NVEO

Natural Volatiles & Essential Oils

Social Learning Perspectives on School Policies in A Higher Educational Institution

[1]Ariel Tinapay, [2]Shiela Tirol

[1]Cebu Roosevelt Memorial Colleges
[2]Cebu Roosevelt Memorial Colleges

Abstract

The study aims to determine the perspectives of the student manual among students, teachers and administrators in a higher educational institution. Most specifically, the main purpose of this study is to answer the following research queries: (1) What is the status of implementation of the student manual of CRMC as perceived by students, teachers and administrators in terms of academic policies, general policies, institutional support and service unit, and bases for disciplinary actions to students? (2) What are the challenges in the implementation of the student manual based on the perspectives of students, teachers, and administrators A quantitative comparative research method with qualitative analysis was used in the study. To find out the extent to which school policies and code of conduct of students were effectively enforced, a quantitative questionnaire was used based on the different features of the student manual of CRMC. A total of 372 respondents (299 students, 60 teachers and 13 administrators) answered the questionnaire The finding shows that academic policies and general policies were implemented while institutional support and service unit along with the bases for disciplinary actions to students were found less implemented areas. It was found out that the respondents having significant difference in terms of perceptions are the students and administrators as well as the teachers and administrators. The study concluded that implementation of general policies in school relates to a good implementation of the academic policies.

Keywords: implementation, student manual, academic policies, general policies, institutional support and service unit, bases for disciplinary action to students

INTRODUCTION

When a code of conduct is adopted, it must be communicated to students by a suitable issuance or publication, such as a student handbook. When pupils failed to follow the rules, they were subjected to the appropriate consequences. The school officials were given the clause of authority by CHED, which meant that instructors and administrators could execute disciplinary penalties on misbehaving children (CHED, 2008). As stated in CHED Memorandum Order No.40, s.1, the right to publish appropriate norms, rules, and regulations that may be deemed necessary for the preservation of discipline in a private higher educational institution. Section 103 of the Higher Education Act of 2008 serves as the guiding concept for private HEIs in enforcing an appropriate student code of behavior.

School rules are actively disobeyed by some kids, according to Oliver, Reschly, and Wehby (2011)'s study on violent conduct and defiance of youth. Teachers' classroom productivity is harmed by a lack of rules enforcement and student disobedience (Lee, Cornell, Gregory, and Fan, 2012; Yeung, Mooney, Barker and Dobia, 2009 A study conducted by Lai et al. (2008) revealed that the Philippines have steered a record of bullying among students, which is the most common misbehavior of students in the country (Ancho et. al, 2013). To ultimately change student's behavior, schools impose consistent and lawful disciplinary practices (Yell and Rozalski, 2008). CRMC provides each student with a copy of the school's student manual of regulations and procedures with the hopes of positively reinforcing

appropriate behavior and preventing student misbehavior; yet, student behavior remains constant, and misconduct continues to occur. Despite the presence of written references to rules and regulations in the student manual, a high rate of student misbehavior has persisted in CRMC, with the most commonly reported misconduct including (a) cyberbullying, (b) use of profane language, (c) defiance, (d) possession of prohibited electronic devices in class, (e) noisiness, (f) fighting, and (g) drunkenness (dean of students, personal communication, August 19, 2016). According to the CRMC student handbook, such behavior results in disciplinary punishments ranging from a written warning to suspension. Gaps in policy implementation among students, instructors, and administrators, may lead to a pattern of disciplinary misconduct Gaston (2015).   It is therefore critical to examine the state of the school policy's implementation in the student manual to see if the present rules and regulations are judged useful in preserving school discipline. This would reveal whether the chosen school institution, along with its administrators and other stakeholders, is employing proactive approaches and procedures found in the research literature as the best way to deal with misbehaviors. This study will evaluate students', teachers', and administrators' awareness of the school's policy as stated in the student handbook. Moreover, this topic allows the researcher to investigate how public opinion influences the implementation of disciplinary policy in a given system.

Statement of Purpose

In this study, the status on the implementation of student manual of Cebu Roosevelt Memorial Colleges (CRMC) was examined and the challenges along the process were explored. The following questions were asked:

1.What is the status on the implementation of student manual of CRMC as perceived by the students, teachers and administrators in terms of:

1.1 academic policies;

1.2 general policies;

1.3 institutional support and services; and

1.4 disciplinary actions to students?

2.What are the challenges in the implementation of the student manual based on the perspectives of:

2.1 students;

2.2 teachers; and

2.3 administrators?

METHODOLOGY

Presented in this section is an outline of the method used in the collection, presentation and analysis of data. The research design, environment, respondents, instruments and data gathering procedures were also discussed. This also covers the type of method used in this research study and the criteria used to select the methodology will be based solely on the problems and structured questions found in this research.

Design

A quantitative comparative method of research with qualitative analysis were adopted in this study wherein the quantitative data were mainly derived from the researcher-developed questionnaire to examine the perceptions of the students, teachers and administrators towards the school's existing status on the implementation of student manual among stakeholders of a higher educational system.

The quantitative comparative research design applied in this study helps to identify specifically how the different group of respondents perceive the implementation process of the student manual. This method is used to describe the similarities and differences in the perceptions of the three group of respondents to establish the cause and effect relationship among the variables. Further, qualitative method using thematic analysis was used to determine the challenges faced in the implementation of the student manual.

