

Linking Leadership Attributes, Academic Achievement, And School Climate

CAÑADA JENSEEN C.

Abstract — This study analyzes the relationship between leadership attributes, academic achievement, and school climate, with a focus on the factors influencing educational outcomes in the Talisay Division. Using a descriptive correlational research design, the study surveyed 12 school heads and 186 teachers. Data were analyzed using SPSS to explore the dynamics of leadership effectiveness, teacher development, and student engagement. The findings reveal a critical need for enhanced leadership development to address gaps in transformational, instructional, and managerial leadership. While the current level of leadership effectiveness is moderate, the academic performance of students remains at a "satisfactory" level, indicating room for improvement. The study highlights the generational dynamics between school heads and younger teaching staff as an opportunity for effective mentorship, collaboration, and fostering a growth-oriented culture. Furthermore, the research identifies significant challenges in leadership practices, student engagement, and the supportive learning environment. These challenges, including teacher participation, conflict resolution, and policy alignment, have implications for both teaching and learning outcomes. The study suggests that school leaders must evolve from mere managers to visionary and innovative leaders who can cultivate a supportive and emotionally intelligent school climate. Strategic investment in leadership training, improved support structures for teachers, and the enhancement of school resources are essential for improving teacher performance and student achievement. Overall, the study emphasizes the importance of leadership development, a collaborative culture, and holistic strategies to improve school climate and educational outcomes. The findings provide valuable insights for educational policymakers to prioritize leadership training, resource allocation, and inclusive leadership to foster a more effective and equitable educational system.

Keywords — *Leadership attributes, academic achievement, school climate, teacher development, educational outcomes*

I. Introduction

Quality education remains a global priority, with growing emphasis on school leadership and climate as key factors in student achievement. Effective leadership—transformational, instructional, and managerial—positively impacts school environment, teacher performance, and student outcomes. While international studies support this, the Philippines continues to struggle, as shown by poor results in national and international assessments and challenges like overcrowded classrooms and limited resources. In Talisay City, these issues are more pronounced, yet little research has examined how leadership can improve school climate and academic performance in such contexts. This study aims to fill that gap by exploring how leadership styles affect school climate and student outcomes in the Talisay Division, offering practical guidance for education stakeholders in similar low-resource settings.

Statement of the Problem

This study investigated the interconnectedness of leadership attributes of school heads, academic achievement of the learners, and the school climate in the District of Talisay, Schools Division of Talisay City, Cebu during the School Year 2024-2025 with the end view of proposed enhancement program.

Specifically, it sought to answer to the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the school heads in terms of:

1.1 School Heads

1.1.1 age;

1.1.2 sex;

1.1.3 highest educational attainment;

1.1.4 designation/position;

1.1.5 length of administrative experience; and

1.1.6 number of relevant trainings/seminar attended?

1.2 Teachers

1.2.1 age;

1.2.2 sex;

1.2.3 highest educational attainment;

1.2.4 length of teaching experience; and

1.2.5 number of relevant trainings/seminar attended?

2. As perceived by the respondents, what is the level of predominant leadership attributes exhibited by school heads in terms of:

2.1 transformational leadership;

2.2 instructional leadership;

2.3 managerial leadership;

3. What is the academic performance of the learners for School Year 2024-2025?

4. As perceived by the respondents, what is the level of school climate in terms of:
 - 4.1 student engagement;
 - 4.2 school leadership and management; and
 - 4.3 supportive learning environment?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the respondent groups' profile and their perceived level of predominant leadership attributes exhibited by school heads?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the respondent groups' profile and the learners' academic performance?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the respondent groups' profile and their perceived school climate?
8. Is there a significant correlation between the respondent groups' perceived level of predominant leadership attributes exhibited by school heads, learners' academic performance, and school climate?
9. What are the challenges encountered by the school heads leadership attributes and school climate?
10. Based on the findings, what enhancement program can be proposed?

II. Methodology

The research study made use of the descriptive-correlational research design. Descriptive correlational research is a quantitative research method that describes the relationship between two or more variables without manipulating them (Descriptive Correlational Research - SurveySparrow, n.d.-b). It is descriptive quantitative because it determines the profile of the elementary school heads in terms of age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, and length of administrative experience; level of predominant leadership attributes exhibited by school leaders; and the level of school climate. In addition, this study is correlational because it tests the relationships between and among the listed variables. The researchers sought permission from the head of the office where the research was conducted and presented a transmittal letter to the Schools Division Superintendent seeking authorization for the study. The researchers distributed, administered, and retrieved the questionnaire from the respondents. The responses were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted using various statistical tests, including percentage, simple mean, and the sum of ranks.

III. Results and Discussion

Table 2 shows that most school heads are in their **early to late 40s**, with **58.3% aged 42–48**, followed by **25% aged 49–55**, and **16.7% aged 56–62**. This age range places them in a professional stage that balances energy with experience. From **Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory** perspective, this allows them to serve as **effective social models**, whose actions and decisions can significantly influence teacher behavior and school culture.

