

Influence of School Administrators' Leadership Styles on School Climate and Culture: A Basis for Continuous Improvement

Shyne Ancelin M. Lugagay

Student
Medina College
Philippines

Abstract:

School principals' leadership styles are pivotal in shaping school climate and culture, which influence teacher collegiality, decision-making, and overall performance. While effective leadership fosters trust, communication, and collaboration, school culture—defined by shared values, customs, and assumptions—directly affects teaching and learning. This study examined the influence of school administrators' leadership styles on school climate and culture as a basis for continuous improvement. A descriptive-correlational design was employed following Creswell (2018). The study was conducted in the Division of Ozamiz City with 30 school administrators and 533 teachers as respondents. Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire and analyzed through frequency count, percentage, mean, standard deviation, Spearman Rank-Order Correlation, and Kruskal-Wallis Test. Findings revealed that administrators demonstrated a very high extent of leadership styles (overall $M = 3.67$), with ethical leadership rated highest. School climate ($M = 3.62$) and school culture ($M = 3.65$) were also perceived at very high levels, highlighting positive decision-making processes and strong underlying assumptions. No significant relationships were found between leadership styles and either school climate ($p = 0.50$) or school culture ($p = 0.312$). However, significant differences in leadership styles were observed when grouped by educational attainment ($p = 0.005$) and length of service ($p = 0.002$). The study concludes that while administrators' leadership styles strongly align with positive perceptions of climate and culture, other factors may also influence these areas. Continuous professional development, inclusive leadership practices, and stronger community engagement are recommended to sustain and further improve school environments.

Keywords: Leadership Styles, School Climate, School Culture, Administrators, Continuous Improvement.

INTRODUCTION

Principals play an important role in shaping the overall climate and culture of a school by their leadership style. Healthy school climate is produced by effective leadership through creating trust, communication, and collaboration between teachers and staff. Leadership styles like empowerment, ethical leadership, and healing from emotional trauma support a healthy environment that enriches teacher collegiality and decision-making. Furthermore, a robust school culture defined by common values, customs, and assumptions has a direct effect on the actions and performance of students and teachers. It is important to know how school climate and culture are affected by administrators' leadership styles to ensure ongoing improvement since this will guide strategies for increasing leadership effectiveness, promoting a more diverse and vibrant learning environment, and eventually enhancing overall school performance.

Leadership styles of school administrators have a great impact on school climate and culture, which in turn affect trust, communication, and cooperation between educators and staff. Kalkan et al. (2020) highlight the fact that leadership styles immediately reflect on school culture and organizational reputation, strengthening the notion that successful leadership creates a healthy school environment. Likewise, Atasoy (2020)

emphasizes that leadership styles of principals are responsible for influencing school culture and organizational change, ultimately shaping overall school performance. Additionally, Nabella et al. (2022) identified that organizational culture and leadership, moderated by school climate, impact secondary school governance effectiveness, which supports the interdependence of these constructs. In addition, Morris et al. (2020) claim that school leadership is pivotal in the development of a positive staff culture that fosters a supportive and engaging environment that improves teamwork as well as job satisfaction. These studies cumulatively attest to the fact that grasping the interdependency between leadership styles, school climate, and culture is fundamental to creating sustained improvement and improved educational outcomes.

Early observations and interviews with school stakeholders identify gaps and lapses in how school administrators' leadership styles impact school climate and culture. A few administrators find it difficult to develop open communication, trust, and collegiality between teachers, creating a lack of collaboration and shared decision-making. Furthermore, inconsistencies in leadership styles, including integrating supportive and directive management styles, impact the overall school environment. Other schools also have weak cultural integration in which espoused values are not supported by actual practice, and disengagement is a result among staff. These gaps necessitate that greater attention be given to examining leadership styles and their direct effects on school climate and culture to formulate targeted strategies for ongoing improvement.

This research hopes to explore the impact of the leadership style of school administrators on school climate and culture, which will act as a groundwork for ongoing improvement. It particularly hopes to find out how much school administrators demonstrate different leadership qualities, including empowerment, stewardship, ethical leadership, and people-centeredness for growth. In addition, the research examines the influence of leadership styles on school climate, such as leadership behavior, open communication, and decision-making, and on school culture, including artifacts, values, and assumptions. By investigating the correlations and differences between these variables according to respondents' demographic profiles, the research hopes to offer insights into best practices in effective leadership in terms of building a favorable school climate. The results will be a basis for formulating strategies to better develop leadership styles, which eventually lead to improved school climate and culture for improved teaching and learning.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational design (Creswell, 2018) to examine the respondents' demographic profile, the leadership styles of school administrators, and the influence of school climate and culture. The design was appropriate as it described existing conditions and analyzed relationships among variables without manipulation.

Research Setting

This study was conducted in the Division of Ozamiz City, Northwestern Mindanao, chosen for its status as a progressive educational hub managing both public and private schools. The setting was appropriate as it allowed the examination of school administrators' leadership styles and their influence on school culture and climate.

Research Respondents

The study involved 30 school administrators (principals, assistant principals, and department heads) and 533 teachers from the Division of Ozamiz City. Administrators were chosen through total enumeration to assess their leadership styles, while teachers were selected through stratified random or purposive sampling to ensure demographic representation. This respondent group was appropriate as administrators shape, and teachers experience, the school's climate and culture.

Research Instrument

The study used a structured survey questionnaire to collect quantitative data on the influence of school administrators' leadership styles on school climate and culture. Part I gathered respondents' demographic profiles such as age, sex, educational attainment, and position. Part II, for administrators, assessed eight

leadership dimensions, including empowerment, stewardship, emotional healing, community building, ethical leadership, active listening, commitment to growth, and vision, using a 5-point Likert scale. Part III, for teachers, measured school climate through leadership behavior, collegiality, communication, trust, decision-making, and management style. Part IV, also for teachers, examined school culture in terms of artifacts, espoused values, and underlying assumptions. This instrument ensured comprehensive data collection from both administrators and teachers, providing a holistic view of leadership's impact on school climate and culture.

Validity of Instrument

The research instrument underwent a rigorous validation process to ensure accuracy and reliability. Content validity was established by a panel of experts in educational leadership, school administration, and research, with the Content Validity Index (CVI) set at 0.80 or higher. Face validity was tested through a pilot with non-respondent administrators and teachers, leading to revisions for clarity. Construct validity was examined using Exploratory Factor Analysis with the KMO test and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity to confirm factor appropriateness. Reliability was measured through Cronbach's alpha, with values of 0.70 or higher indicating internal consistency, and test-retest reliability using Pearson's correlation for stability. A final pilot test with 30 to 50 respondents confirmed the instrument's validity and dependability in measuring leadership styles, school climate, and culture.

Data-gathering Procedure

Data collection began with formal permission from the DepEd Division Office and school principals, followed by an orientation with school administrators to discuss the study's purpose, process, and ethical safeguards. Informed consent was secured from administrators and teachers, ensuring confidentiality, anonymity, and voluntary participation. The structured questionnaire, provided in print or electronic form, covered demographics, leadership styles, school climate, and school culture. Respondents were given ample time to complete the tool, with follow-ups made through visits, calls, or emails to ensure high response rates and clarify queries. Completed questionnaires were collected, checked for accuracy, and encoded into SPSS for statistical analysis. Descriptive and inferential methods were then applied to examine the relationship between leadership styles, school climate, and culture, with strict adherence to ethical standards.

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to the ethical standards of Bryman and Bell (2007) and the APA (2020). Informed consent was obtained from all respondents, ensuring voluntary participation, the right to withdraw at any time, and full awareness of the study's purpose, procedures, and risks. Anonymity and confidentiality were strictly observed by coding responses, presenting only aggregate data, and securing all information in password-protected files and locked storage. The principle of non-maleficence was followed by designing the questionnaire to avoid discomfort and allowing respondents to skip sensitive questions. Integrity and transparency were maintained throughout data collection, analysis, and reporting, with no deception or conflicts of interest. Finally, ethical clearance was secured from the appropriate institutional review board before data gathering.