Environment

The study was conducted at Cebu Roosevelt Memorial Colleges (CRMC), San Vicente St., Bogo City, Cebu from February – March 2017. The school campus is divided into two sections, the high school and the college. The college is divided into four departments namely: College of Commerce, College of Teacher Education, College of Criminology and College of Computer Studies. The student manual of the college has the same features with the high school with few minor differences in terms of the grading system used and departmental PVMGO. All other features are the same with slight modifications.

Respondents

The procedures in selecting sample population of respondents were as follows: For the student respondents, random sampling was used to determine sample student size based on Krejcie and Morgan studies. Based on the student population at CRMC, 1352 comprise the total number of students. Therefore, the sample size representative of the students in this study is 299 (The Research Advisors, 2006). Krejcie and Morgan sample size calculation was used to determine student sample size. Based on $p = 0.05$, the probability of committing type I is less than 5 % or < 0.05 using Krejcie and Morgan sample size table of determining the number of samples.
Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents per college department.

Table 1
Distribution of Student Respondents Per College Department

College Department	Total number of students (N)	Respondents (n)
College of Commerce	372	82
College of Criminology	369	82
College of Teacher Education	454	100

College of Computer Studies	157	35
Total	**1,352**	**299**

Sampling Technique

Proportionate random sampling was employed to ensure representativeness of students by each college departments. From the 1352 student population, the questionnaire was fairly distributed to different departments and academic year of students. The total student respondents in this study is 299 using Krejcie and Morgan sample size calculation (The Research Advisors, 2006). The researcher chooses a 22 % random sample of the population consistent with Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination. A total of 299 student respondents composed of 82 students from the College of Commerce, 82 students from the College of Criminology, 100 students from the College of Teacher Education and 35 students from the College of Computer Studies.

Instrument

A survey questionnaire was used to gather data on the status of implementation of the student manual in a higher educational institution. The questionnaire was adopted from the individual questions constructed by the researcher based on the four features of the student manual of CRMC. The questionnaire was validated by the research adviser through content validation and has obtained high reliability score through a test-retest analysis. Pilot testing was employed in whom the researcher conducted pretest of the questionnaire distributed to 30 college students by doing reliability analysis using Alpha scale. An Alpha value of greater than 0.7 was considered as consistent and reliable. The questionnaire entitled, the status of implementation of the student manual of CRMC composed of four areas that include academic policies (Q1-Q9), general policies (Q10-Q22), institutional support and service units (Q23-Q32) and bases of disciplinary actions for students (Q33-Q44). Likert Scales of values 1 to 4 were assigned to all items anchored at (4) highly implemented; (3) implemented; (2) less implemented; and (1) not implemented. Moreover, an interview was conducted for supportive purposes to validate the respondent's perceptions on the implementation of the student manual.

Data Gathering Procedure

Data gathering was conducted in two separate phases. A written permission to conduct the study was sought first from the Dean of Graduate Studies of Education of the University of the Visayas. Further, a letter was sent to the school head for permission before the questionnaires were distributed. The approval from each deans of the different college departments also were solicited for before the actual gathering of data. The first phase involved field survey in which the researcher visits classrooms and offices to distribute questionnaires to students, teachers and administrators. The questionnaires were distributed personally by the researcher to administrator and teacher respondents of Cebu Roosevelt Memorial Colleges, Bogo City, Cebu. All teachers and administrators were asked personally to participate by soliciting their permission before letting them answer the survey questionnaire.

For the student respondents, the researcher asked assistance from the classroom instructors to facilitate in administering the questionnaires. The content of the instrument was explained carefully to the participants and assured to them that answers will be used for purpose of the study only with utmost confidentiality. From the population of 1352 college students, the researcher obtained filled questionnaires from randomly selected students from different program and academic year composed of 82 students from the College of Commerce, 82 students from the College of Criminology, 100 students from the College of Teacher Education and 35 students from the College of Computer Studies to come up with a total of 299 students as respondents. To validate respondent's perceptions and responses to the questionnaires, an interview was done for supportive purposes.

The last phase of the data collection process was a semi-structured interview conducted to ten randomly selected participants to solicit information regarding the challenges faced in the implementation of the student manual. Data transcribed from the semi-structured interviews were coded, organized thematically and presented in categories with corresponding frequencies of responses. The responses from the interview were used to provide evidence to support the obtained quantitative data.

Data Analysis

For the analysis of data, parametric statistics (mean +standard deviation) was adopted. To consolidate the responses of the participants to each question, weighted mean was applied. The highest and the lowest points of the weighted mean from the set of perceptions were determined by ranking. To come up with the general results of participants' response for each questionnaire parts, composite mean was used to get the average mean. It was used to determine the status on implementation of student manual of CRMC. To test the difference for the given variables for the three groups of respondents such as the students, the teachers and the administrators, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used. PSS version 15 was used to measure the Cronbach alpha values of the four features of school's student manual before data analysis. Factor analysis was used to conduct for 9 items of 'academic policies', 13 items of 'general policies', 10 items of 'institutional support and service units' as well as 12 items of 'bases of disciplinary actions for students' separately. Likert scale with corresponding 1 to 4 values with 1 as the lowest and 4 as the highest was used. The mean ratings were evaluated using the interval scales as follows: 3.50 – 4.0: Highly Implemented (HI); 2.50 – 3.49: Implemented (I); 1.50 – 2.49: Less Implemented (LI); 1.0 – 1.49: Not Implemented.