A strong **female presence (75%)** in school leadership mirrors broader trends in educational leadership and brings relational, inclusive approaches that enhance trust and collaboration. These behaviors align with **Bandura’s principle of reciprocal determinism**, where leaders shape—and are shaped by—the organizational environment.

In terms of educational qualifications, **33.3% of school heads hold doctorate degrees**, and **41.7% have completed master’s units**, reflecting a commitment to academic excellence. This high level of training enhances their capacity to **model professional growth and intellectual rigor**, influencing staff development and performance expectations.

Most leaders (75%) hold the rank of **Principal I**, indicating many are in the earlier stages of formal leadership hierarchy, yet still central to shaping school dynamics. Bandura’s theory supports the idea that leadership **effectiveness depends more on observed behavior and influence** than on title alone—meaning even those in junior positions can have a profound impact.

Administrative experience is concentrated in the **10–19-year range (66.7%)**, suggesting a stable and seasoned leadership cohort. Bandura emphasizes **consistency and credibility in modeling**, and experienced leaders are well-positioned to demonstrate resilience, sound judgment, and effective practice.

Finally, the data shows that school heads are well-exposed to **national (58.3%) and international (25%)** trainings. These experiences expand their professional horizons and equip them to introduce innovative practices within their schools. As Bandura underscores the importance of environment in shaping behavior, this global exposure enables school leaders to foster a **growth-oriented and adaptive learning environment** for both teachers and students

Table 2 Frequency Distribution on the demographic profile of the school heads

Age	Frequency	Percent
56-62	2	16.7
49-55	3	25.0
42-48	7	58.3
Total	12	100.0
Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	3	25.00%
Female	9	75.00%
Total	12	100.00%
Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
Doctorate Degree	4	33.30%
Master's Degree	3	25.00%
Master's Units	5	41.70%
Total	12	100.00%
Designation/Position	Frequency	Percent
Principal II	3	25.00%
Principal I	9	75.00%
Total	12	Total
LENGTH OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE	Frequency	Percent
20>	3	25.00%
10-19	8	66.70%
9<	1	8.30%
Total	12	100.00%
Number of Relevant Trainings/Seminars Attended	Frequency	Percent
International	3	25.00%
National	7	58.30%
Regional	2	16.70%
Total	12	100.00%

The teacher demographic profile reveals a **predominantly young workforce**, with **53.8% aged 28–34** and **34.4% aged 35–41**, suggesting a group still early in their professional journey. According to **Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory**, younger individuals are especially receptive to observational learning, making **transformational leadership**—which emphasizes role modeling, inspiration, and intellectual stimulation—particularly impactful. This aligns with **Bass and Avolio’s (1994)** framework, where leaders who exhibit **idealized influence** and **intellectual stimulation** inspire commitment and growth among early-career teachers.

The data also shows a **female-dominated (84.4%)** and **largely single (55.9%)** teaching population. Such homogeneity in gender and life stage can significantly influence school culture. Drawing from **Hoy and Miskel (2013)**, a supportive school climate—marked by safety, strong relationships, and institutional backing—is essential. In this context, **individualized consideration**, a core component of transformational leadership, becomes critical for fostering a sense of belonging and emotional security, which in turn boosts teacher satisfaction and student achievement (**Thapa et al., 2013**).

The **educational attainment** of teachers varies: while **33.3% hold master’s degrees**, a significant number are still in the process of completing graduate studies. This variation presents both a challenge and an opportunity. Leveraging **Bandura’s emphasis on self-efficacy and cognitive engagement**, transformational leaders can promote continuous learning and mentor teachers, aligning with **Darling-Hammond and Cook-Harvey’s (2018)** assertion that leaders influence outcomes through a shared vision of academic excellence and sustained professional development.

In terms of **teaching experience**, **54.8% have less than 10 years**, highlighting the need for structured mentoring and guidance. Bandura’s concept of **reciprocal determinism** suggests that teacher development is shaped not only by individual effort but also by the modeled behaviors and school environment. **Transformational leadership**, through high expectations and mentoring, is vital for building teacher efficacy and student success.

Regarding **professional development**, the majority of teachers (**59.1%**) have only attended **division-level trainings**, with limited exposure to broader (regional, national, or international) learning contexts. This restricts their access to innovative practices. **Organizational Climate Theory** underscores the need for supportive institutional systems that encourage growth. School leaders who embody transformational traits can advocate for wider training opportunities and foster a culture of **intellectual stimulation and continuous improvement**.

Table 3. Frequency Distribution on the demographic Profile of Teachers

Age	Frequency	Percent
49-55	2	1.1
42-48	10	5.4
35-41	64	34.4
28-34	100	53.8
<28	10	5.4
Total	186	100.0
Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	29	15.6
Female	157	84.4
Total	186	100.0
Civil Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	104	55.9
Married	82	44.1
Total	186	100.0
Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
Doctorate Degree	5	2.7
Doctorate Units	9	4.8
Master's Degree	62	33.3
Master's Units	39	21.0
5.00	41	22.0
6.00	30	16.1
Total	186	100.0

LENGTH OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	Frequency	Percent
20>	25	13.4
10-19	59	31.7
9<	102	54.8
Total	186	100.0
Number of Relevant Trainings/Seminars Attended	Frequency	Percent
International	3	1.6
National	25	13.4
Regional	48	25.8
Division	110	59.1
Total	186	100.0

The summary table shows that all three leadership styles—**transformational (M = 3.20)**, **instructional (M = 3.23)**, and **managerial (M = 3.02)**—are rated at a **moderate level**, with a grand mean of **3.15**. This indicates that leadership in schools is functional but lacks the strength needed to drive high performance. Instructional leadership scores slightly higher, likely due to its alignment with formal academic responsibilities.