Statistical Treatment

Frequency counts and percentages were used to describe respondents' demographic profiles. Mean and standard deviation measured the extent of leadership styles, school climate, and school culture, showing both average responses and variation. Spearman's rank-order correlation determined the relationship between leadership styles and both climate and culture. The Kruskal-Wallis test assessed differences in leadership styles across demographic groups. These methods ensured a comprehensive analysis of the impact of administrators' leadership on school climate and culture.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 - Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile	School Administrators		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Age				
20 - 30 years old	0	0	106	19.89
31 – 40 years old	14	46.67	159	29.83
41 – 50 years old	14	46.67	112	21.01
51 – 60 years old	2	6.66	114	21.39
above 60 years old	0	0	42	7.88
Total	30	100	533	100
Sex				
Male	14	46.67	281	52.72
Female	16	53.33	252	47.28
Prefer not to say	0	0	0	0
Total	30	100	533	100
Educational Attainment				
Bachelor's Degree	0	0	232	43.53
Master's Degree (units earned)	7	23.33	126	23.64
Master's Degree	14	46.67	118	22.14
Doctorate Degree (units earned)	6	20	37	6.94
Doctorate Degree	3	10	20	3.75
Others	0	0	0	0
Total	30	100	533	100

Table No. 1 shows the demographic profile of the respondents, consisting of 30 school administrators and 533 teachers, classified according to age, sex, and level of education. The examination of this demographic information offers an insight into the makeup of leadership and teaching staff of the involved schools that could have an impact on school climate and culture.

In terms of age, school administrators are predominantly within the 31–40 and 41–50 age brackets, each representing 46.67% of the group. This distribution suggests that most school leaders are in their mid-career stages, likely bringing a balance of energy and experience to their roles. Teachers, in comparison, are more highly concentrated within certain age groups, with the most highly concentrated group being 31–40 years old (29.83%), followed by 51–60 (21.39%) and then 41–50 (21.01%). Interestingly, 19.89% of teachers are quite young (20–30 years old), showing there are a considerable number of early-career teachers present in the profession. This diversity in the teacher ages can be responsible for vibrant interactions within the school setting, with older and younger teachers potentially having different values, energy levels, and receptiveness to innovation—factors potentially affecting the prevailing school climate and responsiveness to styles of leadership.

Regarding sex, the statistics present a fairly even split among both groups, though slightly heavier towards females among administrators (53.33%) and males among teachers (52.72%). This close parity indicates that gender dynamics regarding leadership and teacher collaboration could be reduced, possibly facilitating inclusive decision-making and fair treatment in the school setting.

Educationally, the distinction between administrators and teachers becomes obvious. Although none of the school administrators possess a bachelor's degree only, 43.53% of teachers possess one. A large number of school administrators possess higher degrees—46.67% have a master's degree, and 10% possess a doctorate—while among the teachers, only 22.14% and 3.75% possess master's and doctorate degrees, respectively. This gap suggests a more academic level of qualification among school leaders, which can influence their leadership style, professional expectations, and the capacity to motivate and coach teaching staff. Having graduate-educated leaders can create a culture of ongoing professional development and greater academic standards for the school, creating a positive and improvement-driven school environment.

Demographic patterns reveal that school leaders tend to be more educationally progressed and professionally experienced than the general population of teachers. Their mid-career position coupled with increased educational levels places them in a position to have significant impact on school culture. Yet, the younger and less educated teacher group might need more guidance, mentorship, and development activities. These variations highlight the need for leadership that is adaptive, supportive, and collaborative to close the experience and education gap, build positive relationships, and ultimately shape school climate and culture. In addition, the demographic data imply that any continuous improvement strategy should account for generational and qualification gaps, encourage professional development for teachers, and utilize administrators' experience and academic abilities as drivers of school-wide improvement.

Table 2.1 - Extent Do School Administrators' Exhibit Leadership Styles in Terms of Empowerment

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I encourage teachers to take initiative in decision-making.	0.51	3.76
2. I provide opportunities for teachers to develop leadership skills.	0.60	3.72
3. I delegate responsibilities and trust teachers with important tasks.	0.70	3.48
4. I empower teachers to implement innovative teaching strategies.	0.60	3.72
5. I recognize and reward teachers who demonstrate leadership and initiative.	0.73	3.68
Average Mean		3.67 Very High
<i>Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 - 3.25 "High"; 1.76 - 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 - 1.75 "Very Low"</i>		

Table 2.1 shows the level at which school administrators practiced empowerment-oriented leadership styles. The calculated average mean of 3.67, which means Very High, showed that school administrators uniformly displayed empowerment-based leadership practices. This meant that administrators allowed a work environment in which teachers were trusted, supported, and empowered to be actively involved in school decision-making and leadership development. Such an environment was likely to encourage collaboration, innovation, and professional development among the teachers and positively add to the overall school climate and culture.

In terms of particular indicators, the highest mean score of 3.76 was achieved for inspiring teachers to initiate decision-making, suggesting that administrators greatly appreciated teacher contribution and involvement in devising school practices and policies. This was followed in turn by allowing chances for developing leadership skills (3.72) and enabling teachers to adopt innovative pedagogical strategies (3.72), indicating administrators' enthusiasm for developing teachers' capacities and encouraging instruction innovation. Reward and recognition of leadership and initiative received 3.68, which means that teacher effort appreciation was good practice, stimulating motivation and morale. The lowest, but still Very High, was trusting teachers with important issues by delegating responsibilities (3.48), where there was delegation practiced but perhaps less space to increase trust and freedom in key school issues.

The results of the current study indicate that school administrators reflect an extremely high level of empowerment, especially in inspiring teachers to initiate action, offering opportunities for developing

leadership, and empowering them to act on new ideas in their teaching methods. This is consistent with those of Schermuly et al. (2022), who identified that leadership styles defined by trust, delegation, and recognition improve subordinates' psychological empowerment immensely. Both studies underscore that empowering leadership promotes initiative, autonomy, and motivation, leading to enhanced performance and job satisfaction. Although the literature identifies different levels of empowerment based on organizational culture and context (Schermuly et al., 2022), the present results indicate a uniformly high level of empowerment practice among school administrators, suggesting that the educational environment in this study might inherently support participative and trust-based leadership styles.

Table 2.2 - Extent Do School Administrators' Exhibit Leadership Styles in Terms of Stewardship

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I take responsibility for effectively managing school resources.	0.43	3.76
2. I promote a shared vision for continuous school improvement.	0.61	3.68
3. I ensure that school policies align with the best interests of all stakeholders.	0.37	3.84
4. I lead by example in fostering accountability and responsibility.	0.49	3.60
5. I make decisions that consider long-term benefits for the school.	0.66	3.72
Average Mean	3.72	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 - 3.25 "High"; 1.76 - 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 - 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.2 shows the degree of occurrence of school administrators' leadership styles in stewardship. Computed average mean of 3.72, corresponding to Very High, revealed that the administrators consistently displayed high stewardship practices in governing schools. This hinted that they actively assumed responsibility for resources, policies, and decision-making processes that favored long-term school improvement and stakeholder well-being. These kinds of practices must have enhanced trust between teachers, students, and the community, promoting a culture of accountability and collective responsibility.

Among the indicators, the top mean of 3.84 was in ensuring that school policies would be in the best interest of all stakeholders, which suggests a high level of commitment to fairness, equity, and the common good. Responsibility for managing school resources effectively was close behind with a mean of 3.76, which indicates responsible and effective use of resources for the greatest good. Decision-making with long-term outcomes in mind received 3.72, demonstrating administrators' strategic planning and long-term leadership. Encouraging a common vision for ongoing school improvement received 3.68, reflecting on the emphasis given to shared goals and direction. The lowest, but still Very High, was leading by example in establishing accountability and responsibility (3.60), indicating that modeling accountability was being practiced but that there remained opportunity to further develop exemplary leadership behavior.

The results of the current study suggest that school leaders exhibit an extremely high level of stewardship, especially in effectively managing school resources, bringing stakeholders' best interests into alignment with policies, and taking decisions with long-term advantages in view. This is consistent with Onikoyi et al. (2024), who established that school heads embracing stewardship play a vital role in enhancing student academic performance through accountability, shared vision, and effective utilization of resources. The two studies reiterate that stewardship involves a sense of deep responsibility and dedication to the common good of the school community. But while the concern of Onikoyi et al. (2024) was the effect of stewardship on student performance, the present study emphasizes its pervasive effect on maintaining a healthy school climate and culture through ethical decision-making and collective leadership.

Table 2.3 - Extent Do School Administrators' Exhibit Leadership Styles in Terms of Emotional Healing

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I provide emotional support to teachers during challenging situations.	0.60	3.72
2. I actively listen to teachers' concerns and provide guidance.	0.68	3.68

3. I show empathy when teachers experience personal or professional difficulties.	0.74	3.64
4. I foster a school environment that prioritizes emotional well-being.	0.75	3.44
5. I create support systems to help teachers cope with stress and burnout.	0.75	3.44

Average Mean **3.58 Very High**

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.3 showed the level to which school administrators practiced emotional healing leadership styles. The average mean calculated to be 3.58, or Very High, signified that the administrators consistently showed care for teachers' emotional welfare. This implied that school leaders actively nurtured their personnel in professional issues as well as personal difficulties, promoting an empathetic and caring school climate. These practices were necessary in ensuring teacher morale, minimization of stress, and facilitating a positive school climate that is conducive to teacher satisfaction as well as student learning.