Data from the survey questionnaires was reduced to meaningful data. Data was organized, presented in tabular form and analyzed using descriptive qualitative analysis. Transcribed data from the semi-structured interviews were coded, organized thematically and presented in categories with corresponding frequencies of responses. The interview responses were used to provide evidence to support the obtained quantitative data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the data obtained was presented and the results analyzed and given interpretation. The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of students, teachers and administrators regarding the status on the implementation of student manual among stakeholders in a higher

educational institution. The findings from this study were organized in tables presenting student, teacher and administrator perceptions regarding implementation of student manual in terms of academic policies, general policies, institutional support and service units and, bases for disciplinary actions for students.

Status of Implementation of Student Manual in terms of Academic Policies

Table 2 shows the status of implementation of the student manual in terms of academic policies based on the perceptions of students, teachers and administrators. Some of the items in the academic policies were considered implemented while other items were found to be less implemented status as perceived by student and teacher respondents. Nevertheless, the factor means (*M= 2.71*) indicates that this area of the student manual has been implemented.

Academic policies in the student manual were implemented in terms of the admission process of the school being strict with the requirements needed for enrollment as well as the registrar's adherence to the prescribed time frame of the school for enrolment. The school refusing admission of students with undesirable records and allowing withdrawal from subjects after enrollment period as well as the maximum number of days for a student to absent subject for dropping from class to be 20 % of the prescribed number of classes has been also implemented consistently among students, teachers and administrators. However, students and teachers alike agreed with each other that students who absent or cut classes being required letter of explanation from parents/guardian was among the less implemented areas.

Table 2
Status on Implementation of the Student Manual in terms of Academic Policies based on perceptions of students, teachers and administrators.

Academic Policies	Students (M)	DE	Teachers (M)	DE	Admin (M)	*DE*	*WM*	DE
1. Admission process of the school is strict with requirements needed for enrolment.	2.65	I	2.83	I	3.38	I	2.95	I
2. The registrar adheres with the prescribed time frame of the school for enrollment.	2.67	I	2.83	I	2.69	I	2.73	I
3. The school refuses admission of students with undesirable records.	2.56	I	2.77	I	2.92	I	2.75	I
4. Withdrawal from subjects after enrollment period is allowed.	2.55	I	2.80	I	3.00	I	2.78	I
5. The maximum number of days for students to absent subject for dropping out is 20	2.51	I	2.68	I	2.92	I	2.70	I

	% of the prescribed number of classes.							
6.	Students who absent or cut classes are required letter of explanation from parents/guardian.	2.49	LI	2.28	LI	3.00	I	2.59 I
7.	Students with no exam permits are not allowed to take the examinations.	2.48	LI	2.22	LI	3.00	I	2.57 I
8.	Cellphones are not allowed during examinations Table 2 continued	2.47	LI	2.37	LI	3.31	I	2.72 I
9.	Students who cheat during exams is subjected for disciplinary action.	2.48	LI	2.43	LI	2.92	I	2.61 I
	Factor Mean	**2.54**	**I**	**2.58**	**I**	**3.02**	**I**	**2.71** I

Legend: NI- Not Implemented; LI- Less Implemented; I-Implemented; HI-Highly Implemented

Subjecting students to disciplinary actions when caught cheating during examinations was also deemed less implemented (Table 2). While students with no exam permits being not allowed to take examinations and not allowing cellphones during examinations has also been found to be less implemented. Administrators on the other hand, differ in their views regarding the implementation of those mentioned areas based on their perceptions. They have more positive assessments regarding implementation of academic policies compared to the students and the teachers.

These findings were related to the views of Katiliute 2005 on the study regarding issues of education policy implementation in Lithuania (Katiliute, 2005). Results of the study indicated that education providers such as administrators have positive attitude towards education policies while education users such as students and parents have pointed out that there exist a problem in the learning process and education policies. Such problems were identified as authoritarian learning environment, lack of student support to students with difficulties among others. The differing views among education providers and education users were thought to be caused by poor supply of information to the education users and infrequent consultations regarding issues and problems in education policy implementation (Katiliute, 2005). Therefore, the role played by school leaders such administrators have been found to be very crucial and that it would be essential to maintain consultation and communication among members of the school committee and school community (van Wyk, et al., 2014).

Status of Implementation of Student Manual in terms of General Policies

General policies in the student manual were found to be implemented as indicated in the factor mean score (*M= 2.53*) as shown on table 3 on the status of implementation of the student manual in terms of general policies based on the perceptions of students. From the results, it was found out that most items of the general policies were thought to be implemented however, there were few areas considered less implemented based on student and teacher perceptions that would be worth given attention. These areas were examined further in fewer details.