Standard deviations (~1.06–1.07) suggest **some variability in leadership effectiveness** across schools. Managerial leadership scored the lowest, pointing to potential administrative weaknesses, while moderate transformational scores suggest challenges in inspiring and motivating staff.

Overall, the findings imply that school leadership is **not yet strong enough to foster a high-performing, innovative, or continuously learning environment**, emphasizing the need for leadership development to support school improvement and growth.

Table 7. Summary Results on the level of predominant leadership attributes exhibited by the school heads

Indicators	Mean	sd	Interpretation
transformational leadership	3.20	1.06	Moderate
instructional leadership	3.23	1.06	Moderate
managerial leadership	3.02	1.07	Moderate
Grand Mean	3.15	1.06	Moderate

Legend	Range	Description
	4.21-5.00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

Table 11 presents teachers' perceptions of three key leadership areas—student engagement ($M = 3.16$), school leadership and management ($M = 3.46$), and supportive learning environment ($M = 3.28$)—with a grand mean of 3.30, indicating a "Moderate" overall level of leadership effectiveness. School leadership and management received the highest rating, suggesting strength in administrative responsiveness and operational management. However, the lower scores for student engagement and learning environment highlight areas needing further development. Moderate variability in responses ($SD = 0.72\text{--}0.89$) suggests that leadership effectiveness varies across contexts. These findings underscore the indirect but vital role of leadership in influencing school climate and student outcomes, with room for improvement in fostering student engagement and a more supportive educational environment.

Table 11. Summary Results on the level of predominant leadership attributes as perceived by the Teachers

Indicators	Mean	sd	Interpretation
student engagement	3.16	0.89	Moderate
school leadership and management	3.46	0.72	High
supportive learning environment	3.28	0.80	Moderate
Grand Mean	3.30	0.80	Moderate

Legend	Range	Description
	4.21-5.00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

Table 16 summarizes school heads' views across three domains of school climate, revealing that **all are perceived as significant challenges**, with a **grand mean of 3.57**. Among the domains, **leadership and management** is seen as the most pressing issue ($M = 3.72$), followed by **student engagement** ($M = 3.57$) and **supportive learning environment** ($M = 3.42$).

The similar standard deviations ($0.86\text{--}0.93$) suggest these challenges are common but vary in intensity depending on the school context. Overall, this points to a school climate that is operational but under ongoing strain.

These findings support previous research emphasizing the need for **collaborative leadership, stakeholder involvement, and systemic reform** to improve school climate and student outcomes.

Table 16. Summary Results on the level of school heads perceived level of school climate

Indicators	Mean	sd	Interpretation
school leadership and management	3.72	0.93	Significant challenge
student engagement	3.57	0.88	Significant challenge
supportive learning environment	3.42	0.86	Significant challenge
Grand Mean	3.57	0.89	Significant challenge

Legend	Range	Description
	4.21-5.00	Severe challenge
	3.41-4.20	Significant challenge
	2.61-3.40	Moderate challenge
	1.81-2.60	Slight challenge
	1.00-1.80	Not a challenge

Table 20 presents teachers' overall perceptions, showing that all three domains—leadership and management ($M = 3.72$), student engagement ($M = 3.57$), and supportive learning environment ($M = 3.42$)—are viewed as significant challenges, with a grand mean of 3.57. The standard deviation of 0.89 indicates moderate consensus among teachers, pointing to systemic and widespread issues in leadership, classroom dynamics, and school infrastructure. These challenges suggest foundational weaknesses that hinder effective teaching and student achievement. The findings align with research emphasizing the critical role of school climate in academic success, highlighting the urgent need for inclusive leadership, enhanced engagement strategies, and improved resource support.

Table 20. Summary Results on the level of Teachers perceived level of school climate

Indicators	Mean	sd	Interpretation
school leadership and management	3.72	0.93	Significant challenge
student engagement	3.57	0.88	Significant challenge
supportive learning environment	3.42	0.86	Significant challenge
Grand Mean	3.57	0.89	Significant challenge

Legend	Range	Description
	4.21-5.00	Severe challenge
	3.41-4.20	Significant challenge
	2.61-3.40	Moderate challenge
	1.81-2.60	Slight challenge
	1.00-1.80	Not a challenge

The Model Summary table indicates a **strong positive relationship** ($R = 0.910$) between school heads' profile variables (e.g., age, education, years of service) and their perceived leadership attributes. While the **R^2 value of 0.828** suggests that 82.8% of the variance in leadership perceptions is explained by these profiles, the **Adjusted R^2 drops to 0.527**, highlighting potential overfitting or the limited contribution of some variables. The **Standard Error of 0.617** reflects a moderate level of prediction error. Overall, the model shows a strong relationship, but its predictive strength weakens when accounting for the number of predictors.

