2026 Volume: 02 Issue: 09 www.ijrpa.com ISSN 2456-9995 Research Article

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-37

SCHOOL CLIMATE, SCHOOL HEADS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE

***Elaine E. Talagtag, Richard M. Nolasco, Eleanore M. Dagala, and Marje O. Cabasan**

Guimaras State University

Article Received: 30 July 2026
Article Revised: 20 August 2026
Published on: 10 September 2026

***Corresponding Author: *Elaine E. Talagtag**
Guimaras State University.

DOI: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.7683

ABSTRACT

This study determined the school climate, school heads' instructional leadership, and teachers' performance in the Schools Division of Antique, Philippines, during School Year 2025–2026. The study involved 326 randomly selected public secondary school teachers. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed. The dependent variables examined were school climate, school heads' instructional leadership, and teachers' performance, while age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, and school location as independent variables. Data on school climate and instructional leadership were gathered through validated questionnaires while teachers' performance was obtained from the Classroom Observation Tool (COT) ratings for the first and second quarters of School Year 2025–2026. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, t-test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and Pearson's correlation at .05 level of significance through SPSS. Findings revealed that school climate was "Very Highly Favorable," the level of school heads' instructional leadership was "Very High," and teachers' performance was "Outstanding." No significant differences in school climate were found when respondents were classified as to age, but significant differences emerged when respondents were classified as to position, highest educational attainment, teaching experience, and school location. Similarly, the level of school heads' instructional leadership showed no significant differences when the respondents were classified as to age and teaching experience but differed significantly when respondents were classified as to position, highest educational attainment, and school location. Teachers' performance did not significantly differ by age and highest educational attainment but varied significantly by position, teaching experience, and school location. Moreover, significant relationships existed among school climate, school heads' instructional leadership, and teachers' performance.

KEYWORDS: School Climate, School Heads' Instructional Leadership, Teachers' Performance.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of school climate has increasingly become a pivotal factor in educational research, as it encapsulates the overall environment that supports or hinders learning and professional practice. According to Yang and Villanueva (2025), school climate is characterized by teacher interactions, leadership practices, decision-making processes, and the cultural norms that shape attitudes within schools. These elements influence teachers' professional experiences and their sense of efficacy in instructional delivery and collaboration. Positive school climate has been widely linked to improved teacher well-being, commitment, and overall performance outcomes, suggesting its foundational role in fostering effective educational systems.

Instructional leadership of school heads refers to the practices that directly influence teaching and learning processes through curriculum guidance, teacher supervision, feedback, and professional development support. He, Guo, and Abazie (2024) indicate that principals' instructional leadership functions as a significant predictor for teachers' professional development, creating conditions that enhance instructional quality and teachers' pedagogical effectiveness. Relatedly, Hua et al. (2024) found that instructional leadership not only shapes professional learning communities but does so through the mediating role of school climate—where trust, collaborative behaviors, and shared leadership practices strengthen teacher engagement and continuous learning.

Empirical studies have also examined how school climate and instructional leadership jointly influence teachers' performance. For instance, Sayman and Atienzar (2023) revealed that both school climate and principals' instructional leadership significantly affected public elementary teachers' performance, indicating that supportive environments and effective leadership contribute to teachers' ability to adapt and perform under challenging conditions.

In the Schools Division of Antique, public schools operate in diverse contexts that range from urban municipalities to geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas, creating varied school climates that influence daily teaching and learning processes. School heads are tasked with providing effective instructional leadership through classroom supervision, professional development, and curriculum monitoring; however, competing administrative responsibilities, limited resources, and contextual challenges affect the consistency of this instructional leadership across schools. As a result, teachers' performance may vary

depending on the level of support, collaboration, and guidance present within their schools. While some schools demonstrate positive climates that foster teamwork, motivation, and instructional improvement, others experience challenges related to communication, teacher workload, and limited instructional support, highlighting the need to examine how school climate and school heads' instructional leadership are associated with teachers' performance in the Schools Division of Antique.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the school climate, school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' performance in the School Division of Antique, Philippines for School Year 2025-2026.

Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the school climate as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location?

2. What is the level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location?

3. What is the teachers' performance when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location?

4. Are there significant differences in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location?

5. Are there significant differences in the level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location?

6. Are there significant differences in the teachers' performance when classified according to age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location?

7. Are there significant relationships among school climate, school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' performance?

