

Factors Influencing Retention and Migration of Senior High School Students at STI West Negros University

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15567573

Mylene A. Bautista

University Registrar, STI West Negros University, Bacolod City, Philippines
<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-6801-8215>

Cyril C. Alingasa

Master in Public Administration, STI West Negros University
<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1284-7046>

Abstract:

This study aimed to determine the factors influencing the retention and migration of Senior High School students at STI West Negros University in terms of tracks and strands, financial capacity and family support, school policies and school facilities. Moreover, this study aimed to find out whether or not significant difference exist in the following areas when grouped and compared according to age, sex, average monthly family income and school category. This study made use of descriptive research design with 286 students as respondents. Results of the study shows that the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of SHS students according to the aforementioned areas revealed with "high" results. Comparative analysis revealed that there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen track and strands, financial capacity and family support according to variables. While in the area of school policies there is a significant difference in terms of age. Further, in the area of school facilities there is a significant difference in terms of age and school category. Results of this study calls for the students that they should be guided accordingly as to what they really want to pursue in their future career for there are so many selections that will best fit to their interests and skills. Admission's office must clearly explain to the students what are the different offerings available in the university, what they will learn in a specific strand, what program they could possibly enroll in college and what are the possible career they can land into after graduation. Parents should support their children in their journey in school not only financially but most importantly morally. The person's in charge such as guards in the specific area should be firm in implementing the rules, yet in a nice way.

Keywords: Student retention, student migration, senior high school

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

On the brink of its initial implementation, Senior High School (SHS) has generated the anguish among adolescents on the growing social pressures, increased academic responsibility, and a heightened desire for autonomy, and chiefly, on the facet of understanding their parents' standpoints and of choosing the school and the fitting Senior High School track and strand. The transition of students from junior high school to senior high school can be an exciting and keenly anticipated one for some students, whereas for others, this transition can be a rather challenging and an even traumatic experience (Cortez, 2018).

STI schools started to offer SHS education as of School Year 2016-2017. Problem in retention of students every end of semesters and migration to the next semesters to complete Grade 12 and eventually graduate from senior high school was observed.

As a Registrar and as a Teacher of SHS, the researcher has been motivated to identify and determine the factors influencing retention and migration of SHS students in order to gain knowledge on how SHS students view their lives in school. Having problem on the retention and migration of SHS students is not only a rare case with STI West Negros University but also with other schools who have experienced a drastic drop-out in their enrollment from first semesters to the next semesters. There has been too little information as to why these students decide to leave and it would be myopic to limit assumptions on the financial capabilities of parents to sustain senior high education of these students since the government is giving their support through the voucher program. Thus, this investigative study is initiated.

Current State of Knowledge

Understanding the factors influencing students' career choices is crucial, as these decisions significantly impact their futures. Maxwell (2018) highlights how sociodemographic factors shape the lifelong process of career decision-making, involving a sequence of occupations and life roles that influence personal development and work commitment. The Senior High School (SHS) curriculum reflects this by offering specialized tracks—Academic, Technical-Vocational-Livelihood, Sports, and Arts & Design—that align with students' interests and career goals. Research by Sadler et al. (2012) reveals gender disparities in STEM career interest during high school, with males showing greater and more stable interest in engineering fields while females tend to lose interest over time, particularly in STEM. This underlines the challenge of attracting and retaining female students in STEM careers. The SHS program aims to equip students with 21st-century skills, facilitate smooth transitions to higher education or the workforce, and align Philippine education with global standards by addressing gaps in the former 10-year system (Cortez, 2018; K-12 Philippines, 2015; Shahani, 2015).

A comparative review of SHS curricula in the Philippines, Japan, and the US shows varied systems. The Philippines has a structured model with four clear tracks and multiple strands, Japan offers academic and technical-vocational tracks, while the US system is decentralized, varying by state and school district with no fixed tracks. Despite the growing demand for skilled workers, technical-vocational education suffers stigma in the US, contributing to declining enrollment. All three countries face a shortage of qualified teachers, particularly in the Philippines where SHS is a recent implementation (Sarmiento, 2016).