From table 3, it was found out that student and teachers perceived that all forms of bullying, discrimination and harassment being seriously dealt with and given immediate action as well as fund raising in all forms e.i. solicitations and selling of tickets being subject to the approval of the Student's Affairs Office were less implemented. Student contributions being properly accounted for by the department/organization as well as absences being highly monitored by teachers and consultation period being maximized by teachers in helping students with problems and students' participation in school activities being well monitored were among the less implemented areas. However, administrators perceived some of these matters to be implemented. Further, both students and administrators agreed that students cannot enter the school campus without the prescribed uniform/dress code while teachers differ in their perceptions (Table 3).

It was also found out that student and administrator alike would imply that proper haircut was strictly imposed while teachers do not agree to them. This differing views of teachers regarding both matters indicate that it should be given proper attention. Among the items deemed to be implemented by both the administrators and students as shown in table 3 involve wearing of identification card of another person/ improper use of identification card to be given sanction.

It was found out that among the items evaluated, both teachers and students agreed that some areas of the general policies were less implemented while other areas were deemed implemented. However, there were items in which the administrators and students agreed on some areas. These areas usually involved matters on regulations of students regarding allowing entry inside the school campus, the use of proper identification cards and imposing proper haircut. This would imply that teachers were not giving proper attention regarding those matters mentioned or the teachers may not have been very attentive to these regulations because they were not directly involved in imposing such rules in one way or another. Further, it would be give implications that these rules were not fairly and consistently imposed because of the inconsistency of the views of the different group of respondents. According to Omote, et al., 2015, failure to impose fair and consistent implementation of school policy may lead to indiscipline in the school (Omote, et al., 2015).

Table 3
Status on Implementation of the Student Manual in terms of General Policies based on the perception of students, teachers and administrators.

	General Policies	Students	DE	Teachers	DE	Admin	DE	WM	DE
1.	Students cannot enter the school campus without the	2.54	I	2.27	LI	2.92	I	2.58	I

	prescribed uniform/dress code.							
2.	Proper haircut is strictly imposed.	2.69	I	2.20	LI	2.77	I	2.55	I
3.	All forms of bullying, discrimination and harassment is seriously dealt with and given immediate action.	2.15	LI	2.23	LI	2.77	I	2.38	LI
4.	Identification card is worn at all times by students inside the school campus.	2.62	I	2.70	I	2.92	I	2.75	I
5.	Wearing identification card of another person/improper use of ID card is given sanction.	2.69	I	2.32	LI	2.69	I	2.57	I
6.	The use of bulletin board is highly regulated by the Students Affairs Office.	2.34	LI	2.43	LI	2.77	I	2.51	I
7.	Fund raising in all forms e.i. solicitations and selling of tickets is subject to the approval of the Student's Affairs Office.	2.46	LI	2.22	LI	2.46	LI	2.38	LI
8.	Student contributions are properly accounted for by the department/organization.	2.15	LI	2.02	LI	2.54	I	2.24	LI
9.	Habitual tardiness of students is seriously given proper attention.	2.23	LI	2.50	I	2.62	I	2.45	LI
10.	Absences is highly monitored by teachers.	2.54	I	2.10	LI	2.85	I	2.49	LI
11.	Consultation period is maximized by teachers in helping students with problems.	2.38	LI	2.12	LI	2.69	I	2.40	LI
12.	Students' participation in school activities is well monitored.	2.37	LI	2.45	LI	2.62	I	2.48	LI

Table 3 continued

13.	Suspension of classes is under the jurisdiction of the Student Affairs Office.	2.52	I	3.02	I	3.85	HI	3.13	I
	Factor Mean	**2.44**	**LI**	**2.35**	**LI**	**2.81**	**I**	**2.53**	**I**

Legend: NI- Not Implemented; LI- Less Implemented; I-Implemented; HI-Highly Implemented

Status on Implementation of the Student Manual in terms of Institutional Support and Service Units

Table 4 shows the status of implementation of the student manual in terms of institutional support and service units, among the items evaluated, the factor mean of 2.46 denotes a less implemented status. From the results, a consensus between students and teacher perceptions were consistent across the items examined. Students and teachers alike both agree that institutional support and service units of the student manual were less implemented in most areas while administrators had different perceptions based on their higher mean scores indicating implemented status (Table 4). However, from the weighted mean scores, most items in this area of the student manual were considered less implemented. Only two of the items of this area of the student manual had been found to be implemented based on the weighted mean scores of student, teacher and administrator perceptions (Table 4).

Among the items evaluated, institutional support and service units were implemented in terms of discipline and order in the library as being maintained allowing students to maximize study time (*M*=2.69)followed by the athletics/sports office conducting annual intramural games and trainings to develop student's potential (*M*=2.57). The guidance center accommodating students' counselling needs and continually conducting opportunities for students to manage their academic and social life through seminar and training workshops(*M*=2.48) has been less implemented. Another less implemented areas include items on matters about the school maintaining an active outreach program through its extension service units (*M*=2.46).The health services of the school as being able to look into the wellness of all school community by providing free medicines, consultations and dental treatments (*M*=2.45) was also found to be less implemented. Student organizations being optimized to encourage leadership and coordination among students (*M*=2.43) was deemed less implemented and the alumni and scholarship office supporting student graduates in looking for possible job prospects (*M*=2.41) were among the less implemented items. Student activities being regulated and supported by the student affairs office(*M*=2.40) was also found to be less implemented followed by the library having adequate number of books and references available for student access(*M*=2.40). The school registrar accommodating student's needs in terms of curriculum, record updates, information and academic support (*M*=2.35) was also believed to be less implemented.

