

The School Context and the Learning Outcomes of Nursing Students of Brokenshire  
College: Basis of Academic Reform

*Dynah T. Petilona, MAST-Bio*

*[dynah\\_micro@yahoo.com](mailto:dynah_micro@yahoo.com)*

Date Submitted: September 29, 2010

Date Final Revision Accepted: May 2, 2011

Abstract

*This study was conducted primarily to determine if the school context variables which include two major dimensions; the ecology of the school and the school culture significantly predict the learning outcomes of the nursing students. Descriptive survey research design utilizing a self-administered questionnaire was used in the study. A total of 578 respondents were surveyed using stratified cluster sampling. The statistical tool that were used in this study were the mean, standard deviation, and stepwise linear regression model. The results reveal that the mean responses regarding the provisions and conditions of the ecology of the school and school culture marked as moderately evident. Among the school culture variables , Instructional competence and the Attitudes of the students marked a significant findings, wherein the domains of Curriculum strongly influenced the Level 1 nursing students performance in terms of weighted performance average(WPA) but increased in the diversity of learning does not show that it could alleviate the Level 1 WPA; and the social regards for learning affects the Related learning Experience performance of the Level 3 nursing students while the domain in diversity of learners and community linkages does not show that it will improve student's performance. Attitudes of the students also influenced the learning outcomes in terms of Weighted Performance Average(WPA) of the Level 3 nursing students. Improvements in the working conditions increases the Weighted Performance Average (WPA) of the Level 2 nursing students while improvements in biology laboratory facilities does not show that it will increased student performance. School culture indicators marked the significant factor that strongly influenced the learning outcomes of the nursing students as compared to ecology of the school.*

**Keywords:** *school context, learning outcome, academic reform*

School is relevant not because it plays a role or fulfills a need, but because it is true to the mission-vision that defines its identity. Like individuals, a school's identity should be premised on its self-understanding. As a dynamic organism, a school's self understanding

shifts with time and place and might even quite radically differ in varying temporal and spatial contexts. School must envision itself as a catalyst based on the ideals of a free, participatory, humane, global society where people live in harmony with their conscience, with one another and with the environment (Colinares, 2005).

Louis and Miles (1990) cite the issue of leading and managing the process of change as a missing piece in school improvement, other than the exhortation to the principal to exercise "instructional leadership," in their study of urban high school change. Regardless of the new program or changes a school wishes to initiate, those leading school improvement efforts need an understanding of the complex nature of the school prior to and during the change effort in order to sustain implementation. In order to understand the impact of contextual factors on change, it is necessary to examine the circumstances of schooling and the meaning given to these by those in the school as well as those in the outside environment, parents and community members.

Literature suggests that to improve teacher performance, the work environment must enhance teachers' sense of professionalism and decrease their career dissatisfaction. Conley, Bacharach, and Bauer (1989) found that in elementary schools where teachers perceive class size as manageable, the level of dissatisfaction is lower than in schools where teachers perceive class size as less manageable. The body of literature addressing students as players in school improvement is noticeably thin. As Fullan (1991) points out, students are typically seen only as the potential beneficiaries of change rather than as participants in the process of change. This traditional view of students is reflected in the observations of Fine (1991). The principal of the high school in Fine's study seemed to believe that merely telling students what to do, without their involvement, would compel their compliance. Due to their findings regarding the close relationship between teachers and student attitudes, Firestone and Rosenblum (1988) agree that the role of high school students in school improvement activities needs to be evaluated. Students are rarely informed regarding plans in spite of the fact that the plans cannot be carried out successfully when students are not committed to cooperate with the plan, and do not know what to do or how to do it. (Fullan, 1991).

Brokenshire College is not exempted on this critical times facing threats and challenges. The nursing licensure examination showed no consistency in performance national board rating

and not able to garnered board placers since batch June, 2006. How could the school achieved the culture of academic excellence? Thus , the number of nursing enrollees is also decreasing. It is the purpose of this study to examine the school context in which leaders find themselves as they engage in school improvement efforts. The findings of the study gave a wider frame of reference to the following:

*School Administrators and Top Management* – to identify existing situation defects and deficiency by realizing how the school context influenced the learning outcomes of the students. This will guide them in decision making for policy formulation, better strategic planning to maintain effective leadership, governance and quality management system.