Of the indicators, the highest mean value of 3.72 was for being supportive emotionally to teachers in trying moments, capturing administrators' sensitivity in moments of need. This was followed by listening attentively to problems of teachers and guiding them (3.68) and empathy while facing personal or professional challenges (3.64), both presenting a leadership style based on empathy and compassion. The lowest rankings, albeit still in the Very High category, were building a school climate that emphasizes emotional well-being (3.44) and establishing support systems to assist teachers in managing burnout and stress (3.44). These findings suggested that even though there was emotional support, there could be growth in developing more formal structures and programs to address teacher well-being in a more systemic manner.

The results of the current research show that school principals reflect an extremely high level of emotional healing, especially when it comes to providing emotional support, empathy, and actively listening to the problems of teachers. This is supported by the results of Domínguez-Escrig et al. (2021), who stressed that leaders who support emotional healing develop trust, resilience, and a positive environment that contributes to organizational learning and receptivity to innovation. Both of these studies emphasize the importance of empathy and emotional support in leadership, positing that such practices improve professional relationships and foster psychologically safe environments for development. Yet whereas the literature emphasizes emotional healing as a catalyst for radical change in an organizational context (Domínguez-Escrig et al., 2021), the current research echoes its function more as a facilitator of well-being and stress diminishment among teachers, suggesting an environment-specific usage within the school context.

Table 2.4 - Extent Do School Administrators' Exhibit Leadership Styles in Terms of Building Community

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I foster a strong sense of collaboration among teachers and staff.	0.40	3.80
2. I encourage teamwork and shared problem-solving.	0.75	3.44
3. I involve teachers, parents, and stakeholders in school decision-making.	0.59	3.76
4. I promote a culture of respect and unity within the school.	0.68	3.68
5. I organize activities that strengthen relationships among school members.	0.64	3.52

Average Mean **3.64 Very High**

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.4 shows to what extent school administrators manifested leadership styles in community building. The calculated average mean score of 3.64, which was Very High, showed that administrators demonstrated consistently building relationships and collaboration in the school climate. This implied that school leaders

had a high regard for unity, involvement, and respect for each other among teachers, staff, parents, and other constituents. These initiatives probably helped create a positive and welcoming school environment in which members collaborated towards shared objectives.

One of the indicators, with the highest mean score of 3.80, was promoting a good spirit of team collaboration among teachers and staff, indicating that teamwork was very encouraged and promoted. Close to it was engaging teachers, parents, and stakeholders in school decisions (3.76), which indicated an inclusive leadership style that recognized the input of everyone in the school community. Fostering a culture of respect and unity rated 3.68, reflecting the value of positive interpersonal relationships. Planning activities to enhance relationships received 3.52, which reflected efforts toward developing relationships above and beyond formal work interactions. The lowest rating, though still Very High, was fostering teamwork and collaborative problem-solving (3.44), suggesting that collaboration was valued but there may have been potential for further developing cooperative problem-solving efforts.

The results of the current study show that school administrators show an extremely high level of building community, especially in promoting collaboration, engaging stakeholders in decision-making, and encouraging respect and oneness. This is in line with Owan et al. (2022), which reported that leadership styles that focus on collaboration and public relations competencies significantly increase school–community partnerships and collective problem-solving. The two papers underscore the significance of inclusive leadership in enhancing within-school and external relationships, and thereby organizational cohesion. While Owan et al. (2022) focus more on the external aspect of engagement with external stakeholders in the community, the present findings put somewhat more emphasis on intraschool collaboration among teaching staff, indicating that a balance between internal and external relationship-building is necessary for long-term school improvement.

Table 2.5 - Extent Do School Administrators' Exhibit Leadership Styles in Terms of Ethical Leadership

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I demonstrate honesty and integrity in all school-related matters.	0.66	3.72
2. I make decisions based on ethical considerations.	0.40	3.80
3. I ensure transparency in all administrative processes.	0.37	3.84
4. I treat all staff members fairly and impartially.	0.43	3.76
5. I uphold and enforce ethical professional standards.	0.48	3.64
Average Mean		3.75 Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 - 3.25 "High"; 1.76 - 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 - 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.5 reports the level of school administrators' leadership styles in the aspect of ethical leadership. The calculated average mean of 3.75, which translated to Very High, highlighted that school administrators always showed ethical leadership in fulfilling their functions. This meant that they had stressed a great deal of importance on integrity, fairness, and moral responsibility, thus building confidence and credibility in the school setting. The school also obtained a high rating that implied that ethical considerations were deeply ingrained in their decision-making processes, which positively impacted the school climate and culture.

With regards to personal indicators, the highest mean score of 3.84 was drawn for maintaining transparency in every administrative procedure, which reflected that administrators were serious about open communication and accountability. It was followed by taking decisions based on moral principles (3.80), indicating that they were ethical in their leadership practices. Displaying honesty and integrity (3.72) and treating members of staff fairly and equitably (3.76) were also Very High-rated, indicating administrators' commitment to establishing fair and trust-based relations among the stakeholders at school. The lowest mean (3.64), however still Very High, was in maintaining and enforcing professional ethics standards, which suggests that administrators were compliant with professional ethics, but strengthening consistency and enforcement was still needed in some instances. Overall, all measurements indicated ethical leadership was a robust and consistent practice by school administrators that led to a positive school culture and climate.

The results of the current study show that school principals exhibit an extremely high degree of ethical leadership, especially in guaranteeing openness, decision-making based on ethical principles, and addressing employees with justice and equity. The same observation is supported by Göçen's (2021) study, where it was established that ethical leadership is cross-culturally marked by integrity, justice, openness, and follow-through with professional standards. Both studies underscore that ethical leadership promotes trust, respect, and a positive organizational culture. Nevertheless, whereas Göçen (2021) pointed out that there can be cultural variations on the perception and enactment of ethical leadership, today's findings reveal a strongly uniformed ethical leadership style among school administrators that suggests the ethical norms in the educational setting under investigation might be well internalized and consistently followed.

Table 2.6 - Extent Do School Administrators' Exhibit Leadership Styles in Terms of Active Listening

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I create an open environment for teachers to express their ideas and concerns.	0.49	3.60
2. I actively seek and value teachers' input in decision-making.	0.40	3.80
3. I provide feedback that acknowledges teachers' perspectives.	0.80	3.60
4. I address teachers' concerns in a timely and appropriate manner.	0.49	3.60
5. I encourage open discussions and dialogue to improve school operations.	0.80	3.60
Average Mean		3.64 Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 - 3.25 "High"; 1.76 - 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 - 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.6 reflects the degree to which school administrators demonstrated leadership styles in active listening. The calculated average mean value of 3.64, which was translated into Very High, signified that administrators were always engaged in careful and responsive listening techniques during their communications with teachers. This implied that school leaders appreciated open communication, cared about teachers' opinions, and created a platform where issues and ideas could be expressed without fear. Such behavior probably reinforced confidence, enhanced cooperation, and better decision-making among the school.

Of the indicators, the highest mean score of 3.80 was on seeking and valuing teachers' advice in decision-making, indicating that administrators highly valued participative leadership and consensus-oriented decision-making. Developing an open communication environment for teachers to voice their concerns and ideas, offering feedback that recognized teachers' views, responding to concerns promptly, and facilitating open discussion all rated 3.60, suggesting a uniform but equally rated level of commitment to having open lines of communication. These findings suggested that although administrators expressed excellent listening habits, there was some room to further tailor feedback and improve responses' timeliness and depth to teachers' contributions.

The study's findings indicate that school administrators exhibit a highly active extent of listening, as indicated by their capacity to foster open settings, appreciate teachers' input, offer feedback, respond to concerns promptly, and foster conversation. This affirms Merritt's (2021) contention that active listening is an important leadership capability in schools, allowing leaders to build trust, respect, and shared problem-solving. Both the current research and Merritt's research highlight that when leaders are listening actively, they not only gain valuable information but also improve teachers' feelings of belonging and participation in decision-making. Nonetheless, whereas Merritt (2021) noted the potential of active listening effectiveness to be shaped by international school settings' cultural diversity and contextual challenges, the present findings indicate a uniformly robust practice of active listening in the targeted local schools, showing that these skills are being successfully applied irrespective of contextual diversity.

