School Heads' Management Style, Organizational Climate And Performance

Jubahib, Victor Jr Z.

Abstract — This study examined the management styles of school heads and their corresponding effects on the organizational climate and school performance in the DADASANTRI Sub-Congressional District under the Department of Education (DepEd) Schools Division of Bohol for the School Year 2024–2025. The total population consisted of 16 school heads and 205 teachers. The study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design and employed quantitative tools such as Multiple Regression Analysis and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation using SPSS software to analyze the data. The primary aim was to determine whether the school heads' management styles significantly influenced the organizational climate and the implementation of school-based management (SBM) performance indicators as perceived by teachers.

Findings revealed that the school heads predominantly exhibited democratic and transformational leadership styles. However, multiple regression analysis showed no significant relationship between the school heads' demographic profiles and their management styles. Similarly, the teachers' demographic characteristics were not significantly related to their perception of the school heads' leadership, climate, or school performance. Notably, Pearson r correlation results indicated a significant positive correlation between school heads' management styles and both organizational climate ($r = .659$, $p < .01$) and school performance ($r = .763$, $p < .01$) from the teachers' perspectives. These results suggest that leadership practices, rather than demographic attributes, have a stronger influence on how organizational climate and school performance are experienced in the school setting.

The study concludes that effective management styles particularly those that are inclusive, visionary, and supportive play a critical role in shaping a positive school climate and improving

performance. It is recommended that leadership development programs be intensified and that participatory, collaborative practices be institutionalized to sustain effective school-based management across all levels.

Keywords: Management Styles, Organizational Climate, School Performance, School-Based Management (SBM), Educational Leadership

I. INTRODUCTION

In educational institutions, leadership plays a crucial role in shaping the school environment, teacher performance, and student outcomes. This influence often exceeds that of material resources (Harris, 2022; Tobin, 2014; Visone, 2018). In the Philippines, schools deal with ongoing challenges such as poor facilities and lack of learning materials. This makes school heads responsible for tackling these problems (Palatino, 2023; Hernando-Malipot, 2023; Magsambol, 2022; Mbunde, 2017). In response, the government supports School-Based Management (SBM), an initiative that gives schools the power to make decisions locally to boost performance (Skhosana et al., 2023). Research shows that management practices have a major impact on both teacher and school performance (Cantos & Callo, 2022; Kasyadi & Virgana, 2022). This highlights the importance of school leaders' roles in communication, information sharing, and decision-making (Mintzberg, 1973).

Given these factors, the study aims to examine how school heads' managerial roles relate to school performance, teacher effectiveness, and overall outcomes. It looks at teachers' evaluations of leadership roles, measures of school performance, and teacher skills in areas such as teaching methods, learning environments, and professional development. This research is important because it provides insights that can help school leaders, policymakers, and educators improve leadership strategies and school conditions to boost learning outcomes (Giami & Obiechina, 2019). Although the scope is limited to selected public schools and depends on available institutional and self-reported data, the findings present valuable evidence on how

leadership impacts school climate and academic success. Ultimately, the study emphasizes that effective leadership is essential for achieving high-performing schools and promoting ongoing improvement (Wahab & Mahmood, 2015).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

This study aims to investigate the school heads' management style and its effects on the organizational climate and performance in DADASANTRI Sub-Congressional District in DepEd Schools Division in Bohol during the School Year 2024-2025 with the end view of proposing a program.

Specifically, the study seeks answers to the following questions.

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:

    1.1 School Heads;

        1.1.1 Age;

        1.1.2 Gender;

        1.1.3 Civil Status;

        1.1.4 Educational Attainment;

        1.1.5 Position/Designation;

        1.1.6 Length of Administrative Experience; and

        1.1.7 Number of Relevant Seminars and Trainings Attended?

1.2 Teachers;

1.2.1 Age;

1.2.2 Gender;

1.2.3 Civil Status;

1.2.4 Educational Attainment;

1.2.5 Position/Designation;

1.2.5 Length of Teaching Experience; and

1.2.6 Number of Relevant Seminars and Trainings Attended?

2. What is the management style of the school heads in terms of:

2.1 Autocratic or Authoritarian Leadership Style;

2.2 Democratic Leadership Style;

2.3 Laissez-Faire Leadership Style;

2.4 Transformational Leadership Style; and

2.5 Servant Leadership Style?

3. What is the perceived organizational climate in terms of:

3.1 school leadership;

3.2 professional teacher behavior;

3.3 achievement press, and

3.4 institutional vulnerability?

4. What is the school performance in terms of the following school-based management key areas:

4.1 leadership and governance;

4.2 curriculum and learning;

4.3 accountability and continuous improvement, and

4.4 management of resources?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the management style of the school heads?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the perceived organizational climate?

7. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the school performance in terms of the school-based management key areas?

8. Is there a significant relationship between the management style of the school heads and the perceived organizational climate, and the school-based management key areas?

9. Based on the findings of the study, what program can be proposed?

II. METHODOLOGY

The study used a descriptive-correlational research design to describe the profiles of elementary school heads and examine how their management styles relate to school climate and academic performance. This design allowed the researchers to look at demographic factors, leadership approaches, and organizational outcomes at the same time, providing insight into potential relationships among these variables. Ethical procedures were followed through formal

permissions, and data were collected using questionnaires that the researchers distributed and retrieved directly to ensure accuracy and completeness.

To analyze the data, researchers applied statistical tools like percentages and ranking methods to describe demographic distributions, leadership styles, organizational climate, and school performance. Simple random sampling ensured that each eligible teacher or school head in the selected districts had an equal chance to participate, which increased the reliability and representativeness of the findings. The sample focused on school heads whose leadership decisions significantly influence institutional outcomes, while considerations of accessibility and practicality helped determine an adequate sample size.