*Teachers* – this study enable them to realize that teachers as ethical and excellent professionals enhance their contribution to the learning outcomes of the students producing quality graduates to attain center of excellence in the nursing program.

*Students* – to be reflective, values oriented individual, intellectually competent to become productive adults in the society.

### *Theory*

This study is anchored to the goal theory or rational system approach is based on the reasoning that organizations have set of goals that they wish to pursue(Campbell, 1977). This theory believes that organizations are rational , purposive entities pursuing specific missions, goal and objectives( Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnely, 1994). Effectiveness can then be evaluated by criteria that measure how well the goals are being achieved. Often quantitative measures, such as profit in the case of private sector firms, are used to measure goal achievement,. This measurement generally focuses on outcomes rather than processes of the organization. The system theory is based on the idea that organization are social entities existing as parts of larger environment and that to surmise, they function to satisfy the demands of the environment. The effectiveness of the environment is measured in terms on how successful that organization is in satisfying the demands of the environment. The effectiveness of organization under this theory is measured in terms of how organization meet the expectations of their constituencies.

The study aimed to determine which of the school context variables strongly influenced the learning outcomes of the nursing students as basis for academic reform. Specifically, it sought answers to the following sub problems: (A) What is the mean responses of the nursing students regarding the school context in terms of 1.1 Ecology of the school ( a.Resource, b. Physical Arrangements,and c. Working Conditions) and 1.2 School Culture ( a. Attitudes of students towards schooling, b. Cultural Norms of the school, c. Leadership, and d. Instructional Competence Domains (Social regards for learning, Learning environment, Diversity of Learners, Curriculum, Planning, Assessing, and Reporting, and Community Linkages). (B)What are the Learning outcomes among the nursing students in terms of (a.)WPA ( Weighted performance Average) and (b) Related Learning Experience grade, Nursing Care Management, and Health Assessment grade. (C)Which of the school context variables significantly predict the learning outcomes of the nursing student?

The second dimension of the school context is *the culture*. Culture is an expression that tries to capture the informal side of social organizations such as schools. Schein (1985) goes on to define culture as "the deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization, that operate unconsciously, and that define in a basic 'taken-for-granted' fashion an organization's view of itself and its environment".

For the purposes of this paper, *school culture* is conceptualized to include the four elements: the *attitudes of students about schooling*, the *cultural norms of the school*, *Leadership*; and *Instructional competence* composed of the set of informal, unwritten rules governing behavior in the school.

Attitudes of students toward schooling it refers how the students behave during class hour or even during examination time; how they manage their time towards their studies and some misbehavior manifested or observed.

Cultural norms of the school it refers to the physical setting created by the school building and school organization interacts with the beliefs, attitudes and values of people. Attitudes and beliefs held by individuals influence the norms and relationships in the school, and, conversely, cultural norms influence attitudes and beliefs. Relationships between persons in

the school are influenced by and exert influence on other elements of the school culture. Thus, it also relate on the policy governing within the schools.

Leadership-it refers on how leaders establish unity of purpose and direction of the organization, thus, creating and maintaining the internal environment in which people can become fully involved in achieving the organization's objectives.

Instructional Competence as defined in the QMS (Quality management System) Competence requirements are relevant for any personnel performing any task in terms of education, training, experience and skills. On this study instructional competence could be measured using the National Competency Based Teacher standard assessment tool (NCBTS), it will provide a single framework that define effective teaching in all aspects of a teacher's professional life, further enhance their contribution to the learning outcomes of the students.

## **Method**

Stratified cluster random sampling was used in the study to represent sample population of level 1, level 2 and level 3 nursing students. For each stratum, the samples are drawn randomly of which 30% of the total population would represent for each stratum and the class section are randomly selected thru draw lots to have an equal chance of being included in the sample.

The researchers employed the descriptive survey research design to gather facts about the present existing condition of the school and used for inferences that may aid in solving practical problems as experienced by the institution.

The participants of the study are inclusive only to nursing students taking major subjects such as Health Assessment of Level 1 of new curriculum , Nursing Care management 100 of Level 2 and Related Learning Experience 103 of Level 3 of old curriculum under the advisory of Clinical Instructors. Those subjects are taken during summer Academic Year 2009. From Level 1, 112 nursing students responded the study, 231 from level 2, and 235 from Level 3 with a total number of 578 respondents.