Family support and financial capacity play critical roles in students' academic success. King (2017) stresses the importance of active parental involvement, although family-oriented services remain scarce. Studies by Machebe (2017), Mahuro (2016), and Vijaya (2016) affirm that engaged parents—through homework monitoring, participation in school activities, and encouragement—significantly boost student motivation and achievement. Atilano (2016) echoes this, noting that students with supportive parents tend to perform better academically, socially, and graduate on time. However, learners often face challenges such as limited resources, family indifference, or caregiving responsibilities, which impede their education (Malibong, 2017). Alpon (2014) also emphasizes parenting as the foundation for responsible and independent student behavior, advocating for increased parental involvement to reduce dropout rates.

School policies and facilities further influence student outcomes. Figlio (2018) and Danielson (2018) argue that policies must be equitable, clear, and supportive of learning, with the OECD (2016) profile of Korea's education system serving as an example of comprehensive efforts to improve equity and vocational education. Sr. Ndeto (2013) found students generally accepted school rules but recommended incorporating student-friendly disciplinary measures like counseling. Maligalig (2010) highlights that while school resources matter, socioeconomic factors more strongly affect attendance and achievement, particularly among vulnerable groups like lower-income families and working children.

Regarding facilities, research consistently shows that quality environments motivate students and enhance academic performance. Hanssen (2015) and CEEPA (2015) highlight the value of social spaces and libraries, while Osuji (2016) underscores the importance of safe, accessible, and adaptable facilities. Spatial analyses by Ligaya (2016) and Figueroa (2016) reveal disparities in school infrastructure across Philippine regions, with rural schools benefiting greatly from basic facilities and some provinces suffering from poor conditions due to natural calamities and unrest. These findings call for targeted government interventions and adequate funding to ensure equitable learning environments that meet diverse community needs (Akomolafe, 2016).

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study is anchored on B. F. Skinner's theory on Operant conditioning. This operant conditioning: "the behavior is followed by a consequence, and the nature of the consequence modifies the organisms' tendency to repeat the behavior in the future". Theories of this type always dominated the field of human behavior. It consists of references to "mental" events, as in saying that an organism learns to behave in a certain way because it "finds something pleasant" or because it "expects something to happen." The theory of B.F. Skinner was based upon the idea that learning is a function of change in overt behavior. Changes in behavior are the result of an individual's response to events (stimuli) that occur in the environment. A reinforce is anything that strengthens the desired response. It could be verbal praise, a good grade or a feeling of increased accomplishment or satisfaction. A great deal of attention was given to schedules of reinforcement (e.g. interval versus ratio) and their effects on establishing and maintaining behavior, (Culatta, 2018)

Therefore, it encouraged the researcher to conduct this study in order to respond appropriately to certain circumstances which might address the problem, thus, developing one's potential to the fullest and responding positively to the demands in the life of a student as what Skinner believed that the best way to understand behavior is to look at the causes of an action and its consequences (McLeod, 2018).

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to determine the factors influencing the retention and migration of senior high school students at STI West Negros University. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions: 1) What is the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents according to the area of tracks and strands, financial capacity and family support, school policies and school facilities; 2) What is the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration according to aforementioned variables; and 3) the significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

Methodology:

This section presents the discussion of the research methodology used, the subjects and respondents of the study, the research instruments used, the validity and reliability of the instruments, the procedure for data gathering, and the statistical tools and procedure for data analysis.

Research Design

This study aimed to identify the factors affecting retention and migration of Grade 12 students at STI West Negros University and to assess the degree of influence these factors have on actual student retention and migration. Employing a descriptive research design, which systematically describes the characteristics and factual aspects of a population or situation (Bueno, 2016; Agi, 2013), the study focused on key variables such as academic tracks and strands, financial capacity, family support, school policies, and facilities to provide a comprehensive understanding of their impact on student decisions.

Study Respondents

The study focused on the factors influencing retention and migration of senior high school students at STI WNU. The respondents of the study were the 286 selected Grade 12 SHS students enrolled for the school year mentioned. The study utilized a stratified random sampling technique to regulate a reliable representation of the students' sample per strand and to ensure reliability of respondents' selection and to avoid biases, the researcher also employed simple random through a fishbowl technique to assure that all Grade 12 per strand have equal chances of being selected as participants of the study.