Table 2.7 - Extent Do School Administrators' Exhibit Leadership Styles in Terms of Commitment to the Growth of People

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I develop strategic plans to improve the school's long-term success.	0.80	3.60
2. I communicate a clear vision for the school's future.	0.80	3.60

3.	I anticipate challenges and implement proactive solutions.	0.40	3.80
4.	I ensure that school goals align with national educational policies.	0.40	3.80
5.	I involve teachers in shaping and refining the school’s vision.	0.80	3.60
Average Mean			3.68 Very High
<i>Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”</i>			

Table 2.7 shows the degree to which school administrators showed leadership styles as commitment towards the development of people. The calculated average mean of 3.68, classified as Very High, revealed that the administrators maintained consistent dedication to the development of individual as well as institution growth. This implied that school administrators not only emphasized the attainment of short-term objectives but also made long-term strategic plans, vision-setting initiatives, and capacity-building processes to bring sustainable development in the school community. This was likely to improve teacher motivation, organizational development, and overall school performance.

Among the indicators, the highest mean values of 3.80 were obtained for expecting difficulties and taking proactive measures to overcome them and for ensuring that school objectives coincided with national education policies. These outcomes indicated administrators' proactive approach and commitment to higher educational standards. Strategic planning, articulating a shared vision, and engaging teachers in building and sharpening that vision all received a score of 3.60, reflecting an intense but slightly less concentrated effort on collective vision-building and strategic planning. This indicated that while school leaders were effective in aligning with policy and solving problems, there was room to enhance collaborative planning and collective ownership of the school's future direction.

It is evident from the current study findings that school leaders exhibit an extremely high level of commitment towards people development, especially in the areas of preparing for challenges, adopting proactive measures, aligning school objectives with national education policies, and engaging teachers in formulating the school vision. This aligns with the findings of Kareem et al. (2023), who state that transformational educational leaders motivate teachers' commitment by clearly communicating a vision, encouraging collaborative goal-setting, and actively addressing challenges. Both studies emphasize the need for visionary leadership in fostering long-term organizational success and staff engagement. Nevertheless, whereas Kareem et al. (2023) stress the emotional and motivational impact of transformational leaders in instilling commitment, current findings indicate that administrators' commitment in this context is also based on strategic planning and policy fit, as an indicator of the equilibrium between visionary inspiration and systematic organizational management.

Table 2.8 - The Extent to Which School Administrators Exhibit Leadership Styles in Terms of Foresight and Vision

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I develop strategic plans to improve the school’s long-term success.	0.80	3.60
2. I communicate a clear vision for the school’s future.	0.40	3.80
3. I anticipate challenges and implement proactive solutions.	0.40	3.80
4. I ensure that school goals align with national educational policies.	0.49	3.60
5. I involve teachers in shaping and refining the school’s vision.	0.40	3.80
Average Mean	3.72 Very High	
<i>Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”</i>		

Table 2.8 reveals the level to which school administrators had demonstrated leadership styles based on foresight and vision. The calculated average mean of 3.72, translated as Very High, showed that administrators invariably had a forward-looking attitude and a clear vision for direction for their schools. This implied that school principals were forward-looking in planning for the future, articulating school goals in alignment with general educational aims, and engaging all stakeholders in a common vision for sustainable development.

Such considerations were key to guaranteeing that the school was agile, goal-driven, and geared towards enduring prosperity.

Of the indicators, the best average scores of 3.80 emerged for expressing a clear vision for the school's future, foreseeing challenges and applying anticipatory solutions, and engaging teachers in developing and refining the school's vision. The results indicated a strong focus on participatory leadership and strategic foresight. Strategic planning to enhance school long-term effectiveness and alignment of school goals with national education policies both rated 3.60, reflecting similar but somewhat lower priority efforts in these domains. This suggested that school leaders did well to articulate and communicate their vision but had room to continue refining longer-term planning and policy alignment for continued institutional development.

School leaders in this study exhibited a very high level of foresight and vision, especially in articulating a clear vision, foreseeing problems, and engaging teachers in determining the future of the school. This aligns with Abri et al. (2023), who also stressed that foresight in the future is what can help actualize strategic leadership in institutions of learning because it allows leaders to vision the future change, organize the organizational goals around larger educational policies, and involve stakeholders directly in the development of the vision. Both the current findings and literature reinforce that proactive vision development and inclusive planning drive long-term success in institutions. Nonetheless, although Abri et al. (2023) highlight the importance of incorporating foresight into statutory strategic leadership processes, the present study indicates that this is already being done at a high degree within the schools under consideration, and this implies a high level of congruence between theory and practice here.

Table 2.9 - Summary of the Extent Do School Administrators' Exhibit Leadership Styles

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Empowerment	3.67	Very High
Stewardship	3.72	Very High
Emotional Healing	3.58	Very High
Building Community	3.64	Very High
Ethical Leadership	3.75	Very High
Active Listening	3.64	Very High
Commitment to the Growth of People	3.68	Very High
Foresight and Vision	3.72	Very High
Average Mean	3.67	Very High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.75 “Very Low”, 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”, 2.51 – 3.25 “High”, 3.26 – 4.00 “Very High”

Table 2.9 also provided the summary of the level to which school administrators demonstrated different leadership styles. The calculated total average mean of 3.67, which was interpreted as Very High, revealed that school leaders showed evidence of sound leadership practices in all the measured aspects. This implied a holistic approach to leadership, whereby administrators successfully struck a balance between empowerment, ethical decision-making, strategic vision, and interpersonal relationships to promote a positive climate and culture in the school. Such uniformly high scores suggested that leadership actions were both intentional and effective, adding to a climate of support and growth for teaching.

Of the elements, the highest average score was 3.75 in Ethical Leadership, indicating administrators' strong orientation towards integrity, fairness, and transparency in their professional behaviors. This was succeeded closely by Stewardship and Foresight and Vision (both 3.72), indicating that there was a proactive process of resource management and long-term planning. Commitment to the Growth of People (3.68) and Empowerment (3.67) indicated that leaders gave strong importance to teachers' development and participatory decision-making. The lowest, albeit still Very High, was Emotional Healing (3.58), which showed that while emotional support was given, there was still room for further developing structured efforts at teacher well-being. Overall, the results showed that school administrators had a balanced mix of leadership approaches with specific strengths in ethical governance and strategic foresight.

The current research discovered that school leaders exhibit a highly strong level of leadership in all assessed elements, with highest ratings going to ethical leadership, stewardship, and foresight and vision. This goes in line with Fischer and Sitkin's (2022) thorough evaluation of leadership styles, which highlights the multifaceted nature of strong leadership, combining ethical behavior, visionary thinking, community building, and individualized support toward improving organizational performance. Both the literature and the present results underscore that a well-balanced mix of these styles promotes trust, teamwork, and long-term progress. Though Fischer and Sitkin (2022) mention that leadership effectiveness may differ based on context and culture, the uniformly high rates in the present study indicate a homogeneously effective leadership style in the educational context under study.

Table 3.1 - Level of Influence of School Climate and Culture in Terms of Leadership Behavior

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The leadership style of our administrators positively influences my motivation.	0.46	3.74
2. Our administrators create an inclusive and supportive school environment.	0.49	3.66
3. The leadership style affects my willingness to collaborate with colleagues.	0.51	3.55
4. Our school leaders set a good example in terms of professionalism.	0.51	3.48
5. The leadership approach of administrators impacts my job satisfaction.	0.51	3.53
Average Mean		3.59 Very High
<i>Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 - 3.25 "High"; 1.76 - 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 - 1.75 "Very Low"</i>		

Table 3.1 presents the level of influence of school climate and culture in terms of leadership behavior. The computed average mean of 3.59, interpreted as *Very High*, indicated that school administrators' leadership styles had a strong positive influence on teachers' motivation, collaboration, professionalism, and job satisfaction. This suggested that leadership behavior played a crucial role in shaping a supportive and productive school environment, contributing to both teacher engagement and the overall quality of education.

Among the indicators, the highest mean score of 3.74 was for the statement that leadership style positively influenced teachers' motivation, reflecting that administrators' actions and approaches inspired staff to perform at their best. Creating an inclusive and supportive environment followed with a mean of 3.66, indicating that school leaders promoted fairness, respect, and a sense of belonging. The influence of leadership style on collaboration with colleagues scored 3.55, showing that administrators encouraged teamwork and professional cooperation. The lowest, though still *Very High*, scores were for job satisfaction (3.53) and setting a good example in professionalism (3.48), implying that while leadership positively impacted these areas, there was potential to further enhance role modeling and overall work fulfillment among teachers.

The results of the present study indicate that leadership behavior is perceived at a very high level, with administrators positively influencing teacher motivation, fostering an inclusive environment, encouraging collaboration, modeling professionalism, and enhancing job satisfaction. These findings are consistent with those of Sanchez et al. (2020), who reported a strong positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of principal leadership and their perceptions of school climate in high school settings. Both studies highlight that effective leadership behaviors—particularly those that promote inclusivity, collaboration, and professional role modeling—contribute significantly to a positive school climate. However, while Sanchez et al. (2020) focused on high school contexts, the current study encompasses a broader range of educational settings, suggesting that the positive influence of leadership behavior on school climate may be consistent across different school levels.