The proponent used questionnaires consisting of two parts. Part one aimed to gather information on the profile of the school in terms of number of enrollees and nursing licensure examination rating from AY 1<sup>st</sup> sem of 2006 to 2<sup>nd</sup> sem . 2008. Student profile was retrieved from the registrar's records in terms of WPA, NCM (RLE) grade and Health assessment grade. Part two used gathered data about the responses of the students regarding the school context in terms of ecology of the school while in school culture variables, a self- formulated item questions for attitudes of the students, cultural norms of the school, and leadership except for instructional competence patterned from the standard questionnaire of NCBTS (National Competency Based Teacher Standard).

Average weighted mean and standard deviation was used to determine the mean responses of the teachers pertaining to the questions regarding the school context in terms of the ecology of the school and school culture.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to determine prediction models of the learning outcome of students. Hypothesis testing was based at 0.05 level of significance (two-tailed).

## Results and Discussion

**Table 1.1**

*Mean Responses of Students Regarding the Ecology of the School*

	<b>Levels</b>											
	<u>Level 1 (N = 112)</u>			<u>Level 2 (N= 231)</u>			<u>Level 3 (n = 235)</u>			<u>Total (n = 578)</u>		
	Mean	SD	VD	Mean	SD	VD	Mean	SD	VD	Mean	SD	
Resource learning center	3.20	.463	ME	2.81	.584	ME	2.71	.568	ME	2.84	.583	ME
Fundamental laboratories	3.06	.567	ME	2.61	.634	ME	2.64	.685	ME	2.71	.666	ME
Biology laboratories	3.06	.643	ME	2.62	.662	ME	2.61	.721	ME	2.70	.705	ME
Physical arrangement	3.07	.509	ME	2.78	.686	ME	2.63	.649	ME	2.77	.659	ME
Working conditions	3.18	.496	ME	2.82	.595	ME	2.69	.651	ME	2.84	.627	ME

*Note : 3.24 – 4.00 = Fully Evident (FE); 2.43 – 3.23 = Moderately Evident (ME); 1.62 – 2.42 = Slightly Evident (SE); 0.81 – 1.61 = Poorly evident (PE); 0.00 – 0.80 = Not Evident (NE)*

Table 1 presents the students' mean responses about their confirmation regarding the indicators of school ecology analyzed by student academic levels. Results only show the mean responses of these indicators coming from the level one to level three students. It is noted that students of each level affirm the moderate evidence for all school ecology indicators. Among these indicators, both resource learning center and working conditions obtain a consistent relatively the same higher mean-rating while biology and fundamental laboratories have the relatively similar lowest mean rating. These observations denote the school's priority in the provision of learning resources and functional working conditions more than the provision of laboratory facilities.

**Table 1.2**  
*Mean Responses of Students Regarding the School Culture*

	<b>Levels</b>											
	<u>Level 1 (N = 112)</u>			<u>Level 2 (N= 231)</u>			<u>Level 3 (n = 235)</u>			<u>Total (n = 578)</u>		
	Mean	SD	VD	Mean	SD	VD	Mean	SD	VD	Mean	SD	VD
Attitude of students towards schooling	2.97	.513	ME	2.81	.534	ME	2.70	.613	ME	2.79	.571	ME
Cultural norms of the school	2.79	.605	ME	2.69	.562	ME	2.50	.665	ME	2.64	.624	ME
Leadership	3.12	.544	ME	2.94	.558	ME	2.77	.635	ME	2.91	.602	ME
Social regard for learning environment	3.34	.666	FE	3.07	.555	ME	2.87	.606	ME	3.04	.622	ME
Diversity of learners	3.33	.563	FE	3.09	.519	ME	2.93	.539	ME	3.07	.555	ME
Curriculum Planning, Assessing and Reporting	3.25	.577	FE	3.05	.554	ME	2.89	.564	ME	3.02	.576	ME
Community linkages	3.32	.511	FE	3.06	.509	ME	2.88	.566	ME	3.04	.556	ME
	3.11	.531	ME	2.91	.564	ME	2.82	.641	ME	2.91	.599	ME
	3.10	.683	ME	2.94	.621	ME	2.86	.606	ME	2.94	.633	ME