Instruments

This study employed a self-made questionnaire divided into two parts: the first gathered respondents' profiles (age, sex, family income, school category), and the second consisted of 20 items assessing factors influencing retention and migration of Senior High School students at STI WNU during SY 2016-2017 to SY 2017-2018, rated on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (Very Low) to 5 (Very High). The instrument's validity was confirmed through content validation by three experts—each holding a PhD and specializing in senior high school education, curriculum, and research—who rated the questionnaire with an average score of 4.37 ("excellent"), ensuring it measured the intended variables effectively. To establish reliability, the Cronbach Alpha was calculated using responses from 30 Grade 12 students not included in the main study, yielding a high coefficient of 0.935, indicating that the instrument is highly reliable for measuring the study's objectives.

Data Gathering Procedure

As soon as the study instrument was approved, the researcher sought the permission of the SHS Principal to conduct the study. After the official permission obtained, the researcher administers the reliability testing to determine the reliability of the research instrument and after the reliability obtained, the researcher sought the assistance of some teachers in the administration of questionnaires to the respondents. The data gathered from the responses of the respondents were tallied and tabulated using the appropriate statistical tools. The raw data were transformed into numerical code guided by a coding manual. This allowed computer processing, statistical derivations and tabular presentation. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used in the computer processing of the said data.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective No. 1 used descriptive and analytical schemes and mean to determine the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen tracks and strands, financial capacity and family support, school policies and school facilities.

Objective No.2 used a descriptive-analytical scheme and mean to determine the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration according to aforementioned variables.

Objective No.3 utilized a comparative analytical scheme and the Z-test tool to determine the significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in the retention and migration of respondents when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned.

Ethical Consideration

The researchers guaranteed the respondents' choice to participate in the study, the confidentiality of the data acquired, and the nondisclosure of their names. To avoid illegal access or use, all data saved in the electronic device is disposed of whenever its use is completed. Ethical considerations in research are principles that guide your research designs and practices. Scientists and researchers must always adhere to a specific code of conduct when collecting data from people (P. Bhandari, 2022). Voluntary participation, Informed consent, confidentiality, and plagiarism will be strictly considered. Study participants will not be forced or pressured; they can withdraw at any time without giving any reason to withdraw. The study participants will be thoroughly informed about the purpose and nature of the study, including the benefits, risks, and consequences. The study participants will be assured of the confidentiality of all information relevant to their personal information or any form of identifying information relating to their person.

Results and Discussion:

This section deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered to carry out the objectives of this study. All these were made possible by following certain appropriate procedures so as to give the exact data and solution to each specific problem.

Table 1
Degree of Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of respondents in the Area of Chosen Track and Strands

<i>To what degree do the following factors influence your stay in the university?</i>	Mean	Interpretation
1. Chosen track/strand that best suit to your academic and vocational needs.	4.01	High
2. Other people's choice of your track/strand.	3.33	Moderate
3. Academic trainings.	3.72	High
4. Subject requirements.	3.77	High
5. Adviser's influence.	3.88	High
Over all mean	3.74	High

Table 1 presents the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen track and strands.

Item No. 1 "Chosen track/strand that best suit to your academic and vocational needs" got a highest mean score of 4.01 which interpreted as high, and Item No. 2 "Other people's choice of your track and strand" got the lowest mean score of 3.33 which is interpreted as moderate. The overall mean is 3.74 and interpreted as high.

It implies that chosen track and strand that best suit to the student's academic and vocational needs has a high degree of influence for them to stay in the university as stated by Maxwell, 2018 in his study entitled "Factors Influencing Students' Career Choice in Secondary Schools In Rivers State: Implication For Career Counselling", that career choice is one of many important choices students will make in determining future plans and that this decision will impact them throughout their lives. Therefore, students should be careful in making decision as to what track/strand they will enroll during Senior High School. As much as possible they will choose a track/strand that really best suited to their field of interest for them find guidance and determination to finish their study.