Table 3.2 - Level of Influence of School Climate and Culture in Terms of Teacher Collegiality

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I regularly collaborate with my colleagues in planning and decision-making.	0.52	3.52
2. A strong sense of teamwork and respect exists among teachers.	0.51	3.61
3. School leaders encourage professional collaboration among teachers.	0.50	3.42
4. Teachers support each other in improving teaching practices.	0.49	3.65
5. I feel comfortable seeking guidance from my colleagues.	0.49	3.61
Average Mean		3.56 Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 - 3.25 "High"; 1.76 - 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 - 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 3.2 presents the level of influence of school climate and culture in terms of teacher collegiality. The computed average mean of 3.56, interpreted as *Very High*, indicated that collaboration, mutual support, and professional respect among teachers were consistently evident in the school environment. This suggested that teachers worked well together, shared ideas, and relied on one another to improve teaching practices, fostering a strong professional community that positively impacted the overall school climate and culture.

Among the indicators, the highest mean score of 3.65 was for teachers supporting each other in improving teaching practices, showing that peer assistance and professional sharing were common and valued. This was followed by a strong sense of teamwork and respect (3.61) and feeling comfortable seeking guidance from colleagues (3.61), both highlighting a school culture of trust and openness. Regular collaboration in planning and decision-making scored 3.52, indicating that joint efforts were frequent but could still be strengthened. The lowest, though still *Very High*, was school leaders encouraging professional collaboration (3.42), implying that while collaboration occurred organically among teachers, there was room for administrators to play a more active role in facilitating and sustaining these collaborative efforts.

The findings indicate that teacher collegiality in the surveyed schools is very high, with teachers regularly collaborating in planning and decision-making, supporting each other in improving teaching practices, and feeling comfortable seeking guidance from colleagues. This is consistent with Heinla and Kuurme (2022), who found that a positive school culture and climate, characterized by collaboration and mutual support among teachers, significantly enhance teacher-student relationships and overall job satisfaction. Both studies emphasize that strong collegiality contributes to a more cohesive and supportive school environment. However, while Heinla and Kuurme (2022) noted that the degree of collegiality may vary depending on institutional context and leadership influence, the current study suggests a uniformly high level of teacher collaboration, indicating that the schools surveyed may have well-established practices promoting teamwork and professional collaboration.

Table 3.3 - Level of Influence of School Climate and Culture in Terms of Openness in Communication

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I feel comfortable expressing my concerns and ideas to school administrators.	0.49	3.61
2. Our administrators encourage open dialogue and active participation.	0.46	3.69
3. Important school policies and updates are communicated clearly.	0.44	3.74
4. I receive constructive feedback that helps improve my work.	0.44	3.77
5. I believe that my input is valued in school discussions.	0.51	3.42
Average Mean		3.60 Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 - 3.25 "High"; 1.76 - 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 - 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 3.3 presents the level of influence of school climate and culture in terms of openness in communication. The computed average mean of 3.60, interpreted as *Very High*, indicated that communication between school administrators and teachers was generally open, clear, and constructive. This suggested that the school environment promoted transparency, active participation, and the exchange of ideas, which are essential for building trust, fostering collaboration, and ensuring that teachers feel heard and valued.

Among the indicators, the highest mean score of 3.77 was for receiving constructive feedback that helps improve work, reflecting administrators’ commitment to guiding teachers toward professional growth. Clear communication of important policies and updates followed closely with 3.74, indicating that administrators prioritized clarity and timely information sharing. Encouraging open dialogue and active participation scored 3.69, showing that leaders created opportunities for teacher involvement in discussions. Feeling comfortable expressing concerns and ideas scored 3.61, highlighting a generally supportive environment for open expression. The lowest, though still *Very High*, was believing that one’s input is valued in school discussions (3.42), implying that while teachers could express their views, there may have been a need for greater acknowledgment and integration of their contributions into decision-making processes.

The findings of the present study indicate that school climate, particularly in terms of openness in communication, is perceived as very high, with administrators promoting open dialogue, clear communication of policies, and constructive feedback. This is consistent with Zysberg and Schwabsky (2020), who found that a positive school climate, characterized by clear communication and supportive interactions, enhances academic self-efficacy and student achievement. Both studies underscore the importance of open and transparent communication in fostering trust, collaboration, and engagement among school members. However, while Zysberg and Schwabsky (2020) emphasize the impact of school climate primarily on student outcomes, the present study highlights its influence on teachers’ perceptions and participation, suggesting that effective communication also strengthens teacher-administrator relationships and contributes to a collaborative school culture.

Table 3.4 - Level of Influence of School Climate and Culture in Terms of Trust Among School Members

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I trust the decisions made by our school administrators.	0.49	3.62
2. There is mutual trust among teachers, staff, and administrators.	0.50	3.53
3. I feel confident that leadership decisions are made fairly.	0.48	3.64
4. The school fosters an environment where trust is a priority.	0.49	3.62
5. I feel supported by my colleagues and school leaders.	0.49	3.59
Average Mean		3.60 Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”

Table 3.4 presents the level of influence of school climate and culture in terms of trust among school members. The computed average mean of 3.60, interpreted as *Very High*, indicated that a strong level of trust existed between administrators, teachers, and staff within the school community. This suggested that school leaders made fair and reliable decisions, and that relationships among members were grounded in mutual respect and confidence, contributing to a positive and collaborative work environment.

Among the indicators, the highest mean score of 3.64 was for feeling confident that leadership decisions were made fairly, reflecting trust in the objectivity and integrity of administrators’ actions. This was closely followed by trusting the decisions made by administrators (3.62) and the school fostering an environment where trust was a priority (3.62), both indicating consistent confidence in school leadership and institutional values. Feeling supported by colleagues and school leaders scored 3.59, showing that emotional and professional backing was generally present. The lowest, though still *Very High*, was mutual trust among teachers, staff, and administrators (3.53), suggesting that while trust was strong, further efforts could be made to strengthen collective confidence and unity across all school members.

The findings of the present study indicate that trust among school members is perceived at a very high level, with respondents expressing confidence in the fairness of leadership decisions and the mutual trust between teachers, staff, and administrators. This corresponds with Banwo, Khalifa, and Louis (2021), who emphasized that positive and culturally responsive school leadership fosters trust, collaboration, and supportive relationships among school stakeholders. Both studies highlight the critical role of trust in promoting a healthy school climate and culture, where members feel secure and supported in their professional roles. However, while the literature underscores the influence of cultural responsiveness and leadership sensitivity on building trust (Banwo et al., 2021), the current study primarily reflects the overall perception of trust in decision-making and collegial support without explicitly examining the role of cultural factors, suggesting that trust may be established through consistent leadership behaviors even in the absence of targeted cultural interventions.

Table 3.5 - Level of Influence of School Climate and Culture in Terms of Decision-Making Processes

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. I am involved in important decision-making processes in the school.	0.47	3.67
2. School decisions are made transparently and fairly.	0.50	3.56
3. Administrators seek teacher input before implementing major changes.	0.50	3.64
4. The decision-making process considers teachers' professional expertise.	0.50	3.60
5. I believe my contributions help shape school policies and procedures.	0.39	3.84
Average Mean	3.66 Very High	
<i>Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 - 3.25 "High"; 1.76 - 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 - 1.75 "Very Low"</i>		

Table 3.5 presents the level of influence of school climate and culture in terms of decision-making processes. The computed average mean of 3.66, interpreted as *Very High*, indicated that teachers were actively engaged in and positively impacted by the way decisions were made in the school. This suggested that administrators maintained transparent, fair, and participatory practices, ensuring that educators' voices were considered in shaping school directions, which in turn fostered a sense of ownership, commitment, and shared responsibility among staff.

Among the indicators, the highest mean score of 3.84 was for believing that one's contributions helped shape school policies and procedures, highlighting that teachers felt their input had a tangible influence on school governance. Involvement in important decision-making processes followed with 3.67, and administrators seeking teacher input before implementing major changes scored 3.64, both reflecting a strong culture of inclusiveness in planning and policy development. Considering teachers' professional expertise in the decision-making process scored 3.60, showing respect for teachers' knowledge and experience. The lowest, though still *Very High*, was transparency and fairness in decision-making (3.56), suggesting that while fairness was evident, there remained room for enhancing clarity and openness in how decisions were communicated and implemented.

The findings of this study indicate that decision-making processes in the school are highly inclusive, transparent, and considerate of teachers' professional expertise, as evidenced by the very high average mean score. Teachers reported active involvement in shaping policies and procedures, suggesting a collaborative culture where their input is valued. This aligns with Tierney (2023), who emphasized that organizational culture strongly influences decision-making, with inclusive and participatory cultures promoting transparency, fairness, and engagement among members. However, while Tierney (2023) highlights that cultural factors can sometimes constrain participatory decision-making depending on hierarchical norms and

organizational traditions, the present study shows a consistently high level of teacher involvement, suggesting that the school’s culture actively supports collaborative governance and shared responsibility.