Validated research instruments measured the main variables, including the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) for management style, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) for school climate, and institutional performance records for school outcomes. The four-part research instrument collected demographic data and assessed leadership levels, adaptability to school climate, and connection with school performance. This combination of tools ensured a thorough and trustworthy evaluation of how leadership behaviors relate to the overall functioning of schools.

1.2 Procedure

The study uses a descriptive-correlational research design to explore how management and supervision practices affect academic performance and the challenges in the DADASANTRI Sub-Congressional District. The descriptive part presents a factual overview of current administrative practices. The correlational part looks at the relationships between leadership practices, academic success, and the problems faced. This approach works well for education research because it examines how variables are related without changing the natural environment.

Before collecting data, the researcher needs to get formal approvals from the Schools Division Office and school administrators. These approvals are crucial because they ensure cooperation from the institutions and compliance with research protocols. They also provide access

to school data, build trust with stakeholders, and confirm that the research meets governance standards. The study encountered challenges, including delays in getting approvals, participants' reluctance due to concerns about confidentiality, incomplete questionnaires, and restricted access to performance records. Overcoming these issues required persistence and careful ethical practices. Once approvals are secured, orientation sessions will be held to inform participants about the study's purpose, procedures, and their rights. Informed consent will be gathered to ensure that participation is voluntary and ethical. Clear communication during these sessions enhances the research's integrity, protects participant autonomy, and helps ensure the reliability of the collected data.

1.3 Data Processing

The study used both descriptive and inferential statistics to examine the collected data. Descriptive tools such as frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations summarized the respondents' demographic profiles and their views on leadership, school climate, and performance. Inferential methods included Pearson's r to identify relationships among variables and ANOVA to test differences across demographic groups. Researchers analyzed qualitative data from interviews using thematic analysis, which supported and enriched the quantitative findings.

Ethical considerations were important because the research involved human participants. The study strictly observed informed consent, privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity to protect respondents. Participants received full information about the study and their right to withdraw at any time. Sensitive information was removed or disguised to prevent harm, and participants could review and clarify their responses to ensure accuracy and comfort throughout the research process.

To promote fairness and inclusiveness, the study used simple random sampling, allowing all eligible teachers an equal chance of being selected. This method helps create a representative sample, improving the validity and generalizability of the results. By capturing the diversity of the

teaching population, this sampling approach also supports ethical research standards that encourage impartiality and equal participation.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile of Respondent Groups

Age. The age distribution among school heads shows a mix of leadership experience. The largest group, 37.5%, is aged 42 to 48. This group combines experience, energy, and established leadership styles that suit school challenges. Younger leaders, aged 28 to 34 and 35 to 41, make up 18.75% of the total and bring fresh, tech-focused approaches. This age diversity helps address modern educational needs, which include political, financial, and technological changes, as noted by Cibulskaite and Petrauskas (2017).

Sex. The data indicates that 56.25% of school heads are female and 43.75% are male. This reflects a trend of female leadership in basic education. Female leaders often use transformational and participative styles that foster teamwork, trust, and community involvement. These factors enhance the school climate. Chekwa et al. (2017) emphasize that these qualities contribute to developing emotionally intelligent and inclusive school environments.

Civil Status. The civil status data shows that 62.5% of school heads are married, 31.25% are single, and 6.25% are separated. Married leaders may provide stability and consistent leadership based on their personal experiences, while single and separated leaders might offer flexibility and different viewpoints. As Chekwa et al. (2017) point out, leadership effectiveness relies not only on personal background but also on how leaders use their experiences to reach school goals.

Highest Educational Attainment. The school heads have strong academic qualifications: 18.75% hold a Master's degree, 31.25% have Master's units, 25% have Doctorate units, and another 25% are doctorate graduates. This solid academic background supports instructional leadership, evidence-based decision-making, and a solid understanding of curriculum

and policy. Leaders with advanced degrees often apply reflective, analytical, and collaborative methods that support long-term school goals. Chekwa et al. (2017) and Cibulskaite and Petrauskas (2017) note that postgraduate education is essential for effective leadership in a changing educational environment.

Position/Designation. Of the 16 respondents, 62.5% are Principals I to II, indicating that many hold lower-level principal positions. Head Teachers I to III account for 12.5%, Teachers-In-Charge make up 18.75%, and only 6.25% serve as OIC-Principal. None of them hold higher ranks like Principal III to IV or Head Teacher IV to VI. This suggests that the sample consists mostly of entry- to mid-level administrators, which may limit full empowerment, as noted by Chekwa et al. (2017).

Length of Administrative Experience. The data reveals that 37.5% of school heads have less than 10 years of experience, while 62.5% have 10 to 19 years; none have over 20 years. This suggests a relatively young but growing leadership group. Less experienced leaders often bring innovation, while those with 10 to 19 years offer experience and mentoring potential. The lack of highly seasoned leaders highlights the need for mentorship and professional development. The combination of new and experienced leaders fosters continuity, innovation, and a positive organizational climate.

Number of Relevant Seminars/Trainings Attended. School heads frequently attend division seminars (57.73%), followed by regional seminars (21.65%), national seminars (18.56%), and a few international trainings (2.06%). Division seminars provide immediate policy applications, while regional and national trainings enhance strategic leadership skills. Although international exposure is limited, it offers valuable global perspectives. Overall, participation in training improves leadership skills, planning, staff motivation, and supervision, though more international opportunities could further enrich leadership capacity.