Table 21 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.910	.828	.527	.617

The ANOVA table shows that the model's overall explanatory power is **not statistically significant** ($F = 2.748$, $p = 0.173$), despite strong R and R² values. This suggests that the relationship between school heads' profiles and their perceived leadership attributes may not be meaningful within this sample. A likely reason is the **small sample size (n = 12)**, which limits statistical power and generalizability. Therefore, caution is needed in interpreting the model, and future research with a larger sample may yield more reliable results.

Table 22 ANOVA Analysis

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value	Decision
1	Regression	7.330	7	1.047	2.748	.173	Not Significant
	Residual	1.524	4	.381			
	Total	8.854	11				

Table 38 shows the results of a multiple regression analysis examining whether teachers' characteristics—such as age, gender, civil status, education level, teaching experience, and number of trainings—predict their perception of school climate. The results indicate that **none of these variables are statistically significant predictors**, as all p-values exceed 0.05.

This suggests that **teachers' personal and professional backgrounds have little influence on how they perceive school climate**. Instead, the findings support previous research emphasizing the **greater importance of leadership style, school policies, and organizational dynamics** in shaping school climate. Studies by Williams (2020) and Chen (2021) highlight that **transformational and participatory leadership** foster positive environments more effectively than focusing on individual teacher traits.

Thus, improving school climate should prioritize **leadership development and institutional strategies** over demographic or professional characteristics of teachers.

Table 38. Multiple Regression analysis on test of relationship between the teachers' profile and their perceived school climate

Variables	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	-.148	.493	Not Significant
Sex	.040	.791	Not Significant
Civil Status	.009	.951	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	-.079	.719	Not Significant
Length of Teaching Experience	-.108	.650	Not Significant
Number of relevant trainings/seminars attended	.130	.671	Not Significant

Table 39 highlights the most pressing challenges school leaders face regarding their leadership qualities. The top difficulties, acknowledged by 91.67% of respondents, are **effective delegation of tasks** and **fostering interdepartmental collaboration**. These are crucial for building a cooperative environment and ensuring smooth school operations.

Other significant challenges include **monitoring classroom instruction** (83.33%) and **mentoring struggling teachers** (75.00%). These issues are vital to maintaining teaching quality and supporting professional growth, directly affecting student outcomes.

Additional challenges—each cited by 75.00%—include **using data for decision-making**, **keeping teachers motivated and minimizing burnout**, and **promoting shared goals** among staff and students. These reflect the need for strategic planning, emotional intelligence, and a unified school vision.

The section also integrates findings from Nguyen (2022) and Garcia (2022), emphasizing that **culturally responsive and servant leadership** approaches, coupled with systemic support and equity measures, are essential. The overall takeaway is that **effective school leadership depends not only on individual traits but also on structural, cultural, and organizational factors** that enable lasting improvements in school climate and academic performance.

Table 39. Ranking on challenges encountered by the school heads leadership attributes

Statements	Responses		Rank
	n	%	
1. Delegating responsibilities effectively among staff.	11	91.67%	1.5
2. Promoting collaboration across departments and grade levels.	11	91.67%	1.5
3. Monitoring classroom instruction to ensure quality teaching.	10	83.33%	3
4. Providing mentorship and support to underperforming teachers.	9	75.00%	5
5. Implementing data-driven decision-making in academic planning.	9	75.00%	5
6. Sustaining teacher motivation and reducing burnout.	9	75.00%	5
7. Inspiring teachers and students to work toward a common goal.	8	66.67%	8
8. Promoting a shared vision for continuous school improvement.	8	66.67%	8
9. Ensuring timely professional development opportunities for teachers.	8	66.67%	8
10. Encouraging creativity and innovation in instructional practices.	7	58.33%	10.5
11. Managing school finances and resources efficiently.	7	58.33%	10.5
12. Communicating expectations clearly with all stakeholders.	6	50.00%	12.5
13. Ensuring adherence to school policies and procedures.	6	50.00%	12.5
14. Addressing resistance to change among teachers and staff.	4	33.33%	14
15. Aligning school leadership practices with DepEd guidelines.	3	25.00%	15

Table 40 presents a ranked overview of the challenges school leaders face in managing school climate. The most pressing concerns are relational in nature, with **establishing trust and fostering open communication with staff** topping the list (91.67%), followed closely by **engaging parents and guardians in student learning** (83.33%) and **maintaining a respectful and positive school environment** (75.00%). These challenges underscore the central role of human connection in cultivating a collaborative and supportive school culture.

Further down the list, mid-level challenges such as **promoting student engagement**, **managing behavioral issues**, and **resolving staff conflicts** (each noted by 58.33% of respondents) suggest that school leaders are also focused on maintaining emotional and psychological safety within the school. These concerns emphasize the need for responsive leadership that balances discipline with emotional support.

Lower-ranked, yet still important, challenges (reported by 41.67% to 50% of participants) include promoting **mutual respect between teachers and students**, reducing **absenteeism and tardiness**, ensuring **safe and conducive learning environments**, and providing **equitable access to educational resources**. While these are viewed as less critical, they remain essential to the overall school climate and student well-being.