Table 3.6 - Level of Influence of School Climate and Culture in Terms of Supportive vs. Directive Management Style

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. Our administrators provide guidance and mentorship rather than strict control.	0.50	3.56
2. Teachers are given autonomy in classroom decision-making.	0.51	3.42
3. I receive necessary support from leadership to enhance my performance.	0.49	3.65
4. Our school leaders balance authority with encouragement.	0.46	3.74
5. A supportive leadership style positively impacts my teaching.	0.40	3.80
Average Mean	3.63	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”

Table 3.6 shows the level of influence of school climate and culture in terms of Supportive vs. Directive Management Style. The computed average mean of 3.63, interpreted as Very High, indicates that school administrators’ leadership approach is perceived as more supportive than directive, fostering professional autonomy, mentorship, and encouragement among teachers.

The highest rating was observed for the indicator “A supportive leadership style positively impacts my teaching” (3.80, Very High), followed closely by “Our school leaders balance authority with encouragement” (3.74, Very High), highlighting that administrators effectively blend leadership authority with a nurturing approach. The provision of guidance and mentorship rather than strict control also scored high (3.56, Very High), reflecting a preference for developmental leadership practices. Meanwhile, the lowest score was recorded for “Teachers are given autonomy in classroom decision-making” (3.42, Very High), suggesting that while autonomy is generally granted, there remains room to enhance teacher independence in instructional matters. Overall, the findings affirm that a supportive leadership style significantly shapes a positive school climate and culture, encouraging teacher motivation and professional growth.

The findings of this study indicate that school administrators demonstrate a very high level of supportive management, providing guidance, mentorship, and autonomy to teachers while balancing authority with encouragement. This is consistent with Dickhäuser et al. (2020), who emphasized that a motivational and supportive school climate positively influences teachers’ goal orientations and engagement in instructional tasks. Both studies suggest that when administrators adopt a supportive rather than directive approach, teachers feel empowered, motivated, and better equipped to achieve professional and instructional goals. However, while Dickhäuser et al. (2020) focused on the relationship between school climate and teachers’ achievement goals, the present study specifically highlights the administrators’ role in shaping this climate through a supportive versus directive management style, demonstrating a practical application of leadership behavior within the school setting.

Table 3.7 - Summary of the Level of Influence of School Climate and Culture

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Leadership Behavior	3.59	Very High
Teacher Collegiality	3.56	Very High
Openness in Communication	3.65	Very High
Trust Among School Members	3.60	Very High
Decision-Making Processes	3.66	Very High
Supportive vs. Directive Management Style	3.63	Very high

Average Mean

3.62

Very High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.75 “Very Low”, 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”, 2.51 – 3.25 “High”, 3.26 – 4.00 “Very High”

Table 3.7 presented the summary of the level of influence of school climate and culture, which obtained an overall average mean of 3.62, interpreted as *Very High*. This indicated that the school climate and culture were perceived by respondents to be highly positive, supportive, and conducive to professional growth and collaboration. The results implied that the existing environment in the school fostered effective relationships, participatory practices, and trust among members of the school community, reflecting a leadership approach that successfully promoted a productive and harmonious workplace.

Among the components, Decision-Making Processes registered the highest mean score of 3.66 (*Very High*), which suggested that administrators were perceived to have consistently involved teachers in important school decisions, ensuring fairness and transparency. This was closely followed by Openness in Communication (3.65), implying that communication channels in the school encouraged the free exchange of ideas and constructive feedback. Supportive vs. Directive Management Style (3.63) and Trust Among School Members (3.60) both indicated that leaders balanced authority with encouragement, resulting in mutual respect and confidence in leadership decisions. Leadership Behavior (3.59) also ranked high, suggesting that administrators’ actions positively influenced motivation and professionalism among teachers. The lowest-rated, though still “Very High,” was Teacher Collegiality (3.56), which implied that while collaboration was strong, there remained opportunities to further enhance teamwork and shared professional practices among educators.

The findings of the present study indicate that school climate and culture are perceived at a very high level across all components, including leadership behavior, teacher collegiality, openness in communication, trust among school members, decision-making processes, and supportive versus directive management style. This is consistent with Zysberg and Schwabsky (2020), who found that positive school climate—characterized by strong leadership, collaborative teacher relationships, and open communication—enhances students’ academic self-efficacy and overall achievement. Both studies highlight the critical role of leadership and collegial interactions in fostering a supportive and productive school environment. However, while Zysberg and Schwabsky (2020) focus primarily on the direct impact of school climate on student outcomes, the current study emphasizes the perceptions of administrators and teachers regarding the influence of leadership and cultural factors on the school environment, suggesting that high-quality leadership practices are instrumental in shaping both climate and culture.

Table 4.1 - Level of Influence of School Culture in Terms of Artifacts

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The physical environment of the school reflects its values and mission.	0.51	3.42
2. School traditions and ceremonies contribute to a sense of identity.	0.50	3.60
3. Displays, symbols, and slogans promote the school’s culture.	0.49	3.62
4. The dress code and behavioral norms align with school values.	0.44	3.77
5. The school’s facilities enhance the learning environment.	0.49	3.65
Average Mean		3.61 Very High
<i>Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”</i>		

Table 4.1 showed the level of influence of school culture in terms of artifacts, with an overall average mean of 3.61, interpreted as *Very High*. This suggested that tangible elements of the school—such as its physical environment, traditions, symbols, and facilities—strongly reflected and reinforced the institution’s values, mission, and identity. The results implied that the visible manifestations of school culture played a significant role in fostering pride, belongingness, and a supportive atmosphere conducive to both teaching and learning.

Among the indicators, the highest-rated was the alignment of the dress code and behavioral norms with school values (mean = 3.77), which implied that established expectations for appearance and conduct strongly reinforced the desired school culture. This was followed by school facilities enhancing the learning environment (3.65) and displays, symbols, and slogans promoting the school's culture (3.62), indicating that the school made deliberate efforts to create a visually inspiring and functional setting that supported academic and social development. School traditions and ceremonies contributing to a sense of identity (3.60) highlighted the importance of shared rituals in building community spirit. The lowest mean, though still "Very High," was the physical environment reflecting the school's values and mission (3.42), suggesting that while the school environment was aligned with its mission, there might be room for improvement in fully showcasing these values through physical design and aesthetics.

The findings of the present study indicate that school culture, particularly in terms of artifacts, is perceived to have a very high influence, as seen in the alignment of the physical environment, traditions, symbols, and facilities with the school's values and mission. This supports the conclusions of Plaku and Leka (2025), who emphasize that school leaders play a critical role in shaping culture by modeling values, establishing norms, and designing environments that reinforce shared beliefs. Both studies highlight that tangible manifestations of culture, such as symbols, dress codes, and facilities, serve as powerful tools for conveying and sustaining the school's mission. However, while Plaku and Leka (2025) discuss the role of leaders across diverse educational contexts and suggest that leadership effectiveness can vary depending on external and organizational factors, the current study presents consistently very high influence of artifacts, suggesting that the administrators in the sampled schools actively and effectively integrate cultural symbols into everyday practices.

Table 4.2 - Level of Influence of School Culture in Terms of Espoused Values

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The school's values are consistently reflected in daily practices.	0.70	3.48
2. Ethical and moral values are emphasized in school policies.	0.73	3.68
3. The school fosters a culture of respect and responsibility.	0.49	3.60
4. Teachers and administrators uphold shared beliefs and principles.	0.43	3.76
5. The school's vision and mission statements guide operations.	0.68	3.68
Average Mean		3.64 Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 - 3.25 "High"; 1.76 - 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 - 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 4.2 presents the level of influence of school culture in terms of espoused values, yielding an average mean of 3.64, interpreted as *Very High*. This indicated that the school community demonstrated strong alignment between its stated beliefs, mission, and actual practices. The findings implied that the institution's core values were not only articulated but also embedded into policies, behaviors, and everyday routines, thereby fostering a consistent and principled educational environment.

Among the indicators, the highest-rated was teachers and administrators upholding shared beliefs and principles (mean = 3.76), suggesting a strong collective commitment to the school's core philosophy. Ethical and moral values emphasized in school policies and the school's vision and mission guiding operations both received high ratings (3.68), reflecting deliberate efforts to integrate values into governance and decision-making. The promotion of a culture of respect and responsibility (3.60) underscored the importance placed on interpersonal conduct and accountability. Meanwhile, the lowest but still *Very High* rating was the school's values being consistently reflected in daily practices (3.48), which implied that while values were generally present in routine activities, there was room to further ensure that all day-to-day actions fully mirrored the school's stated principles.