*Note : 3.24 – 4.00 = Fully Evident (FE); 2.43 – 3.23 = Moderately Evident (ME); 1.62 – 2.42 = Slightly Evident (SE); 0.81 – 1.61 = Poorly evident (PE); 0.00 – 0.80 = Not Evident (NE)*

The mean responses of students in the academic levels regarding the indicators school culture are shown in Table 1.2. Level one student indicate a fully evident rating for social regard for learning, learning environment, curriculum and diversity of learners while the rest of the indicators are marked as moderately evident. Level two and three students consider all indicators as moderately evident; however relatively higher mean ratings are observed to the same indicators rated as fully evident by the level one student. Also a consistent lowest mean rating under the moderately evident category is given by all students for the cultural norms of the school. The comparatively coherent observations of results denote that the school displayed emphasis for instructional mechanisms than upholding the cultural norms of the school.



**Table 2**  
*Mean Score of the Students' Learning Outcomes*

<i>Level</i>		<i>WPA</i>	<i>health assessment</i>	<i>related learning experiences</i>	<i>nursing care management lecture</i>
level 1 (n = 112)	Mean	83.84	84.59	---	---
	SD	2.511	2.523	---	---
level 2 (n=231)	Mean	84.56	---	---	85.70
	SD	3.055	---	---	2.647
level 3 (n = 235)	Mean	81.51	---	83.59	---
	SD	2.194	---	3.012	---

*Note : 96 – 100 = Excellent; 91 – 95 = Superior; 89 – 90 = Above Average; 80 – 85 = Average; 76 – 79 = Below Average; 75 = Fair; Below 75 = Failed*

Table 2 describes the mean score of students' learning outcomes. The level 1 students displays an average performance as indicated by their weighted percentage average (WPA) (Mean = 83.84, SD = 84.59) and health assessment (Mean = 84.59, SD = 2.523). Likewise, Level 2 students have an average performance as shown by their WPA (Mean = 84.56, SD = 3.055, related learning experiences (RLE) (Mean = 83.59, SD = 3.012) and nursing care management (NCM) (Mean = 85.70, SD = 2.647) of which students perform relatively the same as compared to RLE and WPA. Lastly, level 3 students also displayed and average performance as indicated by their WPA (Mean = 81.51, SD = 2.194).

**Table 3.1**  
*Coefficients of Regression of Level 1 Students' Weighted Percentage Average*

	<i>Unstandardized Coefficients</i>	<i>Standardized Coefficients</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p-value</i>
--	--	--------------------------------------	----------	----------------

		B	Std. Error	Beta	B
(Constant)	78.34	1.10		70.85	.000
Fundamental laboratory	.39	.35	.08	1.10	.270
Attitudes of students toward schooling	-.73	.38	-.15	-1.89	.060
Cultural norms of the school	.19	.40	.04	.48	.631
Leadership	-.17	.50	-.03	-.35	.723
Social regard for learning	-.11	.52	-.02	-.22	.819
Learning environment	1.39	.73	.27	1.88	.061
<b>Diversity of learners</b>	<b>-1.25</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>-.25</b>	<b>-1.99</b>	<b>.047</b>
<b>Curriculum</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>.71</b>	<b>.56</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>.000</b>
Planning.	-.59	.60	-.12	-.98	.326
Assessment, and Reporting					
Community linkages	-.63	.47	-.14	-1.32	.185

*Note: Dependent Variable: WPA; R = .415; Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.135;  $\underline{F}$  (10,224) = 4.656; p = 0.000*

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to predict the Level 1 students' weighted percentage average (WPA) with indicators of ecology of the school and school culture as predictors is presented in Table 3.2. The regression equation is significant,  $R = .415$ , adjusted  $R^2 = 0.135$ ,  $\underline{F}$  (10,224) = 4.656;  $p = 0.000$ . The adjusted R-square indicates that approximately 13.5% of the variation of students' WPA is accounted to the set of variables in the regression equation. Further, indicators of school culture such as diversity of learners ( $p = .047$ ) and curriculum ( $p = .000$ ) significantly predict WPA. The unstandardized B coefficients indicate that increase diversity of learners could decrease the performance of students while improvement in curriculum offerings may increase the student performance.