METHODOLOGY

This study made use of a descriptive-correlational research design which aimed to determine the school climate, school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' performance in the School Division of Antique, Philippines for School Year 2025-2026. A descriptive correlational research design combines the strengths of descriptive and correlational approaches: it allows researchers to systematically describe the current status or characteristics of one or more variables, and simultaneously examine whether, and how strongly, these variables are associated with each other — without manipulating them (Putri, Rezani, & Hermina, 2025). In this design, variables are measured as they naturally occur, making it suited to educational and social science contexts where manipulation is impractical or unethical (McCombes, 2023). According to recent discussions, descriptive research answers "what is" — capturing frequencies, averages, and general patterns — whereas correlational research answers "how are things related," assessing the strength and direction (positive, negative, or none) of relationships among measured variables (Bhandari, 2023). Overall, descriptive correlational design serves as a practical, efficient, and ethically appropriate research strategy when the objective is to describe existing conditions and explore associations between naturally occurring variables — providing foundational insights, informing theory, and guiding future, more rigorous studies (Putri et al., 2025). This design was appropriate for this study as it allowed the researcher to determine the existence of relationships among school climate, school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' performance as dependent variables in relation to their age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location as independent variables. Respondents of the Study The respondents of the study were 326 randomly selected teachers of public secondary schools from 3 clusters in the Schools Division of Antique for School Year 2025-2026. Sampling Design. This study made use of probability sampling technique specifically stratified proportionate random sampling to draw the samples involved in this study. In applying this technique, the researcher identified the target population and determined how it can be naturally divided into strata. The cluster was the basis for the strata. Then the researcher employed a random sampling technique to select a subset of the clusters such as schools to ensure each cluster has an equal chance of being chosen to maintain sample representativeness. After which, the researcher applied the proportionate random sampling technique to determine the number of samples included in each school. To draw the samples in each school, a fishbowl technique was used. This was done by assigning numbers to the participants of population from every school. The numbers of participants

were written in small pieces of paper, one number to a piece. The small pieces of paper were rolled and put in a container big enough to allow the rolled papers to move freely in all directions. The container was shaken thoroughly until the desired number of respondents was picked. Data Gathering Instrument The data in this study were obtained through a questionnaire which was composed of four parts. Part I of the questionnaire listed the personal profile of the respondents such as their age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location. Part II of the questionnaire obtained data on the school climate. This instrument consisted of 15, five-point Likert scale items based from the study of Delgado-Galindo et al. (2025). To answer the instrument, the respondents were asked to assess the climate of their school by indicating the extent of their agreement to each statement in the instrument using the following scale: 5 – Strongly Agree, 4 – Agree, 3-Undecided, 2 – Disagree, and 1 – Strongly Disagree. Part III of the instrument was used to gather data on school heads' instructional leadership. This instrument consisted of 15 items based from the study of He, Guo and Abazie (2024) and required the respondents to answer each item using these options: 5= Strongly Agree, 4- Agree, 3-Undecided, 2-Disagree and 1= Strongly Disagree. Part IV of the instrument solicited data on teachers' performance. The COT Rating obtained by teachers for the first and second quarters of School Year 2025-2026 was used as data for teachers' performance. Validity of the Research Instrument To ensure the validity of the research instrument used in this study, it underwent content and face validation. For this purpose, a jury composed of five members was requested by the researcher to evaluate the instrument in terms of content and format. The suggestions given by these experts were considered by the researcher in the final revision of the instrument to ensure its validity. In addition, to ensure that all questions in the instruments were appropriate, clear, reasonable, typical, and sufficiently inclusive, the researcher used the Good and Scates' Criteria of Validation. Reliability of the Research Instrument To ensure that the research instrument used in this study is reliable, it was pilot-tested to 30 secondary school teachers in the Schools Division of Antique who were not previously chosen as respondents of this study. These teachers were excluded in the final administration of the research instrument. The results of the pilot testing were processed to generate a reliability coefficient acceptable to consider the research instrument as reliable using the Cronbach's Alpha. Results of reliability analysis indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .914 for questionnaire on school climate and .933 for school heads' instructional leadership indicating that the instrument used in this study was highly reliable. Data Gathering Procedure Prior to gathering of data, permission to conduct the study was obtained from the

Office of Schools Division Superintendent, Department of Education (DepEd), Schools Division of Antique and from the Office of the Public School District Supervisor of each school district. The administration of the research instrument followed which was personally distributed by the researcher to the respondents in their respective schools. After a specified period of time, the questionnaires were retrieved by the researcher and they were tallied, analyzed, and interpreted. Frequency, Percentage, t-test, Analysis of Variance (F-test), and Pearson's r. were the statistical used and processed through Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole

The school climate as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole was determined by computing the mean scores.