The findings of this study indicate that espoused values in the school are strongly manifested in daily practices, ethical policies, respect and responsibility, adherence to shared beliefs, and guidance by the school's vision and mission, resulting in a very high overall influence on school culture. This is consistent with Newton

(2024), who emphasizes that schools with clearly articulated values foster a cohesive culture where ethical principles and shared beliefs guide behavior, decision-making, and interactions within the school community. Both the study and the literature highlight that the consistent enactment of school values strengthens the organizational culture and promotes a positive environment for teachers and students. However, while Newton (2024) discusses the theoretical foundations of values education and its long-term impact on personal and social development, the current study provides empirical evidence of the practical application of espoused values in influencing school culture within a specific educational setting.

Table 4.3 - Level of Influence of School Culture in Terms of Underlying Assumptions

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The school culture promotes innovation and continuous learning.	0.59	3.76
2. Implicit beliefs shape teacher-student interactions.	0.64	3.52
3. A shared understanding of expectations exists among staff.	0.40	3.80
4. Deep-rooted traditions influence school operations.	0.43	3.76
5. Decision-making is aligned with the school’s long-standing values.	0.80	3.60
Average Mean		3.69 Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 “Very High”; 2.51 – 3.25 “High”; 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”; 1.00 – 1.75 “Very Low”

Table 4.3 showed the level of influence of school culture in terms of underlying assumptions, resulting in an average mean of 3.69, interpreted as *Very High*. This meant that deeply ingrained beliefs, norms, and traditions strongly shaped the way the school functioned. These core assumptions provided a stable foundation for policies, behaviors, and decision-making, reinforcing the school’s identity and promoting a consistent environment for both teaching and learning.

In terms of specific indicators, the highest-rated was a shared understanding of expectations among staff (mean = 3.80), suggesting clear and unified workplace norms that supported collaboration and consistency. School culture promoting innovation and continuous learning and deep-rooted traditions influencing operations both rated highly (3.76), indicating a balance between preserving valuable traditions and encouraging growth. Decision-making aligned with the school’s long-standing values (3.60) reflected a strong link between past and present in leadership approaches. The lowest, though still *Very High*, was implicit beliefs shaping teacher-student interactions (3.52), implying that while underlying values influenced relationships, there might be opportunities to make these guiding beliefs more explicit to further strengthen mutual understanding.

The findings of the study indicate that underlying assumptions within the school culture are rated very high, reflecting a strong promotion of innovation, shared understanding among staff, and alignment of decision-making with long-standing values. This is consistent with Daries (2021), who emphasizes that principals play a critical role in cultivating a positive school culture by fostering shared beliefs, values, and traditions that guide interactions and decision-making processes. Both the study and the literature highlight that implicit beliefs and deep-rooted practices shape daily operations and teacher-student relationships. However, while Daries (2021) suggests that principals’ proactive interventions are necessary to develop and sustain a positive culture, the current study shows that such underlying assumptions are already well established among the staff, indicating that the school in this context maintains a consistently supportive and innovation-oriented environment.

Table 4.4 - Summary of the Level of Influence of School Culture

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Artifacts	3.61	Very High
Espoused Values	3.64	Very High
Underlying Assumptions	3.69	Very High

Average Mean	3.65	Very High
<i>Scale: 1.0 – 1.75 “Very Low”, 1.76 – 2.50 “Low”, 2.51 – 3.25 “High”, 3.26 – 4.00 “Very High”</i>		

Table 4.4 presents the summary of the level of influence of school culture, yielding an average mean of 3.65, interpreted as Very High. This indicated that the three key components of school culture—artifacts, espoused values, and underlying assumptions—were all strongly present and influential within the school community. The results implied that visible expressions of culture, shared beliefs, and deeply rooted traditions collectively shaped the school’s identity, guided behavior, and fostered an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning.

Among the components, underlying assumptions obtained the highest mean (3.69), showing that core, often unspoken beliefs and traditions were the strongest influence on school operations and interactions. Espoused values followed closely (3.64), highlighting that shared principles and clearly stated goals were consistently upheld. Artifacts (3.61) also scored Very High, reflecting the significance of the school’s physical environment, symbols, and traditions in representing its culture. The close range of these scores suggested a well-balanced cultural framework, where visible elements, stated values, and deeply ingrained assumptions reinforced one another to create a cohesive and stable school climate.

The findings of the present study indicate that school culture is highly influential, with very high ratings across artifacts, espoused values, and underlying assumptions, suggesting a strong alignment between visible practices, declared principles, and shared beliefs within the school. This is consistent with Anwar et al. (2023), who found that a positive school culture, characterized by clear values, shared norms, and supportive practices, significantly impacts school quality and staff motivation. Both studies underscore the importance of a cohesive culture in fostering an environment conducive to professional growth and effective organizational performance. However, while Anwar et al. (2023) focused on vocational schools and highlighted the interaction between culture and work motivation, the current study emphasizes the direct influence of school culture on the overall school environment, including climate and leadership dynamics, suggesting that cultural alignment alone can strongly shape the educational setting.

Table 5 - Test of Significant Relationship Between School Administrators' Leadership styles and School Climate Culture

Test Variables	Correlation Coefficient	P value	Decision
School Administrators' Leadership styles and School Climate Culture	-0.141	0.50	retain the H ₀

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant relationship

Table 5 reveals that the correlation coefficient between school administrators' leadership styles and school climate culture is -0.141 with a p-value of 0.50. This indicates a very weak negative relationship between the two variables. Since the p-value is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis (H₀) is retained. This means that there is no statistically significant relationship between the leadership styles of school administrators and the prevailing school climate culture in the study area.

The absence of a significant relationship suggests that changes in school administrators’ leadership styles may not directly influence the school climate culture, at least within the context of the respondents involved in this study. This could imply that other factors—such as teachers’ professional practices, students’ behavior, community involvement, or institutional policies—might play a stronger role in shaping the overall school climate. For school improvement initiatives, it may be necessary to adopt a more holistic approach that considers multiple aspects of the educational environment rather than relying solely on leadership style adjustments

The study found no significant relationship between school administrators' leadership styles and school climate culture ($p = 0.50$), indicating that variations in leadership approaches did not directly correspond to perceived changes in school climate among respondents. In contrast, Veletić, Price, and Olsen (2023) reported that principals' leadership styles significantly influence school climate, with transformational and participative leadership positively affecting teacher perceptions of organizational quality. While both studies recognize the role of leadership in shaping the school environment, the current study suggests that other factors—such as institutional policies, teacher collaboration, or external community influences—may play a more dominant role in determining school climate within the context examined. This divergence may also reflect contextual differences, as the literature often aggregates data across multiple school types and regions, whereas the current study focuses on a specific local setting.

Table 6 - Test of Significant Relationship in School Administrators' Leadership Styles and School Culture

Test Variables	Correlation Coefficient	P value	Decision
School Administrators' Leadership Styles and School Culture	0.097	0.312	retain the H_0

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant relationship

Table 6 shows that the correlation coefficient between school administrators' leadership styles and school culture is 0.097, with a p-value of 0.312. Since the p-value is greater than the 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis (H_0) is retained. This indicates that there is no statistically significant relationship between the leadership styles of school administrators and the prevailing school culture. The weak positive correlation further suggests that variations in leadership styles have minimal association with changes in the school culture within the context of this study.

The absence of a significant relationship implies that leadership styles alone may not be a strong determinant of school culture in the participating schools. Other factors—such as teachers' collaborative practices, community involvement, institutional policies, or resource availability—could have a greater influence on shaping school culture. This finding highlights the need for school leaders to adopt a more holistic approach, integrating leadership strategies with broader organizational and community efforts to positively influence and sustain a healthy school culture.

The findings of the present study indicate no significant relationship between school administrators' leadership styles and school culture ($p = 0.312$), suggesting that variations in leadership practices do not directly correspond to differences in the perceived school culture. In contrast, Liu, Bellibaş, and Gümüş (2020) found that both instructional and distributed leadership significantly influence teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction through the mediating effects of supportive school culture and teacher collaboration. While the literature emphasizes that effective leadership can actively shape and enhance school culture, the current study's findings suggest that, in this specific context, other factors—such as established school policies, teacher dynamics, or external community influences—may play a stronger role in shaping the school culture, potentially limiting the direct impact of leadership styles alone.