**Table 3.2**

*Coefficients of Regression of Level 1 Students' Performance on Health Assessment*

	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	p-value
--	-----------------------------	---------------------------	---	---------

	B	Std. Error	Beta	B	
(Constant)	84.84	1.76		48.11	.000
<b>Biology laboratories</b>	<b>-1.05</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>-.26</b>	<b>-2.03</b>	<b>.045</b>
Attitudes of students toward schooling	.85	.65	.17	1.30	.195
Cultural norms of the school	.19	.54	.04	.34	.730
Leadership	-.99	.77	-.21	-1.28	.203
Social regard for learning	-.57	.73	-.15	-.78	.434
Learning environment	.77	1.11	.17	.69	.487
Diversity of learners	-1.19	.78	-.27	-1.52	.130
<b>Curriculum</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>.42</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>.045</b>
Planning, Assessing, and Reporting	-1.01	.82	-.21	-1.23	.221
Community linkages	.79	.59	.21	1.33	.185

Note: Dependent Variable: health assessment;  $R = .367$ ; Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.049$ ;  $F(= 10,101) 1.571$ ;  $p = 0.126$

Shown in Table 3.2 is the stepwise multiple regression of the health assessment performance of Level 1 students with indicators of ecology of the school and school culture as predictors. The regression equation is not significant in predicting the students' performance in health assessment,  $R = .367$ ; adjusted  $R^2 = 0.049$ ;  $F(= 10,101) 1.571$ ;  $p = 0.126$ . Only 4.9% of the variances of health assessment performance can be attributed to the set of variables in the equation as provided by the adjusted  $R^2$ . For the school ecology indicators, only the provision of physical biology laboratory ( $p = .045$ ) facilities significantly predict the performance on health assessment. The negative unstandardized coefficient denotes that further improvement of biology laboratory facilities may adversely affect the health performance of students. However, this observation must be taken with utmost caution since the measure used in the evaluation is focused on the evidence of upgrading the facilities. This would not entirely contribute to the skills needed by students in performing health assessment, an extensive instructions should be delivered articulately so that students would easily assimilate the concepts, thereby, achieving excellent academic performance. The findings does not agree with Weinstein and Mc Guffey (1979) study that as the conditions of the facility improved, achievement scores improved, stimulating

environments promoted positive attitudes in students, higher student achievement was associated with schools with better science laboratories. In the case of biology and fundamental laboratories have relatively similar lowest mean rating. The longer the student stay in the school the lowest impressions they have. It is inferred on this observation that immunity of impression will deteriorate in longer time. For the school culture indicators, only the curriculum ( $p = .045$ ) significantly predict health assessment performance. It suggests that better curriculum may improve the same learning outcome of students.

**Table 3.3**  
*Coefficients of Regression of Level 2 Students' Weighted Percentage Average*

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p-value
	B	Std. Error	Beta	B	
(Constant)	85.48	1.22		69.95	.000
<b>Community linkages</b>	<b>-.86</b>	<b>.32</b>	<b>-.17</b>	<b>-2.65</b>	<b>.008</b>
<b>Working conditions</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>.45</b>	<b>.27</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>.002</b>
<b>Biology laboratory</b>	<b>-.89</b>	<b>.39</b>	<b>-.19</b>	<b>-2.24</b>	<b>.026</b>

*Note: Dependent Variable: WPA;  $R = .243$ ; Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.047$ ;  $F(3,227) = 4.756$ ;  $p = 0.003$*

Table 3.3 shows the stepwise multiple regression of level 2 students' weighted percentage average (WPA) with indicators of school ecology and school culture as predictors. The result indicate that the regression equation is significant in predicting the students' WPA,  $R = .243$ ; adjusted  $R^2 = 0.047$ ;  $F(3,227) = 4.756$ ;  $p = 0.003$ . This also shows that 4.7% of the variation of WPA is linearly accounted to the set of predictors. A positive unstandardized coefficient denotes that improvements in the working conditions ( $p = .002$ ) increase the WPA of students while the negative unstandardized coefficients mean that more community linkages ( $p = .008$ ) and improvements in biology laboratory facilities may decrease WPA. However, the same caution as provided in Table 3.2 must be observed for biology laboratory facilities in predicting WPA. This would mean that though the teachers' efforts meaningfully linked classroom activities to real experiences in the attainment of the curricular goals and well-equipped laboratories the findings does not show that these

variables could increase the Level 2 students WPA (Weighted performance average). However, better working condition would improve the learning of the students.