When taken as a whole, the school climate as assessed by the respondents is "Very Highly Favorable" with an obtained overall mean score of 4.53. A scrutiny of the means in the same table reveals that respondents obtained a highest mean score in the indicators "There is mutual respect between teachers and school head" (M=4.69), "Creative and innovative teaching practices are encouraged" (M=4.66), and "Procedures and rules are applied fairly and consistently" (M=4.60) described as "Very Highly Favorable" while they obtained the lowest mean score in the indicators "Classroom environments are organized and conducive to effective teaching" (M=4.33), "Teachers work collaboratively and support one another" (M=4.36), and "Teachers have access to professional development opportunities that strengthen teaching (M=4.43) described also as "Very Highly Favorable."

This result means that all of the schools exhibit very wholesome learning atmosphere. This is shown by having mutual respect between teachers and school head, creative and innovative teaching practices are encouraged and procedures and rules are applied fairly and consistently.

This finding affirms the study of Wang and Degol (2022) who found that when teachers perceive their schools as respectful, collaborative, and supportive workplaces, they are more likely to develop positive attitudes toward their organization and demonstrate stronger engagement with their responsibilities.

Similarly, Thapa et al. (2023) highlighted that favorable school climates emerge when school leaders establish clear expectations, encourage teacher participation, and maintain a culture of mutual respect among stakeholders. Their study revealed that teachers' perceptions of

school climate are strongly influenced by leadership support, collegial relationships, and opportunities for professional collaboration. These conditions create a school environment where teachers feel valued and empowered, resulting in higher assessments of the overall school climate.

Table 1. School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole.

Category	***Mean***	***Description***
Teachers work collaboratively and support one another.	*4.36*	*Very Highly Favorable*
There is mutual respect between teachers and school head.	*4.69*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Leadership promotes open communication and trust among staff.	*4.49*	*Very Highly Favorable*
The overall school environment supports learner learning and engagement.	*4.64*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Teachers feel safe and supported in their work environment.	*4.51*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Creative and innovative teaching practices are encouraged.	*4.66*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Learners feel a sense of belonging within the school community.	*4.56*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Procedures and rules are applied fairly and consistently.	*4.60*	*Very Highly Favorable*
There are positive teacher-learner relationships.	*4.56*	*Very Highly Favorable*
The environment promotes inclusion and respect for diversity.	*4.55*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Teachers have access to professional development opportunities that strengthen teaching.	*4.43*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Classroom environments are organized and conducive to effective teaching.	*4.33*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Teachers feel comfortable raising concerns or suggestions to school leaders.	*4.46*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Teachers are recognized or appreciated for their contributions to school improvement.	*4.53*	*Very Highly Favorable*
There is a clear sense of shared goals and vision among teachers and school heads.	*4.57*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Overall Mean	*4.53*	*Very Highly Favorable*

Scale of Means: 4.21–5.00 Very Highly Favorable; 3.41 – 4.20 Very Favorable; 2.61 – 3.40 Favorable; 1.81-2.60 Unfavorable; 1.00 – 1.80 Very Unfavorable

School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Position, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Teaching Experience and School Location

The school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location was determined by computing the mean scores.

When classified according to age, both respondents who are young (M=4.47) and old (M=4.57) assessed the school climate as "Very Highly Favorable".

When classified according to position, respondents occupying the position of Teacher I-III (M=4.56) and Master Teacher I-II (M=4.44) assessed the school climate as "Very Highly Favorable".

When classified according to highest educational attainment, respondents who are holder of bachelor's degree (M=4.44) master's degree (M=4.64) and doctorate degree (M=4.61) assessed the school climate as "Very Highly Favorable".

When classified according to length of teaching experience, both respondents with short (M=4.46) and long (M=4.58) length of teaching experience assessed the school climate as "Very Highly Favorable".

When classified according to school location, respondents who came from Cluster 1 (M=4.88), Cluster 2 (M=4.40) and Cluster 3 (M=4.72) assessed the school climate as "Very Highly Favorable".