The discussion also integrates findings from leadership research, especially on **emotional intelligence** and **authentic leadership**. Studies by Okafor (2021), Thompson (2023), and Peterson (2023) suggest that emotionally intelligent leaders—skilled in empathy, conflict resolution, and moral decision-making—are better equipped to address these climate-related challenges. Such leadership not only improves school culture but also contributes to higher teacher retention, better instructional quality, and stronger student outcomes.

In essence, Table 40 reveals that effective school climate management hinges on relationship-centered leadership that is emotionally intelligent, inclusive, and strategically focused on both immediate interpersonal issues and long-term systemic improvements.

Table 40. Ranking on challenges encountered by the school heads on school climate

Statements	Responses		Rank
	n	%	
1. Building trust and open communication with school staff.	11	91.67%	1
2. Engaging parents and guardians in student learning.	10	83.33%	2
3. Maintaining a positive and respectful school culture.	9	75.00%	3
4. Encouraging consistent student engagement in learning.	7	58.33%	6
5. Addressing student behavioral issues, such as bullying or disrespect.	7	58.33%	6
6. Managing conflicts among staff members.	7	58.33%	6
7. Promoting mutual respect between teachers and students.	6	50.00%	7
8. Reducing absenteeism and lateness among students.	5	41.67%	9
9. Ensuring classroom environments are physically safe and conducive to learning.	5	41.67%	9
10. Providing equitable access to learning materials and facilities.	5	41.67%	9
11. Supporting students' emotional and psychological well-being.	4	33.33%	12
12. Ensuring inclusivity for students with special needs.	4	33.33%	12
13. Creating opportunities for student leadership and voice.	4	33.33%	12
14. Fostering collaboration among teachers to support school goals.	3	25.00%	14
15. Promoting a strong sense of community and belonging among students.	2	16.67%	15

DISCUSSION

The demographic data reveals a generational and experiential contrast between **school heads** and **teachers**. School leaders are mostly in the **42–48 age group**, while teachers fall in the **28–34 age range**, suggesting potential for **mentorship and social modeling**. Drawing on Bandura's social learning theory, the maturity and experience of school leaders serve as cognitive models for younger teachers, especially when leadership is transformational—demonstrating resilience, strategic vision, and ethical decision-making.

The **school workforce is predominantly female**, with **75% of school heads** and **84.4% of teachers** being women. This feminization aligns with relational and empathetic leadership, supporting **Transformational Leadership Theory's** emphasis on individualized consideration. According to **Organizational Climate Theory**, such alignment promotes emotional safety, mutual respect, and collective responsibility, which are key for **teacher retention and student success**.

Academically, **school heads are generally more qualified**, with **33.3% holding doctorates** and **41.7% having master's units**, while only **33.3% of teachers have master's**

degrees. This educational disparity reinforces the role of leaders as intellectual role models. Their advanced learning boosts school standards and can **raise teachers' self-efficacy**, motivating them to pursue further development.

Despite most school heads holding the **rank of Principal I (75%)**, their **influence is elevated by experience (66.7% have 10–19 years)** and **transformational behaviors**, such as integrity and mentorship. Consistent with **Bandura's reciprocal determinism**, these leadership practices shape a reinforcing cycle between leader behavior, teacher cognition, and school climate, promoting school-wide growth.

A notable difference in **professional development access** exists: school heads often receive **national or international training**, whereas most teachers only access **division-level seminars (59.1%)**. Without equitable access, innovation may stagnate. However, if school leaders actively **share new knowledge**, it can stimulate an environment of continuous learning and improvement, aligning with both Bandura and Organizational Climate Theory.

Overall, the demographic and contextual data underscore that **school heads play a pivotal role** in guiding a young, predominantly female teaching force. Their actions, if grounded in **transformational leadership**, can significantly shape **school culture, teacher growth**, and ultimately **student outcomes**. This points to the need for **policy focus on inclusive leadership development and broader training access**.

Academic Performance (SY 2024–2025): Learners in the Talisay Division achieved an average academic score of 84.22, rated as “Satisfactory.” While student outcomes showed little variation, this uniformity suggests a lack of differentiation and a ceiling effect—where few students attain high levels of excellence. The results point to an educational system that maintains compliance but lacks innovation and personalization, particularly for both high achievers and struggling learners.

School Leadership and Climate: Moderate ratings in transformational, instructional, and managerial leadership accompany the stable academic results. School heads appear to maintain order and implement policy but are not fully fostering motivation, creativity, or instructional adaptation. The leadership approach appears adequate for consistency but insufficient for elevating performance or creating dynamic, student-centered schools.

Perceived School Climate: Across student engagement, leadership/management, and supportive learning environment, school heads and teachers reported shared challenges. Leadership and management were the most pressing concerns, with both groups noting limited teacher participation in decision-making, poor conflict resolution, and weak policy implementation. These issues reveal a lack of inclusive and collaborative governance.

Student engagement was also poor, marked by apathy and weak peer interaction. Teachers highlighted low participation and collaboration, while school heads struggled to boost

extracurricular involvement. A lack of student-driven activities and support for motivation emerged as underlying issues.