Table 2
Degree of Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of respondents in the Area of Financial Capacity and Family Support

<i>To what degree do the following factors influence your stay in the university?</i>	Mean	Interpretation
1. Family's financial capacity.	3.65	High

2. Family's support.	3.94	High
3. Parent's relationship status.	3.72	High
4. Parent's income.	3.57	High
5. Family's support on your extra-curricular activities.	3.69	High
Over all mean	3.71	High

Table 2 presents the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of financial capacity and family support the result revealed that the highest mean score is on Item No. 2 "Family support" with a mean score of 3.94, and the lowest mean score is 3.57 on Item No.4 "Parent's income" which is all interpreted as high. The overall mean score is 3.71 which interpreted as high'.

It implies that family's financial capacity and support contribute a high degree of influence in the retention and migration of the respondents. As what Malibong (2017) cited in her study entitled "Problems Encountered by ALS Leavers in Binalbagan, Negros Occidental: Basis for Skills Enhancement Program", that having limited financial resources; having an indifferent family member who do not interact with each other and unsupportive parents or guardians in learners' education were some common problems encountered by learners. Thus, regardless of parent's income as long as they support their children in anyways, students will definitely strive to finish their education.

Table 3
Degree of Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of respondents in the Area of School Policies

<i>To what degree do the following factors influence your stay in the university?</i>	Mean	Interpretation
1. School policy on attendance	3.79	High
2. Classroom rules	3.60	High
3. Implementation of proper dress code.	3.91	High
4. Proper procedures in dealing student's concerns.	3.73	High
5. Strict implementation of penalties for committed offenses.	3.70	High
Over all mean	3.75	High

Table 3 revealed the result on Degree of Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of Respondents in the area of School policies with the overall mean score of 3.75 which interpreted as high. "Implementation of proper dress code" got the highest mean score of 3.91 and the lowest mean score is 3.60 on Item No. 2 "Classroom rules" and this implies that teachers should give emphasis to their students about classroom rules before the start of classes and always give reminders to them about the rules to avoid issues.

For example, of classroom rules is on attendance policy. Danielson, 2018 states on attendance policies that most schools establish their attendance policies on the assumption that the students cannot learn unless they are in school. The goal of such policies is to ensure that students attend school as much as possible.

Table 4
Degree of Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of respondents in the Area of School Facilities

<i>To what degree do the following factors influence your stay in the university?</i>	Mean	Interpretation
1. Sufficiency and availability of school facilities.	3.83	High
2. Cleanliness and maintenance of classrooms.	3.91	High
3. Functionality of LCD projectors.	3.39	Moderate
4. Presence of air-conditioning units.	3.76	High
5. Sufficiency of laboratories equipment & tools.	3.62	High
Over all mean	3.70	High

Table 4 shows that Item No. 2 "Cleanliness and maintenance of classrooms" got the highest mean score of 3.91 interpreted as high whereas "Functionality of LCD projectors" got the lowest mean score of 3.39 and interpreted as moderate. The overall mean score is 3.70 which interpreted as high.

It implies that students were highly satisfied with the School facilities but were not satisfied with the malfunctioning of LCD projectors since students nowadays are more retentive not only through listening but with the use of visual presentation for them to visualize the ideas or concepts of the topic presented.

Akomolafe (2016) cited in their journal entitled "The Impact of Physical Facilities on Students' Level of Motivation and Academic Performance in Senior Secondary Schools" that there was a significant relationship between physical facilities and students level of motivation and academic performance. Based on the findings of the study, more physical, human and material resources that are of high quality should be made available in public schools to motivate students towards learning.

This is to further implies that based on how the school market during Career Orientation Seminar (COS) that the university has the state of the art facilities that is why the university able to enroll thousands of senior high school students but during their stay in the university many times that they experience on the malfunctioning of the LCD projectors and teachers were not able use it.

Table 5
Difference between the Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of Respondents in the Area of Chosen Track/Strands According to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Z-test	p-value	Sig level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	3.72	-0.926	0.355	0.05	Not significant
	Older	3.80				
Sex	Male	3.69	-1.688	0.093		Not significant
	Female	3.82				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	3.72	-0.976	0.330		Not significant
	Higher	3.81				
School Category	Public	3.69	-1.473	0.142		Not significant
	Private	3.81				

Table 5 shows the result on the Degree of Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of respondents in the Area of Chosen Track/Strands According to Variables.