This result means that regardless of age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location, all of the schools exhibit very wholesome learning atmosphere.

The study of Collie (2022) corroborates with the above findings who found that teachers' perceptions of school climate are associated with organizational support, teacher well-being, and satisfaction with their professional environment. Schools that provide adequate support systems, encourage teamwork, and recognize teachers' contributions tend to develop stronger positive climates.

Table 2. School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Position, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Teaching Experience and School Location.

Variables	*Mean*	*Description*
Age		
Young	*4.47*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Old	*4.57*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Position		
Teacher I-III	*4.56*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Master Teacher I-II	*4.44*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	*4.44*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Master's Degree	*4.64*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Doctorate Degree	*4.61*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Length of Teaching Experience		
Short	*4.46*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Long	*4.58*	*Very Highly Favorable*
School Location		
Cluster 1	*4.88*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Cluster 2	*4.40*	*Very Highly Favorable*
Cluster 3	*4.72*	*Very Highly Favorable*

Scale of Means: 4.21–5.00 Very Highly Favorable; 3.41 – 4.20 Very Favorable; 2.61 – 3.40 Favorable; 1.81-2.60 Unfavorable; 1.00 – 1.80 Very Unfavorable

Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole

The level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole was determined by computing the mean scores.

When taken as a whole, the level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents is "Very High" with an obtained overall mean score of 4.54. A scrutiny of the

means in the same table reveals that respondents obtained a highest mean score in the indicators "Involves teachers in decisions about curriculum and instruction" (M=4.69), "Fosters a positive and supportive learning environment for both teachers and learners" (M=4.63), and "Clearly communicates the academic vision and goals of the school" (M=4.62) described as "Very High" while they obtained the lowest mean score in the indicators "Regularly monitors classroom instruction to ensure quality teaching practices" (M=4.37), "Regularly reviews assessment results with teachers to improve instructional practices" (M=4.44), and "Uses learner achievement data to guide instructional planning and decisions (M=4.47) described also as "Very High."

This result means that all school heads take leadership actions to prioritize, support, and enhance the quality of teaching and learning. This is indicated by involving teachers in decisions about curriculum and instruction, fostering a positive and supportive learning environment for both teachers and learners and clearly communicating the academic vision and goals of the school.

According to Leithwood et al. (2022), strong instructional leadership is demonstrated when school leaders establish clear academic goals, provide meaningful instructional guidance, encourage teacher collaboration, and develop a culture focused on improving learning outcomes. Their study emphasized that teachers tend to perceive school heads more positively when leaders are actively engaged in instructional processes and provide consistent support for professional growth.

Table 3. Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole.

Category	***Mean***	***Description***
Clearly communicates the academic vision and goals of the school.	*4.62*	*Very High*
Ensures that teachers understand and align their teaching with the school's instructional priorities.	*4.61*	*Very High*
Regularly monitors classroom instruction to ensure quality teaching practices.	*4.37*	*Very High*
Provides constructive feedback to teachers based on classroom observations.	*4.50*	*Very High*
Supports the integration of effective teaching strategies across subjects.	*4.61*	*Very High*
Facilitates professional development activities that meet teachers' instructional needs.	*4.51*	*Very High*
Promotes teacher collaboration for sharing instructional best practices.	*4.53*	*Very High*

Category	*Mean*	*Description*
Encourages teachers to attend workshops and training that improve classroom instruction.	*4.60*	*Very High*
Uses learner achievement data to guide instructional planning and decisions.	*4.47*	*Very High*
Regularly reviews assessment results with teachers to improve instructional practices.	*4.44*	*Very High*
Fosters a positive and supportive learning environment for both teachers and learners.	*4.63*	*Very High*
Promotes a culture of continuous instructional improvement among personnel.	*4.53*	*Very High*
Involves teachers in decisions about curriculum and instruction.	*4.69*	*Very High*
Encourages open communication regarding teaching and instructional issues.	*4.53*	*Very High*
Models behaviors that inspire teacher performance.	*4.51*	*Very High*
Overall Mean	*4.54*	*Very High*

Scale of Means: 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

Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Position, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Teaching Experience and School Location

The level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location was determined by computing the mean scores.

When classified according to age, both respondents who are young (M=4.54) and old (M=4.55) assessed the level of school heads' instructional leadership as "Very High".

When classified according to position, respondents occupying the position of Teacher I-III (M=4.60) and Master Teacher I-II (M=4.37) assessed the level of school heads' instructional leadership as "Very High".