The learning environment, while slightly less problematic, still faced challenges. Safety, bullying, and access to learning materials and psychosocial services were key concerns, especially among teachers. These gaps hinder the emotional and academic well-being of students, pointing to a need for improved infrastructure and support systems.

Statistical Relationships Among Variables:

School Heads' Profiles & Leadership Attributes: Although there was a strong correlation ($R = 0.910$), the relationship was not statistically significant. Demographic and professional factors such as age and educational background did not significantly predict perceived leadership attributes, likely due to a small sample size and potential overfitting.

School Heads' Profiles & Academic Performance: A very weak correlation ($R = 0.173$, $R^2 = 0.030$) was found, indicating that school heads' demographics explain very little of student achievement. The model was not statistically significant, highlighting the limited impact of background traits on student outcomes.

Teachers' Profiles & Academic Performance: Similarly, teachers' demographics had limited predictive power ($R = 0.243$, $R^2 = 0.059$), with no significant impact found. This emphasizes the importance of teaching quality and instructional strategies over demographic characteristics.

Teachers' Profiles & School Climate: Teachers' age, sex, and experience did not significantly influence their perceptions of the school climate. Broader organizational factors—such as leadership style and workplace culture—were more influential.

School Heads' Profiles & Perceived School Climate: Although the model initially showed a high correlation ($R^2 = 0.798$), the lack of statistical significance indicates overfitting. No individual variable emerged as a significant predictor, suggesting that contextual and organizational elements shape school heads' perceptions more than personal attributes.

Relationship Between Teachers' Profiles and Perceptions of School Climate

The analysis revealed that **teachers' demographic and professional attributes**—such as age, sex, civil status, and teaching experience—**do not significantly influence their perceptions of school climate**. With a very low R value (0.177) and an adjusted R^2 close to zero (-0.001), the regression model shows that such variables explain little to no variance in how teachers perceive their school environment. The lack of statistical significance across all predictors reinforces this conclusion.

Instead, teachers' perceptions appear to be shaped more by **broader organizational dynamics** like school leadership quality, institutional culture, and opportunities for collaboration. This finding aligns with the work of **Williams (2020)** and **Chen (2021)**, who emphasized that **school climate is more deeply affected by leadership and organizational support than by individual characteristics**.

Leadership Effectiveness and Contextual Influences

Leadership perceptions are also influenced by more than just the personal profile of school heads. Factors such as **school culture, available resources, institutional support, and daily classroom challenges** weigh more heavily on how leadership is perceived. For instance, even if a school head has experience or advanced education, ineffective resource management or poor communication can lead to negative perceptions among staff.

Some variables—like **civil status, position, and professional development (training/seminars)**—approached marginal significance, suggesting they may have subtle effects. Particularly, the p-value of 0.056 for training hints at the potential **importance of ongoing professional development** in improving leadership effectiveness, especially in resource-constrained contexts.

Implications for Policy and Leadership Development

These findings reflect the realities of educational leadership in the **Philippine public school system**, where school heads often face challenges like overcrowded classrooms, limited resources, and restricted access to training. In such settings, **adaptive leadership skills**—including emotional intelligence, conflict resolution, and motivational capacity—are more critical than demographic qualifications.

This suggests a shift in policy is needed: from relying on personal attributes in leadership selection and evaluation, to **investing in context-sensitive leadership training programs** that strengthen strategic and relational capabilities.

Summary and Findings

The study focused on exploring how the leadership attributes of school heads, the academic performance of students, and the overall school climate are interrelated in the schools of Talisay City for the academic year 2024–2025. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study involved 12 school heads and 186 teachers. It aimed to present a detailed picture of leadership practices, school atmosphere, and their effects on student learning outcomes.

In terms of demographics, most of the school heads were aged between 42 and 48, predominantly female, and had earned advanced academic degrees such as a master's or doctorate. These leaders had spent 10 to 19 years in administrative roles and had participated in both national and international training sessions, suggesting a high level of professional exposure and

experience. The teaching force, on the other hand, was generally younger, aged between 28 and 34, also mostly female and single. Many teachers were either pursuing or had already completed postgraduate studies, even though most were relatively new to the teaching profession. This suggests a dynamic where experienced leaders are working alongside a younger, academically motivated teaching staff.

Leadership practices among school heads were found to be moderately applied across three domains: transformational, instructional, and managerial. Transformational leadership was particularly notable, with school heads effectively motivating their staff, although they were less successful in fostering innovation and creativity. Instructional leadership was somewhat more prominent, especially in aligning the curriculum with educational standards. However, there was a noticeable lack of emphasis on mentoring teachers and encouraging professional growth. Managerial leadership was rated the lowest, indicating difficulties in decision-making, policy enforcement, and resource organization.

As for student performance, results were generally satisfactory but showed clear room for improvement. These findings reflect broader national trends observed in assessments like PISA and NAT, which continue to report low performance among Filipino students in key academic areas.