**Table 3.5**

*Coefficients of Regression of Level 2 Students' Performance in Related Learning Experiences*

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p-value
	B	Std. Error	Beta	B	
Attitudes of students toward schooling	86.23 -.23	1.33 .43		64.72 -.55	.000 .582
Cultural norms of the school	-.34	.49	-.07	-.70	.483
Leadership	.27	.43	.05	.62	.533
<b>Social regard for learning</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>.51</b>	<b>.23</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>.032</b>
Learning environment	.23	.77	.04	.29	.767
Diversity of learners	-1.21	.66	-.25	-1.82	.070
Curriculum	.21	.66	.04	.32	.745
Planning, Assessment, and Report	.01	.43	.00	.03	.976
Community linkages	-.28	.42	-.06	-.66	.509

*Note: Dependent Variable: RLE; R = .202; Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.002; F (9,221) = 1.050; p = 0.401*

Stepwise multiple regression analysis on the performance of level 2 students in Related Learning Experiences (RLE) with indicators of school ecology and school culture as predictors. The regression equation is not significant in predicting RLE performance,  $R = .202$ ; adjusted  $R^2 = 0.002$ ;  $F(9,221) = 1.050$ ;  $p = 0.401$ . Based on the adjusted  $R^2$ , .2% of the RLE performance can be accounted by the predictors in the equation. Notably none of indicators of school ecology predict RLE performance. However, among the school culture indicators predict the RLE performance is the **social regard for learning** one of the instructional competence domains. This would imply that ideally teachers serve as positive and powerful role models of the value in the pursuit of different efforts to learn. The teacher's action, statements, and different types of social interactions with students exemplify this ideal would improve students' performance. This findings conformed with

the study of Fine(1991) that merely telling the students what to do , without their involvement, would compel their compliance.

**Table 3.6**  
*Coefficients of Regression of Level 3 Students' Weighted Percentage Average*

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p-value
	B	Std. Error	Beta	B	
(Constant)	81.06	.91		88.55	.000
Resource Learning Center	-.56	.38	-.14	-1.45	.146
Fundamental lab	.26	.34	.08	.76	.445
Biology lab	.22	.32	.07	.68	.496
Physical arrangement	-.09	.35	-.02	-.28	.780
Working conditions	-.42	.38	-.12	-1.08	.279
<b>Attitudes of students toward schooling</b>	<b>-.63</b>	<b>.31</b>	<b>-.17</b>	<b>-2.01</b>	<b>.045</b>
Cultural norms of the school	.25	.36	.07	.69	.491
Leadership	.47	.37	.13	1.27	.203
Social regard for learning	.20	.48	.05	.42	.671
Learning environment	.26	.63	.06	.41	.677
Diversity of learners	-.25	.54	-.06	-.47	.636
Curriculum	.72	.57	.18	1.25	.209
Planning, Assessment, and Report	-.04	.39	-.01	-.10	.918
Community linkages	-.26	.46	-.07	-.56	.572

*Note: Dependent Variable: WPA; R = .254; Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.005; F (14, 219) = 1.081; p = 0.376*

Table 3.6 displays the multiple linear regression of level 3 students' weighted percentage average (WPA) using school ecology and school culture indicators. The result shows that the regression equation do not significantly predict WPA,  $R = .254$ ; adjusted  $R^2 = 0.005$ ;  $F(14, 219) = 1.081$ ;  $p = 0.376$ . It is noted that only .5% of the variation of WPA can be accounted by the set of predictor variables in the equation. The result further reveal that among the indicators of school culture, the attitude of students toward schooling ( $p = .045$ )

significantly predict WPA denoting a negative effect to learning outcomes. Thus, showing a more evident attitude of students toward schooling tend to decrease learning outcomes.