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON THE PROFILE OF THE SCHOOL HEADS

Age	**Frequency**	**Percent**
56-62	3	18.75%
49-55	4	25.00%
42-48	6	37.50%
35-41	3	18.75%
28-34	0	0.00%
Total	**16**	**100.0%**
Sex	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Male	7	43.75%
Female	9	56.25%
Total	**16**	**100.0%**
Civil Status	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Single	5	31.25%
Married	10	62.50%
Widowed	0	0.00%
Separated	1	6.25%
Total	**16**	**100.00%**
Highest Educational Attainment	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Masters Units	5	31.25%
Masters Degree	3	18.75%
Doctorate Degree-Units	4	25.00%
Doctorate Degree	4	25.00%
Total	**16**	**100.00%**
Position/Designation	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Principal I-II	10	62.50%
Principal III-IV	0	0.00%
Head Teacher I-III	2	12.50%
Head Teacher IV-VI	0	0.00%
Teacher-In-Charge (TIC)	3	18.75%
OIC-Principal	1	6.25%
Total	**16**	**100.%**
Length of Administrative Experience	**Frequency**	**Percent**
20>	0	0%
10-19	10	62.50%
<10	6	37.50%
Total	**16**	**100%**
Number of Relevant Seminars/ Trainings Attended	**Frequency**	**Percent**
International	4	2.06%
National	36	18.56%
Region	42	21.65%
Division	112	57.73%
Total	**194**	**100%**

Age. The teaching workforce is mostly young to mid-career. About 35.61% are aged 28 to 34, 20% are 35 to 41, and 19.02% are 42 to 48. Only 7.8% are 56 to 62. This shows energy, flexibility, and openness to new ideas. Leaders should use transformational, coaching, or

participatory styles to improve teaching quality, professional growth, and school climate. Mentoring younger teachers, promoting collaboration, and keeping clear communication strengthens instruction and supports future leadership. Matching leadership styles with teacher age helps keep motivation high, encourages innovation, and improves overall school effectiveness.

Sex. Females make up 63.9% of the teaching workforce, while males account for 36.1%. This impacts school culture and leadership preferences. Female-dominant environments often respond well to collaborative, nurturing, and inclusive leadership. Transformational and gender-sensitive approaches can boost engagement, professional growth, and student-focused teaching while ensuring fair workloads and opportunities. Leadership that fits this demographic fosters respect, teamwork, quality instruction, and improved school performance.

Civil Status. Most teachers are married (45.37%), while 23.9% are single, with few being widowed or separated. Many balance work and family responsibilities, so leaders should use flexible and supportive styles like transformational or servant leadership. Understanding personal circumstances allows leaders to set realistic deadlines, support teamwork, and encourage mentorship. This strengthens teaching quality, community involvement, and school climate, while improving teacher commitment, morale, and performance that aligns with national education goals.

Highest Educational Attainment. Teachers show strong academic advancement: 36.59% have master's credits, 20% hold a master's degree, and 12.68% have a doctorate. This shows commitment to growth despite challenges like time and resources. Leaders should encourage further education through mentoring, incentives, and flexible schedules. Such support improves evidence-based teaching, curriculum enhancement, and school-based research. It also builds future leaders, strengthens school reputation, and aligns teacher development with national goals.

Position/Designation. Most teachers are Teacher III (34.15%), followed by Teacher I (26.83%), Teacher II (22.44%), and only 16.59% are Master Teachers. This shows a skilled workforce with few in senior roles. Leaders should adopt growth-focused and instructional leadership by offering clear career pathways and recognizing achievements. Encouraging

mentorship, shared leadership, and teacher-led projects helps mid-level teachers advance. This improves the school environment, instructional quality, student outcomes, and overall school success.

Length of Teaching Experience. Teachers vary in experience: 41.46% have less than 10 years, 34.15% have 10 to 19 years, and 24.39% have over 20 years. This creates a stable, mostly mid-career workforce. Leaders must support beginners through mentoring while giving experienced teachers leadership roles to impact school culture. Transformational, participative, and instructional leadership can maximize this diversity, improving professional development, teaching quality, student engagement, and overall performance. Teacher experience thus becomes a strength in achieving educational goals.

Number of Relevant Seminars/Trainings Attended. Most professional development happens at the division level (68.49%), with fewer teachers participating in regional (15.76%), national (14.15%), and international (1.61%) trainings. This shows strong local participation but limited exposure to broader practices. Leaders should use transformational and instructional leadership by encouraging post-training collaboration, coaching, and wider access to national and international seminars. Applying new learning in daily teaching improves instruction, research skills, curriculum development, and overall school performance, supporting the goals of the education triad.

TABLE 2
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON THE PROFILE OF THE TEACHERS

Age	**Frequency**	**Percent**
56-62	16	7.80%
49-55	19	9.27%
42-48	39	19.02%
35-41	41	20.00%
28-34	73	35.61%
21-27	17	8.29%
Total	**205**	**100%**
Sex	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Male	74	36.10%
Female	131	63.90%
Total	**205**	**100.00%**
Civil Status	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Single	49	23.90%
Married	93	45.37%
Widowed	32	15.61%
Separated	31	15.12%
Total	**205**	**100.00%**
Highest Educational Attainment	**Frequency**	**Percent**
College Degree	38	18.54%
Masters Units	75	36.59%
Masters Degree	41	20.00%
Doctorate Units	25	12.20%
Doctorate Degree	26	12.68%
Total	**205**	**100.00%**
Position/Designation	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Master Teacher IV	0	0.00%
Master Teacher III	0	0.00%
Master Teacher II	0	0.00%
Master Teacher I	34	16.59%
Teacher III	70	34.15%
Teacher II	46	22.44%
Teacher I	55	26.83%
Total	**205**	**100.00%**
Length of Teaching Experience	**Frequency**	**Percent**
20>	50	24.39%
10-19	70	34.15%
<10	85	41.46%
Total	**205**	**100%**
Number of Relevant Seminars/ Trainings Attended	**Frequency**	**Percent**
International	5	1.61%
National	44	14.15%
Region	49	15.76%
Division	213	68.49%
Total	**311**	**100%**