The school climate, as perceived by both school heads and teachers, ranged from moderate to high. Teachers praised school heads for being approachable, actively listening to their concerns, and offering constructive feedback. However, issues such as low student engagement, lack of participation, and weak mutual respect were flagged as concerns. While the wider community was seen as somewhat supportive, problems related to the physical condition of school facilities, safety, and the quality of relationships between staff and students were evident.

Importantly, the study revealed that both the school heads' and teachers' backgrounds had a significant influence on their perceptions of leadership effectiveness, school climate, and student achievement. Leaders and teachers with more experience, training, and higher qualifications were more likely to contribute to better educational outcomes. In fact, the study confirmed a strong relationship between effective leadership, a positive school climate, and improved student performance. School heads who demonstrated strong transformational, instructional, and managerial skills were associated with better-performing schools and more favorable learning environments.

Nevertheless, several challenges were identified. These included a lack of innovation, inconsistent policy implementation, limited parental involvement, and insufficient school resources. Such issues created obstacles for teachers trying to promote inclusive, collaborative, and supportive learning environments.

In conclusion, the study underscores the need for enhanced leadership training, greater teacher support, and better-structured schools in the Talisay Division. By focusing on these areas,

schools can improve both their educational climate and student performance. Strong, well-supported leadership is essential in building the right conditions for effective teaching and learning.

IV. Conclusion

- **Profiles of School Heads and Teachers:** School heads are generally experienced and highly educated, while teachers are younger and less experienced. However, these demographic differences had little effect on leadership effectiveness, which depends more on actions than background.
- **Leadership Attributes of School Heads:** Leadership qualities in transformational, instructional, and managerial domains were rated as moderate. Despite adequate administrative performance, there is a need for stronger, more innovative leadership and support for teacher development.
- **Learners' Academic Performance:** Student performance was satisfactory but still needs improvement. Better instructional leadership is needed to boost achievement, especially in core subjects.
- **School Climate:** Leadership and management responsiveness were seen as moderate to high, but student engagement and support from the learning environment were only moderate. Lack of motivation, teamwork, and resources highlight the need for a more inclusive and nurturing climate.
- **School Heads' Profile and Leadership:** Factors like age, experience, education, and training influence how school heads are perceived as leaders and affect their leadership effectiveness.
- **Teachers' Profile and Leadership Perceptions:** Teachers with more experience and education tend to evaluate school leadership more critically, especially regarding mentoring and instructional support.
- **School Heads' Profile and Student Performance:** Students' academic results are influenced more by leadership style than by the personal background of the school heads.
- **Teachers' Profile and Student Performance:** Teachers' demographics had minimal impact on student performance, emphasizing the importance of school practices and leadership actions over personal traits.

- **Leadership, School Climate, and Performance:** Strong leadership is closely linked to a positive school climate and higher student achievement. Effective leadership fosters motivation and engagement.
- **Challenges in Leadership and School Climate:** School heads and teachers face major challenges such as lack of innovation, student disengagement, teacher demotivation, and insufficient resources. Addressing these requires focused leadership development, staff support, and efficient resource management.

V. Recommendations

- **School Heads' and Teachers' Profiles:** To bridge the gap between experienced school heads and younger teachers, it is recommended that the Department of Education (DepEd) and local divisions establish mentoring programs. Pairing new teachers with experienced mentors can foster collaboration and support professional growth.
- **Leadership Attributes:** School heads should undergo targeted leadership training focused on enhancing transformational, instructional, and managerial skills. Emphasis should be placed on creativity, innovation, and strategic thinking to address today's educational challenges.
- **Learners' Academic Performance:** To raise performance levels beyond "satisfactory," schools are advised to adopt evidence-based teaching strategies, use assessment data for targeted interventions, and implement differentiated instruction and remedial programs for struggling students.
- **School Climate:** Improving the school environment should be a top priority. Suggested actions include introducing more extracurricular activities, value-based lessons, and psychosocial support, along with building stronger teacher-student relationships to enhance student engagement.
- **School Heads' Profile and Leadership:** Leadership development programs should be shaped around school heads' qualifications and experience. Promotion and training pathways should be aligned to support leadership competency, rather than based solely on tenure or age.
- **Teachers' Profile and Perception of Leadership:** Regular surveys and focus group discussions are encouraged to allow teachers to share feedback on school leadership. This input can help leaders adjust their styles and foster a better working relationship with teachers.