When classified according to highest educational attainment, respondents who are holder of bachelor's degree (M=4.45) master's degree (M=4.65) and doctorate degree (M=4.69) assessed the level of school heads' instructional leadership as "Very High".

When classified according to length of teaching experience, both respondents with short (M=4.53) and long (M=4.56) length of teaching experience assessed the level of school heads' instructional leadership as "Very High".

When classified according to school location, respondents who came from Cluster 1 (M=4.94), Cluster 2 (M=4.36) and Cluster 3 (M=4.88) assessed the level of school heads' instructional leadership as "Very High".

This result means that regardless of age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location, all school heads take leadership actions to prioritize, support, and enhance the quality of teaching and learning.

Hallinger and Wang (2023) reported that school heads who effectively perform instructional leadership functions contribute to stronger teacher commitment and improved instructional practices. Their findings revealed that teachers' perceptions of leadership effectiveness increase when administrators frequently communicate instructional expectations, conduct classroom supervision, provide constructive feedback, and encourage evidence-based teaching strategies. The very high assessment of school heads' instructional leadership in the present study may therefore reflect the visibility and effectiveness of school heads in guiding teachers and supporting instructional improvement within their schools.

Table 4. Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Position, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Teaching Experience and School Location.

Variables	***Mean***	***Description***
Age		
Young	*4.54*	*Very High*
Old	*4.55*	*Very High*
Position		
Teacher I-III	*4.60*	*Very High*
Master Teacher I-II	*4.37*	*Very High*
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	*4.45*	*Very High*
Master's Degree	*4.65*	*Very High*
Doctorate Degree	*4.69*	*Very High*
Length of Teaching Experience		
Short	*4.53*	*Very High*

Variables	*Mean*	*Description*
Long	*4.56*	*Very High*
School Location		
Cluster 1	*4.94*	*Very High*
Cluster 2	*4.36*	*Very High*
Cluster 3	*4.88*	*Very High*

Scale of Means: 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

Teachers' Performance When Taken as a Whole

The teachers' performance when taken as a whole was determined by computing the mean score.

When taken as a whole, the teachers' performance is "Outstanding" with an obtained overall mean score of 4.81.

Table 5. Teachers' Performance When Taken as a Whole.

Variables	*Mean*	*Description*
As a Whole	*4.81*	*Outstanding*

Scale of Means: 4.50–5.00 Outstanding; 3.50–4.49 Very Satisfactory; 2.50–3.49 Satisfactory; 1.50–2.49 Unsatisfactory; 1.00–1.49 Poor

Teachers' Performance When Classified According to Age, Position, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Teaching Experience and School Location

The teachers' performance when classified according to age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location was determined by computing the mean scores.

When classified according to age, both young (M= 4.85) and old (M=4.79) teachers have "Outstanding" performance.

When classified according to position, teachers occupying the position of Teacher I-III (M= 4.85) and Master Teacher I-II (M=4.71) have "Outstanding" performance.

When classified according to highest educational attainment, teachers who are holder of bachelor's degree (M=4.78), master's degree (M=4.86) and doctorate degree (M=4.81) have "Outstanding" performance.

When classified according to length of teaching experience, both teachers with short (M= 4.86) and long (M=4.78) length of teaching experience have "Outstanding" performance.

When classified according to school location, both teachers who came from Cluster 1 (M= 4.95), Cluster 2 (M= 4.80) and Cluster 3 (M=4.80) have "Outstanding" performance.

This result means that regardless of age, position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location, teachers consistently demonstrate exemplary instructional practices that exceeded performance standards. They effectively engaged learners, utilized appropriate pedagogical strategies, and created a highly conducive learning environment.

According to Darling-Hammond et al. (2023), highly performing teachers are characterized by strong pedagogical knowledge, reflective teaching practices, effective classroom management, and the ability to adapt instruction based on learners' diverse needs.

Table 6. Teachers' Performance When Classified According to Age, Position, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Teaching Experience and School Location.