"Younger and older" respondents with mean scores of 3.72 and 3.80 as shown in the table using the Z-test, computed p -value is 0.355 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "not significant". Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen track/strands according to age" is therefore accepted.

This implies that age does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen track/strands.

For "male and female" respondents the mean scores are 3.69 and 3.82 as shown in the table with the Z-test of -1.688, computed p -value is 0.093 and is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". Hence, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen track/strands according to sex" is therefore accepted.

This implies that sex does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen track/strands.

According to the level of family income, the "lower" average family monthly income has a mean score of 3.72 and the "higher" average family monthly income has a mean score of 3.81. The calculated p -value is 0.330 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". The hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen track/strands according average family monthly income" is therefore accepted.

This implies that average family monthly income does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen track/strands.

As shown in the table, with regards to the school category, the students coming from "public" schools have a mean score of 3.69 and the students coming from "private" schools have a mean score of 3.81. The calculated p -value is 0.142 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen track/strands according to school category" is therefore accepted.

This implies that students' coming from either "public or private" schools do not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of chosen track/strands.

Table 6
Difference between the Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of Respondents in the Area of Financial Capacity and Family Support According to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Z-test	p-value	Sig level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	3.72	0.361	0.718	0.05	Not significant
	Older	3.69				
Sex	Male	3.66	-1.536	0.116	0.05	Not significant
	Female	3.80				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	3.65	-2.483	0.014	0.05	Not significant
	Higher	3.90				
School Category	Public	3.70	-0.482	0.630	0.05	Not significant
	Private	3.74				

Table 6 shows the result on the Degree of Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of respondents in the Area of Financial Capacity and Family Support According to Variables.

"Younger and older" respondents with mean scores of 3.72 and 3.69 as shown in the table using the Z-test, computed p -value is 0.718 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "not significant". Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of financial capacity and family support according to age" is therefore accepted.

This implies that age does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of financial capacity and family support.

For "male and female" respondents the mean scores are 3.66 and 3.80 as shown in the table with the Z-test of -1.536, computed p -value is 0.116 and is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". Hence, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of financial capacity and family support according to sex" is therefore accepted.

This implies that sex does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of financial capacity and family support.

According to the level of family income, the "lower" average family monthly income has a mean score of 3.65 and the "higher" average family monthly income has a mean score of 3.90. The calculated p -value is 0.014 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". The hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of financial capacity and family support according average family monthly income" is therefore accepted.

This implies that average family monthly income does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of financial capacity and family support.

As shown in the table, with regards to the school category, the students coming from "public" schools have a mean score of 3.70 and the students coming from "private" schools have a mean score of 3.74. The calculated p -value is 0.630 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of financial capacity and family support according to school category" is therefore accepted.

This implies that students' coming from either "public or private" schools do not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of financial capacity and family support.

Table 7
Difference between the Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of Respondents in the Area of School Policies According to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Z-test	p-value	Sig level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	3.70	-1.987	0.048		significant
	Older	3.87				
Sex	Male	3.71	-1.089	0.277	0.05	Not significant
	Female	3.80				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	3.71	-1.492	0.137		Not significant
	Higher	3.85				
School Category	Public	3.73	-0.415	0.678		Not significant
	Private	3.77				

Table 7 shows the result on the Degree of Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of respondents in the Area of School Policies According to Variables.

"Younger and older" respondents with mean scores of 3.70 and 3.87 as shown in the table using the Z-test, computed p -value is 0.048 which is less than 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "significant". As a result, the hypothesis that states "there is a significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of school policies according to age" is thereby rejected.

This implies that age significantly affects the retention and migration of respondents in the area of school policies.

For "male and female" respondents the mean scores are 3.71 and 3.80 as shown in the table with the Z-test of -1.089, computed p -value is 0.277 and is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". Hence, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of school policies according to sex" is therefore accepted.

This implies that sex does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of school policies.

According to the level of family income, the "lower" average family monthly income has a mean score of 3.71 and the "higher" average family monthly income has a mean score of 3.85. The calculated p -value is 0.137 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". The hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of school policies according to average family monthly income" is therefore accepted.