Table 4

Status on Implementation of the Student Manual in terms of Institutional Support and Service Units based on the perceptions of students.

	Institutional Support and Service Units	Students (*M*)	DE	Teachers (*M*)	DE	Admin (*M*)	DE	*WM*	DE
1.	The school registrar accommodates students' needs in terms of curriculum, record updates, information and academic support.	2.31	LI	1.90	LI	2.85	I	2.35	LI
2.	The library has adequate number of books and references available for student access. Table 4 continued	2.00	LI	2.42	LI	2.77	I	2.40	LI
3.	Discipline and order are maintained in the library allowing students to maximize study time.	2.46	LI	2.60	I	3.00	I	2.69	I
4.	The school maintains an active outreach program through its extension service units.	2.15	LI	2.22	LI	3.00	I	2.46	LI
5.	The guidance center accommodates students counseling needs and continually conduct opportunities for students to manage their academic and social life through seminar and training workshops.	2.38	LI	2.13	LI	2.92	I	2.48	LI
6.	The health services of the school look into the wellness of all school community by providing free medicines, consultations and dental treatments.	2.46	LI	2.05	LI	2.85	I	2.45	LI
7.	Student activities are regulated and supported by the student affairs office.	2.31	LI	1.98	LI	2.92	I	2.40	LI
8.	Student organizations are optimized to encourage leadership and coordination among students.	2.38	LI	2.13	LI	2.77	LI	2.43	LI

9. The athletics/sports office conducts annual intramural games and trainings to develop students' potential.	2.65	I	2.45	LI	2.62	I	2.57	I
10. The alumni and scholarship office supports student graduates in looking for possible job prospects.	2.39	LI	2.15	LI	2.69	I	2.41	LI
Factor Mean	**2.35**	**LI**	**2.20**	**LI**	**2.84**	**I**	**2.46**	LI

Legend: NI- Not Implemented; LI- Less Implemented; I-Implemented; HI-Highly Implemented

These findings explain why discipline in CRMC became a challenge in school. Omote, et. al (2015) have pointed out as cited in the related literature of this study, that fair and consistent implementation of school policy should not be overlooked since failure to implement such leads to indiscipline in school. Structure and support in school was described by Gregory et. al (2010) as consistent enforcement of school rules. Thus, institutional support and service unit in school play essential part in enforcing discipline and order in school. A weak institutional support could lead to low morale among students making them feel deprived of good service and feel being neglected thus may result to misbehavior.

Status on Implementation of the Student Manual in terms of Bases for Disciplinary Actions for Students

From table 5, the status of implementation of the student manual in terms of disciplinary actions for students has been presented. The items on this area of the student manual were considered to be less implemented from the factor mean score of (*M=2.42*). It can be inferred that among all items assessed, both teachers and students came up with the same perceptions of some items found to be less implemented areas while administrators came out to have differing views on their implementation (Table 5).

Disciplinary actions for students were thought to be implemented in terms of matters that involved selling prohibited drugs or inducing other person to take drugs calls for expulsion at the 1st offense (*M*=2.52). Students caught drinking intoxication beverages inside the campus or going to school under the influence of liquor resulting to suspension at 1st to 4th offense (*M*=2.51) followed by another implemented area characterized by lascivious acts or indecent acts done publicly in the school premises leading to suspension at the 1st to 3rd offense (*M*=2.51) were also found to be implemented. The weighted mean scores based from the group of respondents indicate an implemented status of these three matters regarding disciplinary actions for students. However, it would be important to note that some of these items were deemed less implemented by both student and teachers as reflected on their average mean scores while administrators on the other hand, implied different perceptions indicating these areas to be implemented otherwise.

Table 5

Status on Implementation of the Student Manual in terms of Bases forDisciplinary Actions for Students based on the perceptions of students, teachers and administrators.

	Bases for Disciplinary Actions for Students	Students	DE	Teachers	DE	Admin	DE	WM	DE
1.	Tardiness is given attention by the teacher and resolved at the classroom level.	1.89	LI	2.08	LI	2.69	I	2.22	LI
2.	Absences is dealt with and resolved by the teachers from the 1st to 6th offense.	2.12	LI	2.03	LI	2.92	I	2.36	LI
3.	Bullying, Discrimination and Harassment at third offense is referred to the guidance office with the offender to be transferred to another class.	2.32	LI	1.97	LI	2.62	I	2.30	LI
4.	Cheating in examinations at 4th offense result to failing grades of students.	2.21	LI	2.22	LI	3.00	I	2.47	LI
5.	Vandalism, destruction of school property deliberately or tearing pages of books and magazines in the library result to suspension at the 1st to 3rd offense.	2.34	LI	2.43	LI	2.69	I	2.49	LI
6.	Smoking and gambling within the school campus at 1st to 3rd offense lead to suspension.	2.35	LI	2.05	LI	2.92	I	2.44	LI
	Table 5 continued								
7.	Students caught drinking intoxication beverages inside the campus or going to school under the influence of liquor are suspended at 1st to 4th offense.	2.33	LI	2.27	LI	2.92	I	2.51	I
8.	Selling prohibited drugs or inducing other person to take drugs calls for expulsion at the 1st offense.	2.04	LI	2.15	LI	3.38	I	2.52	I
9.	Lascivious acts or indecent acts done publicly in the school premises lead to suspension at the 1st to 3rd offense.	2.56	I	1.98	LI	3.00	I	2.51	I