Variables	***Mean***	***Description***
Age		
Young	*4.85*	*Outstanding*
Old	*4.79*	*Outstanding*
Position		
Teacher I-III	*4.85*	*Outstanding*
Master Teacher I-II	*4.71*	*Outstanding*
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	*4.78*	*Outstanding*
Master's Degree	*4.86*	*Outstanding*
Doctorate Degree	*4.81*	*Outstanding*
Length of Teaching Experience		
Short	*4.86*	*Outstanding*

Variables	*Mean*	*Description*
Long	*4.78*	*Outstanding*
School Location		
Cluster 1	*4.95*	*Outstanding*
Cluster 2	*4.80*	*Outstanding*
Cluster 3	*4.80*	*Outstanding*

Scale of Means: 4.50–5.00 Outstanding; 3.50–4.49 Very Satisfactory; 2.50–3.49 Satisfactory; 1.50–2.49 Unsatisfactory; 1.00–1.49 Poor

Differences in the School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Position and Length of Teaching Experience

As reflected in Table 7, no significant differences existed in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, t=

-1.727, p > .05. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age was not rejected.

This result means that respondents have similar assessment of the school climate regardless of the age.

The above findings indicate that respondents, regardless of whether they are young or old, share relatively similar perceptions of the overall school climate. This means that age does not substantially shape how respondents experience or evaluate important aspects of the school environment. The consistency in perceptions across age groups indicates that school policies, leadership practices, and workplace conditions are implemented in a manner that is experienced uniformly by teachers, fostering an inclusive and equitable environment where all personnel receive comparable support and opportunities regardless of age.

This finding is supported by the study of Aldridge and McChesney (2022), which revealed that teachers' perceptions of school climate were generally consistent across demographic groups, including age.

On the other hand, significant differences existed in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to position, t= 1.967, p < .05 and length of teaching experience, t= -2.027, p < .05. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no

significant differences in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to position and length of teaching experience was rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents differ in their assessment of the school climate when their position and length of teaching experience are considered. In the case of this study, respondents occupying the position of Teacher I-III (M=4.56) with long years (M=4.58) teaching experience have better assessment of school climate than respondents occupying the position of Master Teacher I-II (M=4.44) with short (M=4.46) years of teaching experience.

This finding means that length of teaching experience shapes teachers' perceptions of the school environment than position alone. Teachers who have served for many years, despite remaining in Teacher I–III positions, may have developed stronger interpersonal relationships, greater familiarity with school policies and culture, and a deeper sense of belonging within the organization. These experiences can foster more favorable perceptions of school climate.

In contrast, Master Teacher I–II respondents with relatively short teaching experience may assess the school climate less favorably because they are still adjusting to the expanded responsibilities associated with their leadership roles. As instructional leaders, master teachers are expected to mentor colleagues, monitor instructional practices, facilitate professional development, and support school improvement initiatives. These additional responsibilities may expose them to organizational challenges, such as increased workload, accountability demands, and coordination with various stakeholders, leading them to evaluate the school climate more critically.

This finding is supported by Aldridge and McChesney (2022), who emphasized that teachers' perceptions of school climate may vary depending on their professional experiences, responsibilities, and level of engagement within the school organization.

Table 7. Significant Differences in the School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Position and Length of Teaching Experience.

Variables	***Mean***	***t-test value***	***p-value***	***Remarks***
Age				
Young	*4.47*	*-1.727*	*.085*	*Not Significant*
Old	*4.57*			

Variables	*Mean*	*t-test value*	*p-value*	*Remarks*
Position	*Position*	*Position*		
Teacher I-III	*4.56*	*1.967*	*.051*	*Significant*
Master Teacher I-II	*4.44*			
Length of Teaching Experience	*Length of Teaching Experience*	*Length of Teaching Experience*		
Short	*4.46*	*-2.027*	*.043*	*Significant*
Long	*4.58*			

p <.05, Significant

p >.05, Not Significant

Differences in the School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Location

Table 8 shows that significant differences existed in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment, F = 5.446, p < .05 and school location, F = 20.997, p < .05. Post hoc test results revealed that the significant differences lie between bachelor's degree and master's degree with mean difference of -.194; between Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 with mean difference of .475 and between Cluster 2 and Cluster 3 with mean difference of -.315. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment and school location was rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents differ in their assessment of the school climate when their highest educational attainment and school location are considered.

This finding indicates that teachers' perceptions of the school climate are shaped by both their educational qualifications and the context in which they work. Teachers with different levels of educational attainment may have varying professional knowledge, leadership expectations, and experiences that shape how they perceive the school climate. Those with advanced academic qualifications may possess broader perspectives on effective school practices and organizational culture, leading them to evaluate the school climate differently from teachers with lower educational attainment.