This implies that average family monthly income does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of school policies.

As shown in the table, with regards to the school category, the students coming from "public" schools have a mean score of 3.73 and the students coming from "private" schools have a mean score of 3.77. The calculated p -value is 0.678 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of school policies according to school category" is therefore accepted.

This implies that students' coming from either "public or private" schools do not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of school policies.

Table 8
Difference between the Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of Respondents in the Area of School Facilities According to Variables

Variables	Categories	Mean	Z	p-value	Sig level	Interpretation
-----------	------------	------	---	---------	-----------	----------------

Age	Younger	3.61	-3.477	0.001	significant
	Older	3.94			
Sex	Male	3.67	-0.817	0.415	Not significant
	Female	3.74			
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	3.69	-0.311	0.756	Not significant
	Higher	3.72			
School Category	Public	3.77	1.972	0.049	significant
	Private	3.60			

Table 8 shows the result on the Degree of Influence of Factors in Retention and Migration of respondents in the Area of School Facilities According to Variables.

"Younger and older" respondents with mean scores of 3.61 and 3.94 as shown in the table using the Z-test, computed p -value is 0.001 which is less than 0.05 level of significance, interpreted as "significant". As a result, the hypothesis that states "there is a significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of school facilities according to age" is thereby rejected.

This implies that age significantly affects the retention and migration of respondents in the area of school facilities.

For "male and female" respondents the mean scores are 3.67 and 3.74 as shown in the table with the Z-test of -0.817, computed p -value is 0.415 and is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". Hence, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of school facilities according to sex" is therefore accepted.

This implies that sex does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of school facilities.

According to the level of family income, the "lower" average family monthly income has a mean score of 3.69 and the "higher" average family monthly income has a mean score of 3.72. The calculated p -value is 0.756 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "not significant". The hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of school facilities according to average family monthly income" is therefore accepted.

This implies that average family monthly income does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of school facilities.

As shown in the table, with regards to the school category, the students coming from "public" schools has a mean score of 3.77 and the students coming from "private" schools has a mean score of 3.60. The calculated p -value is 0.049 which is less than 0.05 level of significance and interpreted as "significant". Thus, the hypothesis that states "there is significant difference in the degree of influence of factors in retention and migration of respondents in the area of school facilities according to school category" is thereby rejected.

This implies that school category significantly affects the retention and migration of respondents in the area of school facilities.

This is to further implies that age and school category are significantly affects the retention and migration of respondents in the area of school facilities while the sex and average family monthly income does not significantly affect the retention and migration of respondents in the area of school facilities.

Conclusions:

The study found that most respondents were younger male students from public schools with lower family incomes. Factors influencing retention and migration of senior high school students—across tracks and strands, financial capacity and family support, school policies, and facilities—generally showed high influence, regardless of age, sex, income, or school category. However, some differences emerged: older students and those from public schools valued school facilities more, likely due to their previous experiences with less-equipped environments. While track choice, financial support, and family backing were consistently influential, school policies showed significant variation by age,

with older students more familiar and compliant with rules. Despite the availability of facilities like LCD projectors, younger female students from private schools rated their functionality lower, indicating maintenance issues. Recommendations include guiding students in career track selection, encouraging parental moral and financial support, enforcing school policies firmly and fairly (especially dress code), and improving maintenance and user orientation of school facilities to maximize their benefits and enhance student retention and satisfaction.

Acknowledgment

"Great things never came from your comfort zones" – Megan Nicole O'Neal. Reaching this far has never been easy and enjoyable journey but it's worth all the hardships. With that, let this acknowledgement be a testament of the researchers' thankfulness to all the people who helped her walked through in this journey.