10.	The use of defamatory or obscene language in oral or written form/rumor-mongering/verbal altercation within school premises is dealt with at the 2nd offense through suspension and dropping/exclusion at the 3rd offense and dismissal/non-readmission at the 5th offense.	2.34	LI	2.10	LI	3.00	I	2.48	LI
11.	Making false or malicious statements regarding the good name of the school and its officials is sanctioned by dropping/exclusion for 1 year at the 1st offense and dismissal at the 2nd offense.	2.38	LI	2.30	LI	2.38	I	2.35	LI
	Table 5 continued								
12.	Fighting which leads to serious physical injury except in self-defense within the school premises is sanctioned with suspension at the 1st offense and dismissal/non-readmission at the 2nd offense.	2.31	LI	2.32	LI	2.54	I	2.39	LI
	Factor Mean	**2.27**	**LI**	**2.16**	**LI**	**2.84**	**I**	**2.42**	**LI**

Legend: NI- Not Implemented; LI- Less Implemented; I-Implemented; HI-Highly Implemented

Among the less implemented status of the disciplinary actions for students were those involving vandalism, destruction of school property deliberately or tearing pages of books and magazines in the library resulting to suspension at the 1st to 3rd offense (*M*=2.49).While the use of defamatory or obscene language in oral or written form/rumor-mongering/verbal altercation within school premises being dealt with at the 2nd offense through suspension and dropping/exclusion at the 3rd offense and dismissal/non-readmission at the 5th offense(*M*=2.48).Cheating in examinations at 4th offense resulting to failing grades of students(*M*=2.47) as well as smoking and gambling within the school campus at 1st to 3rd offense leading to suspension(*M*=2.44). Fighting which leads to serious physical injury except in self-defense

within the school premises to be sanctioned with suspension at the 1st offense and dismissal/non-readmission at the 2nd offense (*M*=2.39) as well as absences being dealt with and resolved by the teachers from the 1st to 6th offense (*M*=2.36) were also considered to be less implemented. Making false or malicious statements regarding the good name of the school and its officials to be sanctioned by dropping/exclusion for 1 year at the 1st offense and dismissal at the 2nd offense (*M*=2.35) and bullying, discrimination and harassment at third offense is referred to the guidance office with the offender to be transferred to another class (*M*=2.30) were also found to be less implemented status. While tardiness to be given attention by the teacher and resolved at the classroom level (*M*=2.22) was found also to be less implemented.

This implies that the school fails to impose properly the disciplinary actions to students leading them to repeat the misbehavior. Discipline problem could occur due to inconsistency in giving proper enforcement of the necessary sanctions for the misconduct. Students who misbehave in schools should be made accountable of their actions through the provision of consequences proportionate and appropriate for them (Nevid, 2009). Based on the social cognitive theory of Albert Bandura, modelling plays important part in the way people behave. What people observed on another person's experiences had an impact on their behavior (Hergenhahn and Olson, 2005). Thus, when students observed that misbehavior was not seriously dealt with, they tend to repeat such action, becoming a vicious cycle of misconduct.

Means of the implementation of the four areas of the student manual.

The four areas of the student manual, including academic policies, general policies, institutional support and service unit as well as the bases for disciplinary action for students were shown in table 6. Among the areas perceived by the respondents, academic policies (*M*= 2.64, *St.D.*= 0.29) topped the most implemented area of the student manual of CRMC based on perceptions of students, teachers and administrators followed by general policies (*M*= 2.53, *St.D.*= 0.33) found also to be implemented. Institutional support and service unit (*M*= 2.46, *St.D.*= 0.33) was considered less implemented while the least agreed area of the student manual was the bases for disciplinary actions for students (*M*=2.42, *St.D.*= 0.36) which was found to be the least implemented area as shown in table 6.

Table 6

Means of the different areas of the student manual in terms of status of implementation.

Areas of the student manual	Mean	DE	Standard Deviation (Std. D.)
Academic Policies	2.71	I	0.29
General Policies	2.53	I	0.33
Institutional Support and Services Unit	2.46	LI	0.33
Bases for Disciplinary Actions for Students	2.42	LI	0.36

Legend: NI- Not Implemented; LI- Less Implemented; I-Implemented; HI-Highly Implemented

From this data, the challenges in the implementation of the student manual can be distinguished as those areas found to be less implemented i.e., the bases for disciplinary actions for students (*M*=2.42, *St.D*.= 0.36) being the least implemented to be the weakest area followed by institutional support and service unit (*M*= 2.46, *St.D*.= 0.33) as among the challenged area of the student manual.