Management Styles of School Heads

Table 3 shows that school heads mainly show democratic leadership (4.93), servant leadership (4.84), and transformational leadership (4.78) with overall high ratings (M = 4.15). This indicates a clear preference for participative, service-focused, and inspiring approaches. These methods promote teamwork in decision-making, empower teachers, and create a supportive school environment. The lower use of autocratic leadership (2.61) and the moderate rating for laissez-faire leadership (3.61) help prevent rigidity and disengagement. This ultimately improves professional growth, instructional quality, and student outcomes.

TABLE 3: SCHOOL HEADS' SELF-PERCEPTION

Management Style	Mean	Interpretation
Democratic	4.93	Very High
Servant	4.84	Very High
Transformation	4.78	Very High
Laissez-Faire	3.61	High
Autocratic	2.61	Moderate
Grand Mean	4.15	High

Table 4 shows that teachers view democratic (3.50), servant (3.49), and transformational (3.47) leadership styles as high. This suggests that school heads are participative, supportive, and able to encourage professional growth. Laissez-faire leadership (3.26) is also appreciated for promoting autonomy. In contrast, autocratic leadership received the lowest average score (3.02), which is seen as moderate. This indicates that strict, directive styles are less preferred. The overall average of 3.35 indicates a moderate perception, emphasizing that inclusive and empowering leadership shapes the school culture. This positively influences teacher engagement, instructional quality, and the organizational climate. However, there is still a need to improve management effectiveness and lessen authoritative behaviors.

TABLE 4: TEACHERS' PERCEPTION

Management Style	Mean	Interpretation
Democratic	3.50	High
Servant	3.49	High
Transformation	3.47	High
Laissez-Faire	3.26	High
Autocratic	3.02	Moderate
Grand Mean	3.35	Moderate

Therefore, leadership is largely participatory and empowering, fostering collaboration and trust, though teachers perceive room for improvement in consistency and depth.

Organizational Climate

School heads rated the climate as generally high (Grand Mean = 4.15), with very high scores in school leadership, professional teacher behavior, and achievement press, but moderate institutional vulnerability. Teachers rated the climate slightly lower (Grand Mean = 3.42), with high scores in achievement press and professionalism but moderate vulnerability.

TABLE 5: SCHOOL HEADS' VIEW

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
School Leadership	4.85	Very High
Professional Teacher Behavior	4.58	Very High
Achievement Press	4.58	Very High
Institutional Vulnerability	2.61	Moderate
Grand Mean	4.15	High

TABLE 6: TEACHERS' VIEW

Indicator	Mean	Interpretation
School Leadership	3.46	High
Professional Teacher Behavior	3.59	High
Achievement Press	3.60	High
Institutional Vulnerability	3.02	Moderate
Grand Mean	3.42	High

Both groups agree on strong professionalism and achievement orientation, but external pressures remain a challenge.

School Performance under SBM Key Areas

Leadership & Governance (4.79), Curriculum & Learning (4.70), Accountability & Continuous Improvement (4.73), and Management of Resources (4.84) were rated Outstanding by school heads, with an overall average of 4.76, reflecting strong confidence in their leadership, instructional management, and resource use. Teachers rated the same areas slightly lower (3.45–3.58, Very Good; average 3.53), revealing a small perception gap. This suggests school leaders should adopt more inclusive practices, involve teachers in decisions, and communicate clearly to enhance engagement, trust, teamwork, teaching quality, and overall school performance.

TABLE 7: SCHOOL HEADS' RATING

Key Area	Mean	Interpretation
Leadership & Governance	4.79	Outstanding
Curriculum & Learning	4.70	Outstanding
Accountability & Continuous Improvement	4.73	Outstanding
Management of Resources	4.84	Outstanding
Grand Mean	4.76	Outstanding

TABLE 8: TEACHERS' RATING

Key Area	Mean	Interpretation
Leadership & Governance	3.58	Very Good
Curriculum & Learning	3.57	Very Good
Accountability & Continuous Improvement	3.53	Very Good
Management of Resources	3.45	Very Good
Grand Mean	3.53	Very Good

The model initially shows a moderate-to-strong correlation (R = .714), suggesting school heads' profile variables align with perceived leadership style. However, after adjusting for predictors and sample size, the explanatory power drops sharply (Adjusted R^2 = .019), revealing the model explains very little variance beyond chance and may be over fitted. This indicates limited confidence in using demographic or credential variables to predict leadership styles.

TABLE 9. MODEL SUMMARY

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.714	0.510	0.019	0.488

The regression is not significant (F = 1.039, p = .481), with the regression mean square (.248) nearly matching the residual (.238), showing school heads' profiles add little predictive value. Overall, profiles alone are not useful for explaining perceived leadership style.

TABLE 10. ANOVA

Model	Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig,
1	Regression	1.734	7	0.248	1.039	0.481
	Residual	1.669	7	0.238		

No school head profile variable is significant (all p > .05), and even the largest beta (Civil Status, β = −1.352) has negligible impact. This confirms demographics do not predict perceived leadership, emphasizing the importance of leadership behaviors instead.