Table 7 - Test of Significant Relationship in School Administrators' Leadership Styles and Demographic Profile

Kruskal Wallis Test	P value	Decision
School Administrators' Leadership Styles Vs. Age	0.124	retain the H_0
School Administrators' Leadership Styles Vs. Educational Attainment	0.005	reject the H_0
School Administrators' Leadership Styles Vs. Length of Service	0.002	reject the H_0

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant difference

Table 7 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test examining the relationship between school administrators' leadership styles and their demographic profile. The findings reveal that age has no significant relationship with leadership styles, as indicated by the p-value of 0.124, which is above the 0.05 threshold, leading to the retention of the null hypothesis. However, educational attainment ($p = 0.005$) and length of service ($p = 0.002$) show statistically significant differences, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis for these variables. This suggests that variations in leadership styles are influenced by administrators' levels of education and years of professional experience, but not by their age.

The significant differences based on educational attainment and length of service imply that advanced academic preparation and accumulated professional experience may contribute to shaping more developed or varied leadership approaches. School systems may therefore benefit from supporting continuous professional development and promoting higher education among administrators to enhance leadership effectiveness. Meanwhile, the absence of a significant difference by age suggests that maturity alone does not dictate leadership style—rather, it is the combination of formal learning and experiential growth that plays a more crucial role.

The findings of the present study indicate that school administrators' leadership styles do not significantly differ based on age, but they vary significantly according to educational attainment and length of service. This is partially consistent with the study by Campos-García and Zúñiga-Vicente (2020), which found that a principal's demographic characteristics, including experience and educational background, can influence strategic decision-making and leadership practices in secondary schools. Both studies suggest that professional qualifications and tenure play a critical role in shaping leadership approaches. However, while Campos-García and Zúñiga-Vicente (2020) reported that age also had a measurable impact on leadership and decision-making, the current study found no significant effect of age, indicating that in the sampled schools, experience and educational attainment are more decisive factors than chronological age in determining leadership behavior.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The study concludes that school administrators in the respondent schools consistently demonstrate a very high level of leadership across various styles, particularly in ethical leadership, empowerment, and foresight, which positively aligns with the very high perceptions of school climate and culture among teachers. These results indicate that strong, value-driven leadership contributes to a supportive, collaborative, and communicative school environment. However, the absence of significant relationships between leadership styles and both school climate and culture suggests that other factors, such as institutional policies, teacher dynamics, and community engagement, may also play a substantial role in shaping these aspects. Furthermore, the significant differences in leadership styles when grouped by educational attainment and length of service highlight the importance of continuous professional development and leadership training tailored to administrators' qualifications and experience, ensuring sustained improvement in fostering positive school climates and cultures.

Recommendations

School administrators are encouraged to sustain strong leadership practices in ethical leadership, empowerment, and foresight while further strengthening emotional healing skills, supported by professional development aligned with their background and service. Teachers should actively engage in open communication, collaborative decision-making, and collegial activities, while providing constructive feedback to administrators. Students must be given greater participation in activities and decision-making to build trust and engagement, with student councils serving as partners in leadership. Non-teaching staff should be included in capacity-building and communication platforms to promote inclusivity and productivity. Policymakers and DepEd are advised to integrate leadership training modules, mentorship systems, and evaluation processes into capacity-building programs. Parents and community stakeholders should actively

support school initiatives through participation and partnerships that reflect shared values. Finally, future researchers may investigate other factors influencing school climate and culture, expand to different settings, and use mixed methods for deeper insights.

REFERENCES:

1. Abri, Y. B. S. B. H. A., Adnan, M. A. B. M., Alesayi, A. K. S. A., Al-Qari, H. B. S. B. H., & Eisaei, M. S. A. A. (2023). The role of future foresight in achieving strategic leadership for educational institutions in the Sultanate of Oman. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(10). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i10/19134>
2. American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). American Psychological Association.
3. Anwar, K., Rahman, A., Nurwahidin, M., Sutrisno, S., & Saputra, N. (2023). The influence of school culture and work motivation on school quality in vocational schools. *Tafkir Interdisciplinary Journal of Islamic Education*, 4(3), 430–445. <https://doi.org/10.31538/tijie.v4i3.661>
4. Atasoy, R. (2020). The Relationship Between School Principals' Leadership Styles, School Culture and Organizational Change. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 16(5), 256-274.
5. Banwo, B. O., Khalifa, M., & Louis, K. S. (2021). Exploring trust: Culturally responsive and positive school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 60(3), 323–339. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEa-03-2021-0065>
6. Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2007). *Business research methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
7. Campos-García, I., & Zúñiga-Vicente, J. Á. (2020). Strategic decision-making in secondary schools: The impact of a principal's demographic profile. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 21(3), 543–564. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2020.1802653>
8. Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
9. Daries, A. E. (2021). *The role of principals in cultivating a positive school culture* (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch University). Stellenbosch University. <https://scholar.sun.ac.za/server/api/core/bitstreams/78c0db9c-ac33-47cc-beffcabf7a486993/content>
10. Dickhäuser, O., Janke, S., Daumiller, M., & Dresel, M. (2020). Motivational school climate and teachers' achievement goal orientations: A hierarchical approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(1), 391–408. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12370>
11. Domínguez-Escrig, E., Mallén-Broch, F. F., Chiva, R., & Alcamí, R. L. (2021). Effects of emotional healing on organisational learning and radical innovation: A leadership-based approach. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 35(1), 224–239. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jocm-04-2021-0105>
12. Fischer, T., & Sitkin, S. B. (2022). Leadership styles: A comprehensive assessment and way forward. *Academy of Management Annals*, 17(1), 331–372. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0340>
13. Göçen, A. (2021). Ethical leadership: A cross-cultural study. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 10(1), 37–57. <https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.811919>
14. Heinla, E., & Kuurme, T. (2022). The impact of school culture, school climate, and teachers' job satisfaction on the teacher-student relationship: A case study in four Estonian schools. *Research Papers in Education*, 39(3), 439–465. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2022.2150883>
15. Kalkan, Ü., Altınay Aksal, F., Altınay Gazi, Z., Atasoy, R., & Dağlı, G. (2020). The Relationship Between School Administrators' Leadership Styles, School Culture, and Organizational Image. *Sage Open*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020902081>
16. Kareem, J., Patrick, H. A., Prabakaran, N., B, V., Tantia, V., M., P. M., P. K., & Mukherjee, U. (2023). Transformational educational leaders inspire school educators' commitment. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, 1171513. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1171513>
17. Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Gümüş, S. (2020). The effect of instructional leadership and distributed leadership on teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Mediating roles of supportive school culture and teacher collaboration. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(3), 430–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220910438>
18. Merritt, M. R. (2021). Active listening in the diverse roles of international school leaders. *IMCC Journal of Science*, 1(2), 115–130.

19. Morris, J. E., Lummis, G. W., Lock, G., Ferguson, C., Hill, S., & Nykiel, A. (2020). The role of leadership in establishing a positive staff culture in a secondary school. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(5), 802-820. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219864937>
20. Nabella, S. D., Rivaldo, Y., Kurniawan, R., Nurmayunita, N., Sari, D. P., Luran, M. F., & Wulandari, K. (2022). The Influence of Leadership and Organizational Culture Mediated by Organizational Climate on Governance at Senior High School in Batam City. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 12(5), 119-130.
21. Newton, N. (2024). School cultures, values education and personal education. In *Values, relationships and engagement in Quaker education (Palgrave Studies in Alternative Education)*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-51784-6_4
22. Onikoyi, O. A., Akinnubi, O. P., Yusuf, J., Olaifa, S. A., & Ayoku, B. O. (2024). School head stewardship in enhancing secondary school students' academic results. *Gagasan Pendidikan Indonesia*, 5(1), 39-47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30870/gpi.v5i1.28514>
23. Owan, V. J., Asuquo, M. E., & Etudo-Eyor, E. (2022). Leadership styles, public relation skills and school-community collaboration: A quantitative analysis of the perception of stakeholders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 28(4), 715-737. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2045627>
24. Plaku, A. K., & Leka, K. (2025). The role of leaders in shaping school culture. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1541525>
25. Sanchez, J. E., Paul, J. M., & Thornton, B. W. (2020). Relationships among teachers' perceptions of principal leadership and teachers' perceptions of school climate in the high school setting. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(6), 855-875. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1708471>
26. Schermuly, C. C., Creon, L., Gerlach, P., Graßmann, C., & Koch, J. (2022). Leadership styles and psychological empowerment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 29(1), 73-95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518211067751>
27. Tierney, W. G. (2023). *The impact of culture on organizational decision-making*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003447887>
28. Veletić, J., Price, H. E., & Olsen, R. V. (2023). Teachers' and principals' perceptions of school climate: The role of principals' leadership style in organizational quality. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 35, 525-555. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-023-09413-6>
29. Zysberg, L., & Schwabsky, N. (2020). School climate, academic self-efficacy and student achievement. *Educational Psychology*, 41(4), 467-482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2020.1813690>