Perceptions of Students, Teachers and Administrators towards the Implementation of Student Manual

The means of the different features of the student manual were compared across the three groups of respondents namely, the students, teachers, and administrators. One-way ANOVA's were computed based on the four features of the student manual separately, for the academic policies followed by general policies; then for the institutional support and service units; and finally for the bases for disciplinary actions for students. For the academic policies, the 299 participants in the student respondents had an average result of (*M* = 2.54); the 60 participants in the teacher respondents had an average of (*M* = 2.58); and the 13 participants in the administrator group had a mean of (M = 3.02) (Table 8). There was a significant difference among the perceptions of the three group of respondents, *F* (2, 24) = 16.77 *p* = .000, η^2 = 2.58 as shown on table 7. A follow-up pairwise comparison was made to determine which pair of respondents showed significant difference (Table 8).

Table 7

ANOVA Single factor: Academic policies

Respondents	Mean	F	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
students	2.54	16.77	.0000	Reject Ho	There is significant difference.
teachers	2.58				
Admin	3.02				

Table 8

Respondents / Fisher (LSD) / Analysis of the differences between the categories with a confidence interval of 95% (academic policies):

Contrast	Critical value	p-value	Interpretation
admin vs students	2.064	**< 0.0001**	Significant
admin vs teachers	2.064	**< 0.0001**	Significant
teachers vs students	2.064	0.663	Not Significant

LSD-value:0.189

Results of Fisher LSD post-hoc tests (Table 8) revealed that there were significant differences between the perceptions of the administrators and the students and also the administrators and the teachers but no significant difference between the students and the teachers.

For the general policies, table 9 showed ANOVA result showing the average of the 299 student respondents to be M= 2.44; with the mean for 60 teachers at M= 2.35; while the result for the 13 admin respondents at M = 2.81. There was also a significant difference among the perceptions of the three group of respondents, *F* (2, 36) = 10.05 *p* = .000, η^2 = 0.36 as shown on table 9 based on the perceptions of the respondents.

Table 9

ANOVA Single factor: General policies

Respondents	Mean	F	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
students	2.44	10.04643	0.000341	Reject Ho	There is
teachers	2.35				significant
Admin	2.81				difference.

Table 10

Respondents / Fisher (LSD) / Analysis of the differences between the categories with a confidence interval of 95% (general policies):

Contrast	Critical value	p-value	Interpretation
admin vs students	2.028	**0.000**	Significant
admin vs teachers	2.028	**0.002**	Significant
teachers vs students	2.028	0.427	Not Significant

LSD-value: 0.218

To determine which among the pair of groups made significant difference, LSD Post-hoc test was conducted as shown on table 10. The computed LSD value of 0.218 indicate that pairwise comparison of admin-teachers showed significant difference. The admin-teacher comparison also showed significant result while the students-teachers difference was not significant as shown in table 10.

From table 11, it was found out that there was a significant result among the perceptions of respondents on the status of implementation in terms of institutional support and service units based on ANOVA. Shown in table 11, the respondents of 299 students have an average of (M = 2.35); with the 60 teacher respondents at a mean of (*M* = 2.20) and the administrators of 13 respondents have (*M*= 2.84) average. The three group of respondents differed significantly as shown in table 8 with *F* (2, 36) = 34.38 *p* = .000, η^2 = 0.72.

Table 11

ANOVA Single factor: Institutional Support and Service Units

Respondents	Mean	F	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
students	2.35	34.38191	0.000	Reject Ho	There is
teachers	2.20				significant
Admin	2.84				difference.

Table12

Respondents / Fisher (LSD) / Analysis of the differences between the categories with a confidence interval of 95% (Institutional Support and Service Units):

Contrast	Critical value	p-value	Interpretation
admin vs students	2.052	**< 0.0001**	Significant
admin vs teachers	2.052	**< 0.0001**	Significant
teachers vs students	2.052	0.078	Not Significant

LSD-value: 0.165

Based on Fisher LSD Post-Hoc result, the LSD value for this area was computed as 0.165. The comparison between admin-teacher as well as the result for admin-teacher showed that both pairs have significant difference. The students-teachers pairwise comparison was not significant (Table 12).

The data on the perceptions of the respondents on the status of implementation in terms of bases for disciplinary actions for students was shown on table 13. From the respondents of 299 students, the average was (M = 2.27); the teachers of 60 respondents had a mean of (M =2.16) while the 13 administrators had (M = 2.84) as average (Table 13). Based on data table 13, ANOVA result showed significant difference among different groups F (2, 33) = 38.7.38 p = .000, η^2 = 0.70.

Table 13

ANOVA Single factor: Bases for Disciplinary Actions for Students

Respondents	Mean	F	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
students	2.27	38.7	0.00	Reject Ho	There is significant difference.
teachers	2.16				
Admin	2.84				

Table 14

Respondents / Fisher (LSD) / Analysis of the differences between the categories with a confidence interval of 95% (Bases for Disciplinary Actions for Students):

Contrast	Critical value	p-value	Interpretation
admin vs students	2.035	**< 0.0001**	Significant
admin vs teachers	2.035	**< 0.0001**	Significant
teachers vs students	2.035	0.202	Not Significant

LSD-value: 0.169

The LSD value based on FISHER Post-hoc test was 0.169 as shown in table 14. The pairwise mean comparison between admin-teachers showed significant result and also the admin-students difference was significant. Meanwhile, the comparison of students-teachers was not significant (Table 14).