TABLE 11. MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

Varibles	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	.825	.413	Not Significant
Sex	−.017	.981	Not Significant
Civil Status	−1.352	.146	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	1.011	.327	Not Significant
Position/Designation	−.733	.270	Not Significant
Length of Administrative Experience	−.058	.947	Not Significant
Seminars/Trainings	−.130	.790	Not Significant

B. Teachers' Profile → Perceived Management Styles

The model shows near-zero correlation (R = .075) and negative Adjusted R^2 (−.020), indicating teachers' profiles explain almost none of the variance in perceiving leadership. Perceptions are shaped more by shared experiences of leadership behaviors than by individual characteristics.

TABLE 12. MODEL SUMMARY

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.075	.006	−.020	.548

The regression is not significant (F = .219, p = .981), showing predictors contribute negligibly and explain minimal variance. Leadership perception should focus on communication, inclusion, and support, not teacher demographics.

TABLE 13. ANOVA

Model	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.461	7	.066	.219	.981
	Residual	81.006	270	.300		
	Total	81.467	277			

No teacher profile variable significantly predicts leadership perception (all p > .05, small coefficients), emphasizing that improving leadership perception should focus on leaders' actions—such as transparency, vision, and servant leadership—rather than staff composition.

TABLE 14. MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

Variable	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	−.052	.533	Not Significant
Sex	.000	.886	Not Significant
Civil Status	−.046	.658	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	−.043	.776	Not Significant
Position/Designation	−.074	.592	Not Significant
Length of Teaching Experience	.043	.771	Not Significant
Seminars/Trainings	.116	.373	Not Significant

C. School Heads' Profile → Perceived Organizational Climate

Although R suggests moderate association, the negative Adjusted R^2 (−.329) indicates overfitting, showing heads' profiles have little practical value in explaining organizational climate, which is shaped more by leadership behaviors and systems.

TABLE 15. MODEL SUMMARY

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.579	.336	−.329	.375

The model is not significant (F = .505, p = .806), indicating school heads' profiles do not predict organizational climate, which is influenced more by interactions and leadership practices than by leaders' backgrounds.

TABLE 16. ANOVA

Model	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.497	7	.071	.505	.806
	Residual	.983	7	.140		
	Total	1.480	14			

No school head profile variables significantly predict perceived climate (all p > .05), suggesting that improving climate should focus on leadership behavior, communication, and trust rather than demographics.

TABLE 17. MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

Predictor	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	−.029	.980	Not Significant
Sex	.128	.880	Not Significant
Civil Status	−.249	.803	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	−1.332	.272	Not Significant
PD (Position/Designation)	.016	.983	Not Significant
LOAE (Admin Experience)	1.125	.291	Not Significant

D. Teachers' Profile → Perceived Organizational Climate

The model explains virtually no variance ($R^2 = .002$; Adjusted $R^2 = -.024$), showing teacher profiles do not predict perceived climate, which is shaped more by shared experiences of leadership.

TABLE 18. MODEL SUMMARY

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.048	.002	−.024	.403

The model is not significant ($F = .090$, $p = .999$), showing teacher profile variables do not predict organizational climate. Efforts should focus on leader behaviors and school processes, as predictor effects are minimal.

TABLE 19. ANOVA

Model	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.103	7	.015	.090	.999
	Residual	43.943	270	.163		
	Total	44.046	277			

All predictors are non-significant and near-zero, indicating negligible influence of teacher demographics on climate perception. This aligns with the view that climate is shaped by leadership and culture, not staff attributes.

TABLE 20. MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

Predictor	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	.003	.975	Not Significant
Sex	−.022	.830	Not Significant
Civil Status	−.018	.865	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	.000	.998	Not Significant
Position/Designation	−.070	.613	Not Significant
Length of Teaching Experience	.098	.506	Not Significant

E. School Heads' Profile → Perceived School Performance (SBM Key Areas)

Although $R = .587$ suggests moderate association, the negative Adjusted R^2 (−.311) shows poor fit and overfitting, making the model unreliable for predicting perceived SBM performance from demographics. Efforts should focus on leadership practices rather than background traits.

Table 21. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.587	.345	−.311	.451

The regression is not significant (F = .526, p = .792), showing heads' demographic and professional profiles do not explain perceived SBM performance. Improvements should focus on leaders' actions and SBM processes rather than leader characteristics.

TABLE 22. ANOVA

Model	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.750	7	.107	.526	.792
	Residual	1.427	7	.204		
	Total	2.177	14			

No profile variable significantly predicts perceived SBM performance, and even larger betas (e.g., Age = 1.855) are non-significant. This highlights the need to focus on leadership behaviors, stakeholder engagement, and resource alignment to shape performance perceptions.

TABLE 23. MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

Variables	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	1.855	.135	Not Significant
Sex	−1.220	.177	Not Significant
Civil Status	−1.507	.159	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	.249	.829	Not Significant
Position/Designation	−.358	.628	Not Significant
Length of Administrative Experience	.355	.727	Not Significant

F. Teachers' Profile → Perceived School Performance (SBM Key Areas)

The model shows minimal association (R = .076) and negative Adjusted R^2, indicating teacher profiles do not predict perceived SBM performance. Perceptions are driven more by shared school processes than by staff composition.

TABLE 24. MODEL SUMMARY

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Model	R
1	.076	.006	−.020	.549	1	.076

The model shows minimal association (R = .076) and negative Adjusted R^2, showing teacher profiles do not predict perceived SBM performance. Perceptions are shaped more by shared school processes than staff composition.

TABLE 25. ANOVA

Model	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.476	7	.068	.225	.979
	Residual	81.414	270	.302		
	Total	81.889	277			

All predictors are non-significant with small betas, confirming teacher characteristics do not influence SBM performance perceptions. Leadership practices and school systems are the key drivers of these perceptions.