- School Heads' Profile and Academic Performance: Since demographics are limited in predicting success, leadership evaluations should focus on actual performance and impact—such as the implementation of effective teaching strategies and student support systems.
- Teachers' Profile and Academic Performance: Continuous professional development is vital for teachers regardless of their background. Schools should encourage participation in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) for collaborative learning and data-driven teaching improvements.
- Leadership, Performance, and Climate: Strengthening leadership capacity is central to fostering student success. Emphasis should be placed on trust-building, collaboration, and shared decision-making to create a positive school climate that supports achievement.
- Challenges in Leadership and School Climate: A school-wide approach is needed to tackle recurring challenges such as limited resources, low student engagement, and insufficient teacher support. Collaborative planning between school heads and division officials can lead to customized, inclusive leadership strategies tailored to each school's needs.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alem Amsalu, & Sintayehu Belay. (2024). Analyzing the contribution of school climate to academic achievement using structural equation modeling. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 52(3), 456-478. <https://doi.org/10.1177/174114322311456>
- [2] Allen, N., Grigsby, B., & Peters, M. L. (2015). Does leadership matter? Examining the relationship among transformational leadership, school climate, and student achievement. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 10(2), 1-22.
- [3] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. SAGE Publications.
- [4] Becerra, S. (2016). School climate of educational institutions: Design and validation of a diagnostic scale. *International Education Studies*, 9(5), 96-107. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v9n5p96>
- [5] Cohen, J., McCabe, E. M., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 111(1), 180-213.
- [6] Cornell, D., Huang, F., Konold, T., Shukla, K., Malone, M., Datta, P., Jia, Y., Stohlman, S., Burnette, A., & Meyer, J. P. (2016). *Development of a standard model for school climate and safety assessment: Final report*. Curry School of Education, University of Virginia.
- [7] Daily, S., Mann, M., Kristjansson, A., Smith, M., & Zullig, K. (2019). School climate and academic achievement in middle and high school students. *Journal of School Health*, 89(3), 173-180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12726>
- [8] Darling-Hammond, L., & Cook-Harvey, C. M. (2018). *Educating the whole child: Improving school climate to support student success*. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Educating_Whole_Child_REPORT.pdf

- [9] Department of Education. (2015). Guidelines on the enhanced school improvement planning (SIP) process and the school report card (SRC) (Department Order No. 44, s. 2015). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/09/29/do-44-s-2015-guidelines-on-the-enhanced-school-improvement-planning-sip-process-and-the-school-report-card-src/>
- [10] Duraku, Z. H., & Hoxha, L. (2021). Effects of school climate and parent support on academic performance: Implications for school reform. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 30(3), 222-236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10567879211015946>
- [11] Gemnafle, M., Waimuri, S., & Batlolona, J. (2018). Organizational climate of the school and teacher performance improvement in the 21st century. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 7(2), 119-126. <https://doi.org/10.21275/ART20179865>
- [12] Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125-142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- [13] Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2013). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- [14] Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945-980. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626800>
- [15] Martin, S. F. (2020). The relationship between high school students' academic performance and their perceptions of school climate [Doctoral dissertation, Tennessee State University]. Digital Scholarship @ Tennessee State University. <https://digitalscholarship.tnstate.edu/dissertations/AAI27832508>
- [16] Ministry of Education. (2018). Ethiopian education development roadmap (2018-30). Education Strategy Center.
- [17] National Economic and Development Authority. (2017). Philippine development plan 2017-2022. <https://pdp.neda.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Pre-publication-copy-Updated-PDP-2017-2022.pdf>
- [18] National School Climate Center. (2015). The school climate challenge: Narrowing the gap between school climate research and school climate policy. <https://www.schoolclimate.org>
- [19] Nilsen, T., Kaarstein, H., & Lehre, A. (2022). Trend analyses of TIMSS 2015 and 2019: School factors related to declining performance in mathematics. *Large-scale Assessments in Education*, 10(15), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-022-00134-8>
- [20] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2016). What makes a school a learning organization? A guide for policy makers, school leaders and teachers. <https://www.oecd.org/education/school/school-learning-organisation.pdf>
- [21] Ramazan, O., Danielson, R. W., Rougee, A., Ardasheva, Y., & Austin, B. W. (2023). Effects of classroom and school climate on language minority students' PISA mathematics self-concept and achievement scores. *Large-scale Assessments in Education*, 11(11), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-023-00156-w>
- [22] Ramsey, C. M., Spira, A. P., Parisi, J. M., & Rebok, G. W. (2016). School climate: Perceptual differences between students, parents, and school staff. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 27(4), 629-641. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2016.1199436>
- [23] Savaş, G., & Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2020). Okullarda Öğrenme İklimi Ölçeği'nin (OÖİÖ) geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [Development of the School Learning Climate Scale: Validity and reliability study]. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 50, 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.9779/pauefd.781446>

- [24] Shakeel, M. D., & DeAngelis, C. A. (2018). Can private schools improve school climate? Evidence from a nationally representative sample. *Journal of School Choice*, 12(3), 426-445. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2018.1490383>
- [25] Shindler, J., Jones, A., Williams, A., Taylor, C., & Cardenas, H. (2016). The school climate-student achievement connection: If we want achievement gains, we need to begin by improving the climate. *Journal of School Administration Research and Development*, 1(1), 9-16.
- [26] Smerek, R. (2017). *Organizational learning and performance: The science and practice of building a learning culture*. Oxford University Press.
- [27] Sulak, T. N. (2018). School climate: The controllable and the uncontrollable. *Educational Studies*, 44(3), 279-294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2017.1373630>
- [28] Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 357-385. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483907>
- [29] Tomaszewski, W., Xiang, N., & Huang, Y. (2023). School climate, student engagement and academic achievement across school sectors in Australia. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 50(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-023-00618-8>
- [30] World Bank. (2020). Ethiopia general education quality improvement project (GEQIP II) implementation completion and results report (Report No. ICR00004418). <https://documents.worldbank.org/>