Likewise, the significant differences based on school location suggest that the environment in which a school operates contributes to teachers' perceptions of its climate. Schools situated in Cluster 1, Cluster 2, or Cluster 3 may differ in terms of resource availability, infrastructure, community involvement, accessibility to professional development opportunities, and administrative support. These contextual variations can influence teachers' daily experiences and interactions, resulting in differing assessments of the school climate.

This finding is supported by Aldridge and McChesney (2022), who emphasized that school climate perceptions are influenced by both individual and contextual factors.

Table 8. Significant Differences in the School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Location.

Variables	***Sum of Squares***	***F-value***	***p-value***	***Remarks***
Highest Educational Attainment	*Highest Educational Attainment*			
Between Groups	*2.909*	*5.446*	*.005*	*Significant*
Within Groups	*86.265*			
Total	*89.174*			
School Location				
Between Groups	*10.260*	*20.997*	*.000*	*Significant*
Within Groups	*78.914*			
Total	*89.174*			

$p < .05$, Significant

Differences in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Position and Length of Teaching Experience

As reflected in Table 9, no significant differences existed in the level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, $t = -.066$, $p > .05$ and length of teaching experience, $t = -.352$, $p > .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age and length of teaching experience was not rejected.

This finding indicates that respondents have similar assessment of the school heads' instructional leadership regardless of their age and length of teaching experience.

The above findings indicate that teachers, irrespective of their age or years in the teaching profession, perceive the instructional leadership of their school heads in a consistent manner. This means that neither age differences nor the level of professional experience significantly shapes how teachers evaluate key instructional leadership. The consistency in teachers' perceptions means that school heads demonstrate instructional leadership that are visible and experienced uniformly across the teaching workforce.

This finding is supported by Hallinger and Wang (2023), who emphasized that effective instructional leadership is largely reflected through observable leadership practices, including communicating clear instructional goals, monitoring classroom instruction, providing feedback, and supporting teachers' professional learning.

On the other hand, significant differences existed in the level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to position, $t = 2.465$, $p < .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to position was rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents differ in their assessment of the level of school heads' instructional leadership when their position is considered. In the case of this study, respondents occupying the position of Teacher I-III ($M=4.60$) have better assessment of the school heads' instructional leadership than respondents occupying the position of Master Teacher I-II ($M=4.37$).

This finding means that teachers' professional positions shape how they perceive the instructional leadership of their school heads. Teacher I–III respondents may evaluate their school heads more favorably because they primarily experience instructional leadership through classroom supervision, coaching, professional development opportunities, and administrative support that directly facilitate their teaching responsibilities. Since classroom teachers are the primary recipients of instructional guidance, they may perceive the school heads' efforts as effective and responsive to their instructional needs.

In contrast, Master Teacher I–II respondents may provide relatively less favorable assessments because their roles involve greater responsibilities in instructional supervision, mentoring, curriculum implementation, and school improvement initiatives. As instructional leaders themselves, master teachers frequently collaborate with school heads in planning, monitoring, and evaluating instructional programs, giving them a more comprehensive

understanding of leadership practices and organizational challenges. Their advanced expertise and broader involvement in instructional management may lead them to apply higher professional standards when evaluating school heads' instructional leadership.

This finding is supported by Hallinger and Wang (2023), who emphasized that teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership may differ depending on their level of involvement in instructional decision-making and their relationship with school administrators.

Table 9. Significant Differences in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Position and Length of Teaching Experience.

Variables	***Mean***	***t-test value***	***p-value***	***Remarks***
Age				
Young	*4.54*	*-.066*	*.947*	*Not Significant*
Old	*4.55*			
Position	*Position*	*Position*		
Teacher I-III	*4.60*	*2.465*	*.014*	*Significant*
Master Teacher I-II	*4.37*			
Length of Teaching Experience	*Length of Teaching Experience*	*Length of Teaching Experience*		
Short	*4.53*	*-.352*	*.725*	*Not Significant*
Long	*4.56*			

p <.05, Significant

p >.05, Not Significant

Differences in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Location

Table 10 shows that significant differences existed in the level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment, $F = 3.221$, $p < .05$ and school location, $F = 22.846$, $p < .05$. Post hoc test results

revealed that the significant differences lie between bachelor's degree and master's degree with mean difference of -.196; Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 with mean difference of .587 and between Cluster 2 and Cluster 3 with mean difference of -.521. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the level of school heads' instructional leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment and school location was rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents differ in their assessment of the level of school heads' instructional leadership when their highest educational attainment and school location are considered.