It was found out that among the three group of respondents, students, teachers and administrators, the teachers and administrators differ in their perceptions regarding the implementation of the student manual. Consequently, the students and administrators also had different views based on their perceptions. While the students and teachers have no significant difference in terms of their responses. This was consistent across the four features of the student manual namely; academic policies, general policies, institutional support and service units and bases for disciplinary actions for students based on Post-hoc test.

CONCLUSION

Academic policies and general principles from the student manual were adopted, but institutional support and service units, as well as justifications for student disciplinary proceedings, were not. It is clear that academic and general policies are inextricably linked. The implementation of broad policies leads to excellent academic policy practice in the classroom. Institutional support and the foundations for student disciplinary proceedings are linked in the sense that institutional support and service units play a critical

role in imposing disciplinary consequences on students. The presence of adequate institutional support in schools leads to well-enforced discipline among students. As a result, indiscipline in the school under investigation is due in part to a lack of effective implementation of disciplinary procedures for pupils, as well as a lack of institutional support and service.

These two fundamental criteria are critical in ensuring that pupils retain appropriate behavior. Furthermore, in order for the school to instill right behavior in pupils, it must first be able to model good behavior by examining the structure of its institutional support and determining if the school's rules and regulations were adequately accounted for. Both environmental and personal factors influenced behavior, according to the social cognitive theory. Environmental factors are those observed by individuals in their environment, such as whether rules are implemented and misbehaviors are effectively regulated, or whether they are tolerated and misused. The climate of the school is also a factor that influences conduct. The presence of a robust institutional support and service unit in school can be used to describe a healthy school climate. Personal elements include the ability to demonstrate self-discipline, a sense of responsibility, and participation.

Hence, in order to generate a strong sense of responsibility among these stakeholders, a strong sense of involvement among students, teachers, and administrators in the implementation of the school policy in the student manual should be established. The administrators' impressions differed significantly from those of the teachers and pupils, implying that they had opposing viewpoints. The disparity between administrators' and teachers' and students' perspectives on school policy implementation suggests that there is a gap between these stakeholders; consequently, research and additional analysis into the causes of this gap would be beneficial. As a result, the study will assist stakeholders in identifying potential solutions to the school's issues in implementing school policies as outlined in the student manual.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the findings obtained in the study, the following are recommended:

1. For the administrators, the student manual is the substance of all school policies which serve as the guiding light for all stakeholders in the proper implementation of the rules and regulations of the school particularly on matters regarding discipline. Therefore, the need to continually examine and update the student manual and conduct review of its impact to its different stakeholders must be done periodically for continuous improvement and ensuring that all regulations are properly imposed and followed.

2. The school must set a committee assigned in the update and revision of the student manual annually composed of several members representing each stakeholder of the school such as the students, teachers, administrators as well as important school community members like parents, alumni and school board.

3. A quarterly meeting and conference should be scheduled to ensure that communication and dissemination of school policies are properly carried out. Such conferences would include consultations with all members of the school community such as the parents, students, teachers and school administrators so that whatever gap or challenges faced by the school in implementing school rules and regulations would be addressed and attended to immediately.

References:

Ancho, I.V., Park S. (2013). School Violence in the Philippines: A Study on Programs and Policies. *Advanced Science and Technology Letters Vol.36 (Education 2013), pp.27-31*http://dx.doi.org/10.14257/astl.2013.44.07

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. (4th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., &Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? Educational Researcher, 39(1), 59-68.

Hergenhahn, B. R. & Olson, M. H. (2005). *An Introduction to Theories of Learning*. (7th ed.)

Katiliute, E., (2005). *Issues of Education Policy Implementation: Differences in Education Stakeholders' Attitudes.*Institute of Educational Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Kaunas University of Technology, Kaunas, Lithuania.

Lai, S.H. (2008) Bullying in Middle Schools" An Asia-Pacific Regional Study. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 9, 503 –515.

Oliver, R., Reschly, D., &Wehby, J. (2011). The effects of teachers' classroom management practices on disruptive or aggressive student behavior: Asystematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 7(4).

Omote, M.J., Thinguri, R.W., Moenga, M.E. (2015). A Critical Analysis of Acts of Student Indiscipline and Management Strategies Employed by School Authorities in Public High Schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research Vol. 3* No.12 December 2015

Sideridis, G., Antoniou, F., Stamovlasis, D., & Morgan, P. (2013). The relationship between victimization at school and achievement: The cusp catastrophe model or reading performance. *Behavioral Disorders*, 38(4), 228-242.

Sideridis, G., & Morgan, P. (2013). Academic and behavioral difficulties at school: Introduction to the special issue. *Behavioral Disorders*, 38(4), 193-200.

vanWyk, C., Pelser, A.M., (2014). Leadership's Role In Effective Implementation Of School Discipline Policies. International Business & Economics Research Journal July/August 2014 Volume 13, Number 4. pp. 833-840.

Yell, M.L., &Rozalski, M. E. (2008). The impact of legislation and litigation on discipline and student behavior in the classroom. Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 52(3), 7-16.doi:10.3200/PSFL.52.3.7-16