**Table 3.7**

*Coefficient of Regression Learning Outcomes (Weighted Percentage Average)*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p-value
		B	Std. Error	Beta	B	
1	(Constant)	80.830	.772		104.652	.000
	School ecology	-.064	.296	-.012	-.217	.828
	<b>School culture</b>	<b>.861</b>	<b>.342</b>	<b>.140</b>	<b>2.517</b>	<b>.012</b>

*Note: R = .132, Adjusted R-square = .014, F = 5.124, p = .006*

The table shows that school culture marked as the significant variable yielded a p value of 0.012 as compared to school ecology with a p value of .828. This would implies that the students learning outcomes is not influenced by the ecological resources such as the Resource learning facilities , working conditions, physical arrangement and laboratories while school culture variables specifically, Instructional competence and the student attitudes strongly influenced students' performance. This findings conformed with the study of Saphier and King (1985) list from their experience twelve norms of school culture that support significant, continuous, and widespread improvements in instruction. These include norms that encourage: high expectations; experimentation; use of the knowledge bases; involvement in decision making; protection of what's important; collegiality; trust and confidence; tangible support; appreciation and recognition; caring, celebration, and humor; traditions; and honest, open communication. The degree to which these norms are strong makes a difference in the ability of school improvement activities to have a lasting, or even any, effect.

**Table 3.8**

*Coefficient of Regression Learning Outcomes (Health Assessment)*

Model	Unstandardized	Standardized	t	p-value
-------	----------------	--------------	---	---------

		Coefficients		Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	B	
1	(Constant)	-7.489	10.520		-.712	.477
	School ecology	2.988	4.036	.041	.740	.459
	School culture	16.675	4.662	.196	3.577	.000

*Note: R = .225, Adjusted R-square = .047, F = 15.317, p = .000*

The table above revealed that school culture again marked a significant predictor affecting the students learning outcomes in terms of the student Health assessment subject with a p value of 0.000 as compared to school ecology ( pvalue= .459). This would mean that Brokenshire College reached the standard physical facilities that would alleviate the student performance; however, the prevailing major issues revealed that school culture marked a significant factor that deprived the student performance. This finding is related to the ideology that School, teacher and student is a community of caring. Teachers and students need to believe they are being treated with decency and fairness by those at other levels (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Firestone & Wilson, 1991). When many of their personal and professional needs are satisfactorily met through their work environment, teachers are able to transmit to students a sense of interest and caring for their academic endeavors and their personal lives. In schools with a strong community sense, teachers feel less isolated, have more social support, and are more likely to find help from colleagues with work-related problems. Teachers can also establish and find value in attachment to students and communicate to them their belief in the importance of academic work (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988).

## **Conclusion**

The researcher hereby concludes.

1. The general implication of the mean responses regarding the ecology of the school and school culture marked as moderately evident.
2. The attitude of the students significantly influenced the learning outcomes of the nursing students.
3. Instructional competence marked a significant factors that strongly influenced the learning outcomes of students. Improvements in curriculum may increase student performance. Social regards for learning is also a significant factor that would deprived



learning outcomes. School culture marked a significant factor affecting the learning outcomes as compared to school ecology.

4. Diversity of learners, community linkages and improvements in biology facilities does not show that it could improved students performance.

### **References**

Bryk, A.S. & Driscoll, M.E. (November, 1989). The high school as community: Contextual influences, and consequences for students and teachers. University of Chicago.

Campbell. J.P.(1977). The Cutting Edge of Leadership: An overview. In J. Hunt and L.L. Larson (Eds.) Carbondal IL: Southern Illion University Press.

Colinares, Nilo E. (2005), Philippine Education in the Third Millennium: Trends, Issues, and Challenges , Concerns. Published by the 6Ns Enterprises, University of Eastern Philippines.

Conley, Bacharach, S.B., & Bauer, S. (1989). The School Work Environment and teacher career dissatisfaction, educational Administration Quarterly, 25(1), pp.58-81.

Deal, T. & Kennedy, A. (1982). Corporate cultures. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Fullan, M.G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change, 2nd Edition. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gibson, J.L. & Donnely, J.H. (1994). Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes(8<sup>th</sup> edition). Boston, MA: Irwin.

Louis, K.S. & Miles, M.B. (1990). Improving the Urban high School, New York: Teachers College Press.

Saphier, J. & King, M. (1985). Good Seeds Grow in Strong Cultures. Educational Leadership, 42(6). pp. 67-74.

Schein, E.H. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco. Jossey Bass.

Weinstein, C. & Mc Guffey, C. (1979). The physical environment of the school. A review of the research, *Review of Educational Research* . Vol. 49; 4