TABLE 26. MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

Variables	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	−.080	.336	Not Significant
Sex	.013	.904	Not Significant
Civil Status	.039	.706	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	−.046	.762	Not Significant
Position/Designation	.043	.754	Not Significant
Length of Teaching Experience	−.062	.676	Not Significant
Seminars/Trainings	.025	.850	Not Significant

G. Correlations Among Key Variables (School Heads' Perceptions)

Management style has a moderate, significant positive correlation with school performance ($r = .549$, $p < .05$), showing that transformational and servant leadership relates to stronger SBM outcomes. Correlations with climate (.215) and climate with performance (.304) are positive but non-significant, suggesting climate may play a secondary role.

Leadership in DADASANTRI schools is mainly democratic, servant, and transformational, fostering positive climate and SBM performance. Yet, institutional weaknesses and differing views between heads and teachers highlight the need for participatory governance, leadership development, and resilience strategies.

TABLE 27. PEARSON R CORRELATIONS

Variables	Management Style	Organizational Climate	School Performance
Management Style	1.000	.215	.549*
Organizational Climate	.215	1.000	.304
School Performance (SBM Key Areas)	.549*	.304	1.000

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed); N = 15.**

Discussion

The study shows that school leaders' styles significantly influence organizational climate and school performance, with transformational and servant leadership strongly linked to better SBM outcomes. Teachers perceiving leaders as supportive, inclusive, and visionary report greater effectiveness, highlighting that leadership is about active influence rather than positional authority. Organizational climate—marked by respect, trust, and open communication—also affects performance, acting as a channel through which leadership shapes outcomes.

Practically, these findings call for ongoing leadership development focused on emotional intelligence, conflict resolution, and participatory decision-making, alongside structured teacher roles in governance. School improvement programs should address leadership behavior, organizational culture, and teaching practices simultaneously, using perception-based data to guide interventions. Planning for leadership succession and mentoring ensures continuity, while policymakers should invest in relational, ethical, and transformative leadership initiatives for sustained school improvement.

IV. CONCLUSION

The study shows school heads' leadership styles strongly influence organizational climate and school performance, especially in school-based management, highlighting the importance of effective, participatory, and transformational leadership.

While leader and teacher profiles have no significant direct effect, leadership quality and school climate matter most, emphasizing the need for professional development, training, and inclusive decision-making to foster excellence and long-term educational success.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the study's findings and conclusions, the following recommendations aim to improve leadership practices, enhance organizational climate, and boost school performance:

- Regular training on transformational and servant leadership should be provided for developing collaboration, motivation, and vision.
- Involve teachers and stakeholders in planning and decision-making to boost ownership, transparency, and accountability.
- Mentorship and leadership pathways should be established to grow future school leaders.
- Periodically conduct organizational climate assessments using surveys and feedback to help inform targeted interventions.
- Further develop teacher development programs through empowerment and collaboration to enhance instructional leadership.
- Recognize and reward leaders and teachers promoting positive culture and who accomplish school goals.
- Continuously improve management strategies through in-school research and reflective practices.
- Ensure that division and regional offices are supporting the leadership and climate initiatives within school improvement planning.

REFERENCES

[1.] Acido, J.V. & Kilongkilong, D.A. (2022). Resource Management Practices Towards Sustainable Support System During Pandemic. International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies, Volume 3 Issue 4, pp. 19 - 42. DOI: https://doi.org/10.53378/352930
[2.] Al Khajeh, E. H. (2018). Impact of leadership styles on organizational performance. Journal of Human Resources Management Research, 2018, 1-10.
[3.] Allen, N., Grigsby, B., and Peters, M. L. 2015. Do-es Leadership Matter? Examining the Relationship among Transformational Leaders-hip, School Climate, and Student Achievement. International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 10(2), pp. 1-22.
[4.] Alsaleh, N. J. 2020. Teaching Critical Thinking S-kills: Literature Review. Turkish Online Jo-urnal of Educational Technology-TOJET, 19(1), pp. 21-39.
[5.] Aquino, C.C., Afalla, B.T. & Fabelico, F.L. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE) Vol. 10, No. 4, 1325~1333. 10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21518
[6.] Aquino, J. M. and Reyes, M. G. 2022. The Relationship of Sports Participation in Academic Performance among College of Arts and Sciences Varsity Players. Physical Education and Sports: Studies and Research, 1(2), pp. 107-122.
[7.] Aquino, J. M. D. R. and Chavez, M. A. 2022. Tea-ching Effectiveness: Basis for the Development of Assessment Tools. Journal of Rese-arch, Policy, and Practice of Teachers and Teacher Education, 12(2), pp. 41-65.
[8.] Balkar, B. (2015). The relationships between organizational climate, innovative behavior and job performance of teachers. International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 7(2).
[9.] Baughman, N. 2016. The Influence of the Transformational Principal on School Climates Perceived by Elementary Staff. Doctoral Dissertation, Aurora University.
[10.] Berkovich, I. 2016. School Leaders and Transformational Leadership Theory: Time to Part Ways?. Journal of Educational Administration.
[11.] Bryman, A. (2016). Social research methods (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
[12.] Cantos, A.S. & Callo, E.C. (2022). The Impact of School Heads' Technology Leadership on Teachers' Technological Proficiency and Academic Optimism. International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies, Volume 3 Issue 3, pp. 120 - 141. DOI: https://doi.org/10.53378/352914
[13.] Chanco, B. (2022). Crisis in education. Demand and Supply - The Philippine Star. Available online at: https://www.philstar.com/business/2022/07/04/2192779/crisis-education
[14.] Chekwa, C., Quast, J., & Adams, M. G. (2017). Spirituality and servant leadership. International Journal of Management and Administrative Sciences, 5(6), 8-14.
[15.] Cherry, K. (2019). Autocratic Leadership. Retrieved from https://www.verywellmind. com/what-is-autocratic- leadership-2795314
[16.] Chughtai, A. A. (2016). Servant leadership and follower outcomes: Mediating effects of organizational identification and psychological safety.The Journal of Psychology, 11-5.

