogers, T., Duncan, T., Wolford, T., Ternovski, J., Subramanyam, S., & Reitano, A. (2017). A randomized experiment using absenteeism information to "nudge" attendance (REL 2017– 252). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.
25. Seelman, K. L., & Walker, M. B. (2018). Do Anti-Bullying Laws Reduce In-School Victimization, Fear-based Absenteeism, and Suicidality for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Questioning Youth? Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47(11), 2301–2319. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0904-8
26. Smerillo, N. E., Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., & Ou, S. R. (2018). Chronic absence, eighth-grade achievement, and high school attainment in the Chicago Longitudinal Study. Journal of School Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.11.001
27. Smythe-Leistico, K., & Page, L. C. (2018). Connect-Text: Leveraging Text-Message Communication to Mitigate Chronic Absenteeism and Improve Parental Engagement in the Earliest Years of Schooling. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 23(1–2), 139–152. https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2018.1434658
28. Tejada-Gallardo, C., Blasco-Belled, A., Torrelles-Nadal, C., & Alsinet, C. (2020). Effects of school-based multicomponent positive psychology interventions on well-being and distress in adolescents:
29. A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 49(10), 1943–1960. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01289-9.
30. The Hamilton Project. (2018). Chronic absence across the United States, 2015-16 school year. [Interactive map]. Retrieved from http://www.hamiltonproject.org/charts/chronic_absence_across_the_united_states.
31. Tolan, P., Elreda, L. M., Bradshaw, C. P., Downer, J. T., & Ialongo, N. (2020). Randomized trial testing the integration of the Good Behavior Game and MyTeachingPartnerTM: The moderating role of distress among new teachers on student outcomes. Journal of School Psychology, 78(Feb), 75–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2019.12.002.
32. van de Sande, M. C. E., Fekkes, M., Kocken, P. L., Diekstra, R. F. W., Reis, R., & Gravesteijn, C. (2019). Do universal social and emotional learning programs for secondary school students enhance the competencies they address? A systematic review. Psychology in the Schools, 56(10), 1545–1567. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22307.
33. Wilson, C., Woolfson, L. M., & Durkin, K. (2022). The impact of explicit and implicit teacher beliefs on reports of inclusive teaching practices in Scotland. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 26(4), 378–396. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1658813.