References:

- Akomolafe, C. O., & Adesua, V. O. (2016). The Impact of Physical Facilities on Students ' Level of Motivation and Academic Performance in Senior Secondary Schools in South. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(4), 38–42.
- Akareem, H. S. (2016). Determinants of education quality: what makes students' perception different?, *Open Review Educational Research*, 3:1, 52-67, DOI:10.1080/23265507.2016.1155167
- Atilano, E.B. (2016). Factors Influencing the Dropout Rate in Alternative Learning System-Accreditation and Equivalency Program. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education* - October 2016 Volume 6, Issue 4
- Bayer, C. (2017). When Kids are Held Back, Gains Can Follow: New evidence on long-term effects of grade retention in third grade finds good news among the nuance. *Usable Knowledge Relevant Research for Today's Educators*. Retrieved from <https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/17/07/when-kids-are-held-back-gains-can-follow>
- Cherry, Kendra. (2018). A Closer Look at Correlational Research. Retrieved from <https://www.verywellmind.com/correlational-research-2795774>
- Cortez, C. V. (2018). Parental Perspectives, School Choices and Track Preferences of Pioneer Senior High School Students of Selected Public Secondary Schools in the First District of Ilocos Sur. *International Journal of Education Research for Higher Learning*, 24(1).
- Culatta, Richard. (2018). Operant Conditioning (B.F Skinner). Retrieved from <http://instructionaldesign.org/theories/operant-conditioning>
- Danielson, C. (2018). Enhancing Student Achievement: A Framework for School Improvement. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/102109/chapters/Policies-and-Practices-Affecting-Students.aspx>
- EREMIE, Maxwell D. & IBIFARI, Blessing (2018). Factors Influencing Students' Career Choice In Secondary Schools In Rivers State: Implication For Career Counselling. *International Journal of Innovative Education Research* 6(4):93-100, Oct.-Dec., 2018, © SEAH PUBLICATIONS, 2018. Retrieve from <http://seahipaj.org/journals-ci/dec-2018/IJIER/full/IJIER-D-12-2018.pdf>
- Figueroa, L.L., Lim, S. & Lee, J. (2016): Investigating the relationship between school facilities and academic achievements through geographically weighted regression, *Annals of GIS*, DOI: 10.1080/19475683.2016.1231717
- Figueroa, L.L., Lim, S. & Lee, J. (2016) Spatial analysis to identify disparities in Philippine public school facilities, *Regional Studies*, 3:1, 1-27, DOI: 10.1080/21681376.2015.1099465
- G.M. Mahuro & N. Hungi | Stephen Lamb (Reviewing Editor) (2016) Parental participation improves student academic achievement: A case of Iganga and Mayuge districts in Uganda, *Cogent Education*, 3:1, DOI: 10.1080/2331186X.2016.1264170
- Green, Christopher D. (First published in *Psychological Review*, 57, 193-216). Classics in the History of Psychology: Are Theories of Learning Necessary by B.F Skinner (1950). Retrieved from <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Skinner/Theories/>
- Hanssen, T. E. S., & Solvoll, G. (2015). The importance of university facilities for student satisfaction at a Norwegian University. *Facilities*, 33(13–14), 744–759. <https://doi.org/10.1108/F-11-2014-0081>
- King, G., Williams, L., & Hahn Goldberg, S. (2017, May 1). Family-oriented services in pediatric rehabilitation: a scoping review and framework to promote parent and family wellness. *Child: Care, Health and Development*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12435>
- Machebe, C H., Ezegbe, B. N., Onuoha, J. (2017). The Impact of Parental Level of Income Student's Academic Performance in High School in Japan. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 5(9): 1614-1620. <https://www.hrpub.org>
- Mcleod, S. (2018). BF Skinner: Operant Conditioning Skinner - Operant Conditioning. *Simply Psychology*, (1948), 1–10.
- Malibong, R. (2017). Problems Encountered by ALS Leavers in Binalbagan, Negros Occidental: Basis for Skills Enhancement Program. STI West Negros University, Bacolod City.



- Plamo, L. et.al. (2017). Assessment for the Preparedness of Senior High School Students under Academic Strand for College. University of Batangas, Philippines
- Sarmiento, D. H., & Orale, R. L. (2016). Senior High School Curriculum in the Philippines, USA, and Japank. *Journal Of Academic Research*, 01:3(September), 12-13.
<https://doi.org/http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1037851.1037869>
- Vijaya, R. (2016). Parental Involvement and Academic Achievement among High School Students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Review* 5(12)