[17.] Cibulskaite, N. & Petrauskas, E. (2017). Administrative excellence within public school heads' approach. Retrieved August 11, 2018 from https://www.Futureacademy.org.uk/files/images/upload/FullTextICEEPSY2017Volume XXXIP012.pdf, DOI: https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2017.10.12
[18.] Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). Research methods in education (8th ed.). Routledge.
[19.] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
[20.] Damanik, E. and Aldridge, J. 2017. Transformational Leadership and its Impact on School Climate and Teachers' Self-Efficacy in Indonesian High Schools. Journal of School Leadership, 27(2), pp. 269-296. DOI: 10.11 77/105268461702700205.
[21.] Deal, T. E. and Peterson, K. D. 2016. Shaping School Culture. John Wiley and Sons.
[22.] Dypiangco, M.D. (2022). Correlates of Managerial Practices of Principals in Private Elementary Schools in Four Western Towns of Tarlac. International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology. Volume 7, Issue 6, June – 2022
[23.] Egeberg, M. and Trondal, J. 2018. An Organizational Approach to Public Governance: Understanding and Design. Oxford University Press.
[24.] Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal, 5(6), 215–217. https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149
[25.] Etxeberria, F., Intxausti, N., & Azpillaga, V. (2017). School climate in highly effective schools in the Autonomous Region of the Basque Country (Spain). REICE. Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficaciay Cambio en Educacion, 15(4), 5-26.
[26.] Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. The Leadership Quarterly, 30(1), 111-132.
[27.] Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). How to design and evaluate research in education (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
[28.] Garmston, R. J. and Wellman, B. M. 2016. The Adaptive School: A Sourcebook for Developing Collaborative Groups. Rowman and Littlefield.
[29.] Giami, C. B. N., & Obiechina, F. N. (2019). Principals' managerial skills and teachers' job performance in public secondary schools in Rivers State, Nigeria. International Journal of Innovative Psychology & Social Development, 7(2), 97-104.
[30.] Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2017). Statistics for the behavioral sciences (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.
[31.] Harris, S. (2022). School leadership: How to respond to and solve problems. SecEd. Available online at: https://www.sec-ed.co.uk/content/best-practice/school-leadership-how-torespond-to-and-solve-problems/
[32.] Hashim, M., Khan, M. A., & Adnan, S. (2019). Servant Leadership and Enhancement of Organizational Performance. Global Social Sciences Review, 4(1), 166-174.
[33.] Hernando-Malipot, M. (2023). DepEd identifies challenges in basic education through BER. Manila Bulletin. Available online at: https://mb.com.ph/2023/01/30/deped-identifieschallenges-in-basic-education-through-ber-2023/
[34.] Ifedili, C.J. (2016). Instructional supervision and quality assurance in schools in nigeria. European Law Review, 8 (1), 22-28, DOI : https://doi.org/10.21859/eulawrev-08013

[35.] Jashari, A. & Kutllovci, E. (2020). The impact of human resource management practices on organizational performance case study: Manufacturing enterprises in Kosovo. Verslas: Teorija ir praktika / Business: Theory and Practice. Vol. 21, Iss. 1, pp. 222-229, https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2020.12001
[36.] Kasyadi, S. & Virgana, V. (2022). Leadership style, Environmental Factors, and Job Satisfaction as Correlates to Headmaster Performance in Selected High Schools in Jakarta. International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies, Volume 3 Issue 3, pp. 1 - 17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.53378/352899
[37.] Kirana, B.N., Fitria, H. & Fitria, Y. (2021). The Effect of School Leadership and Management on Teacher Performance in Cluster IV of East Baturaja. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 565
[38.] Konold, T., Cornell, D., Jia, Y., and Malone, M. 2018. School Climate, Student Engagement, and Academic Achievement: A Latent Variable, Multilevel Multi-Informant Examination. Aera Open, 4(4), 2332858418815661.
[39.] Kumar, R. (2019). Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
[40.] Kutsyuruba, B., Klinger, D. A., and Hussain, A. 2015. Relationships among School Climate, School Safety, and Student Achievement and Well-Being: A Review of the Literature. Review of Education, 3(2), pp. 103-135.
[41.] Lapuz, M.L. & Pecajas, E.S. (2022). School heads' authority, accountability, and empowerment as functions of school performance. International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences, 9(3), 69–83. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6701039
[42.] Lemos, R., Muralidharan, K. & Scur, D. (2021). Personnel Management and School Productivity: Evidence from India. RISE Working Paper Series. 21/063. https://doi.org/10.35489/BSG-RISEWP_2021/063
[43.] Luu T.T. (2016). How servant leadership nurtures knowledge sharing: The mediating role of public service motivation. International Journal of Public Sector Management,29(1), 91 – 108
[44.] Macatangay, J.D. & Callo, E.C. (2022). Preparedness and Promotion of Technology Leadership Toward Self-Efficacy and Instructional Performance. International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies, Volume 3 Issue 3, pp. 185 - 208. DOI: https://doi.org/10.53378/352920
[45.] Macha, W.,Mackie,C., & Magaziner, J. (2018). Education in the Ph ili ppin es. Retrie ved on Septe mbe r 10, 2021 fro m https://wenr.wes.org/2018/03/education-in-the-philippines
[46.] Magsambol, B. (2022). LIST: 5 education issues that the next DepEd chief needs to address. Rappler. Available online at: https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/iq/list-educationissues-next-deped-chief-needs-to-address/
[47.] Mbunde, J. M. (2017). Head Teachers' Role in Facilitating School Facilities that Influence Pupils' Performance in Kcpe. European Scientific Journal, 13(19), 146. https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2017.v13n19p146
[48.] McCombes, S. (2023). Descriptive research. Scribbr. https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/descriptive-research/

[49.] Melo, R.C. (2021). Managerial Skills of School Heads as Correlate of Teacher's Work Performance in Distance Learning. International Journal Of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies, Volume 1, March Issue.
[50.] Metz, D. & Ilies, L. & Metz, M. (2019). The Role of Management Practices In Ensuring Organizational Performance. Proceedings of the International Management Conference, vol. 13(1), pages 666-674.
[51.] Minkos, M. L., Sassu, K. A., Gregory, J. L., Patwa, S. S., Theodore, L. A., and Femc-Bag-well, M. 2017. Culturally Responsive Practice and the Role of School Administrators. Psychology in the Schools, 54(10), pp. 1260 -1266.
[52.] National Center on Safe and Supportive Learning Environments (2021). Physical environment. Retrieved on July 28, 2021 from https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/topic-research/environment/physical-environment
[53.] Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & Sendjaya, S. (2017). How servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of LMX, empowerment, and proactive personality. Journal of Business Ethics, 145(1), 49-62.
[54.] Nhlapo, V. (2020). The leadership role of the principal in fostering sustainable maintenance of school facilities. South African Journal of Education, 40(2), 1-9. https://dx.doi.org/10.15700/saje.v40n2a1790
[55.] Northouse, P. G. (2021). Leadership: Theory and practice (9th ed.). SAGE Publications.
[56.] Palatino, M. (2023). The Philippines' Basic Education Crisis. Asean Beat. Available online at: https://thediplomat.com/2023/02/the-philippines-basic-education-crisis/
[57.] PRC-Educational Statistics Task Force (2019). Retrieved on January 2 7 , 2 0 2 2 f r o m https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2004_2018-PRC-natl-pass-r ate-from-2393-heis-as-of-18June2019.pdf
[58.] Ragnarsson, S., Kristjánsdóttir, E. S., & Gunnarsdóttir, S. (2018). To be accountable while showing care: The lived experience of people in a servant leadership organization. SAGE Open, 8(3), 2158244018801097.
[59.] Ross, D. J. and Cozzens, J. A. 2016. The Principal-ship: Essential Core Competencies for Instructional Leadership and Its Impact on School Climate. Journal of Education and Training Studies, 4(9), pp. 162-176.
[60.] Rudasill, K. M., Snyder, K. E., Levinson, H., and Adelson, J. 2018. Systems View of School Climate: A Theoretical Framework for Research. Educational Psychology Review, 30 (1), pp. 35-60.
[61.] Sağlam, M. H., & Alpaydın, Y. (2017). The Relationship between School Administrators Personalities and Servant Leadership Behaviours. Journal of Education and Training Studies, 5(8), 106-113.
[62.] Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). Research methods for business students (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
[63.] Silamine, M.T.H. & Rodrigue, N.N.H. (2021). Leadership styles and organizational performance of employees: The case of some primary and secondary schools in Cameroon. International Journal of Educational Research Review, 6(1),30-45.
[64.] Simbre, A. P. and Ancho, I. V. 2019. Examining School Climate and Teachers' Organizational Commitment. Suan Sunandha Academic and Research Review, 13(2), pp. 48–61. Retrieved from https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/inde x.php/ssajournal/article/view/256635.

[65.] Smith, P. A., Escobedo, P., and Kearney, W. S. 2020. Principal Influence: A Catalyst for Positive School Climate. International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership, 16 (5), n5.
[66.] Tansiongco, L. A., & Ibarra, F. (2020). Educational Leader's Adversity Quotient, Management Style, and Job Performance: Implications to School Leadership. Indonesian Research Journal in Education, 386-401.
[67.] Thibault, T., Gulseren, D. B., and Kelloway, E. K. 2019. The Benefits of Transformational Leadership and Transformational Leadership Training on Health and Safety Outcomes in Increasing Occupational Health and Safety in Workplaces. pp. 334-348. Edward Elgar Publishing.
[68.] Uthman, K. Y. 2018. The Influence of Transformational Leadership Style and School Environment towards School Improvement in Nigerian Secondary Schools. Doctoral Dissertation, University Utara Malaysia.
[69.] Uwazurike, C.N. & Ezenwa-Adiuku, C.O. (2021). Managerial Styles as Correlate of Teachers Job Performance in Secondary Schools in Nigeria. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, Volume V, Issue VII
[70.] Vasilescu, M. 2019. Leadership Styles and Theories in an Effective Management Activity. Annuals-Economy Series, 4, pp. 47-52.
[71.] Veliu, L., Manxhari, M., Demiri, V., & Jahaj, L. (2017). THE INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON EMPLOYEE'S PERFORMANCE. Management (16487974), 31(2).
[72.] Visone, J. D. (2018). The Development of Problem-Solving Skills for Aspiring Educational Leaders. Journal of Leadership Education, V17, I4. DOI:10.12806/V17/I4/R3
[73.] Wang, M. T. and Degol, J. L. 2016. School Climate: A Review of the Construct, Measurement, and Impact on Student Outcomes. Educational Psychology Review, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 315-352.