This finding indicates that teachers' perceptions of their school heads' instructional leadership vary according to their academic qualifications and the location of their schools. Teachers with different levels of educational attainment may possess varying professional knowledge, leadership expectations, and exposure to current educational theories and best practices, which differ how they evaluate school heads' instructional leadership. Those with graduate-level qualifications may apply more rigorous standards in assessing instructional supervision, curriculum leadership, professional development, and data-informed decision-making, while teachers with lower educational attainment may assess these leadership practices from a different professional perspective.

Similarly, the significant differences based on school location indicate that contextual factors shape teachers' experiences of instructional leadership. Schools in different clusters may vary in terms of access to educational resources, infrastructure, professional learning opportunities, community support, and administrative challenges. These differences can affect how school heads perform their instructional leadership roles and how teachers perceive the effectiveness of those efforts.

This finding is supported by Hallinger and Wang (2023), who emphasized that teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership are influenced by their professional experiences and organizational contexts.

Table 10. Significant Differences in the Level of School Heads' Instructional Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Location.

Variables	*Sum of Squares*	*F-value*	*p-value*	*Remarks*
Highest Educational Attainment	*Highest Educational Attainment*			
Between Groups	*3.413*	*3.221*	*.041*	*Significant*
Within Groups	*171.163*			
Total	*174.576*			
School Location				
Between Groups	*21.635*	*22.846*	*.000*	*Significant*
Within Groups	*152.941*			
Total	*174.576*			

p <.05, Significant

Differences in the Teachers' Performance When Classified According to Age, Position and Length of Teaching Experience

As reflected in Table 11, no significant differences existed in the teachers' performance when classified according to age, t= 1.613, p > .05. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the teachers' performance when classified according to age was not rejected.

This finding indicates that teachers have similar performance regardless of their age.

The above findings indicate that age does not significantly differ teachers' ability to perform their professional responsibilities effectively. Both young and old teachers demonstrate comparable levels of performance, suggesting that they are equally capable of meeting instructional expectations, implementing the curriculum, managing classrooms, assessing learners, and fulfilling other teaching-related duties. This finding further indicates that teachers' performance is determined more by their professional competence, commitment, continuous learning, and adherence to educational standards than by their chronological age.

This finding is supported by Darling-Hammond, Flook, Cook-Harvey, Barron, and Osher (2023), who emphasized that teacher effectiveness is primarily associated with professional

knowledge, pedagogical skills, reflective practice, and access to continuous learning opportunities rather than demographic characteristics.

On the other hand, significant differences existed in the teachers' performance when classified according to position, t= 3.262, p < .05 and length of teaching experience, t= 2.320, p < .05. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the teachers' performance when classified according to position and length of teaching experience was rejected.

The above findings indicate that teachers differ in their performance when their position and length of teaching experience are considered. In the case of this study, teachers occupying the position of Teacher I-III (M=4.85) with short (M=4.86) length of teaching experience have better performance than teachers occupying the position of Master Teacher I-II (M=4.71) with long (M=4.78) length of teaching experience.

This finding means that higher teaching performance is not determined solely by position or years of service. Teachers in the Teacher I–III ranks who are relatively new to the profession may demonstrate strong instructional performance because of their enthusiasm, motivation, adaptability, and familiarity with current pedagogical approaches, educational technologies, and learner-centered teaching strategies. They may also be highly driven to excel in classroom instruction and meet performance standards, particularly during the early stages of their careers when they are establishing their professional reputation and striving for career advancement.

In contrast, Master Teacher I–II respondents with longer teaching experience often assume broader responsibilities beyond classroom instruction, including mentoring beginning teachers, leading professional learning communities, coordinating curriculum implementation, conducting demonstration teaching, and supporting school improvement initiatives. These additional leadership and supervisory functions may reduce the amount of time they devote exclusively to classroom teaching, which can affect performance ratings that primarily emphasize instructional practice. Moreover, experienced master teachers may handle more complex instructional and administrative tasks, making their roles substantially different from those of Teacher I–III personnel. This finding highlights that performance of teachers is shaped by multiple factors, including role expectations, workload, professional responsibilities, and motivation, rather than by position or length of teaching experience alone

This is consistent with the findings of Kraft, Blazar, and Hogan (2022) found that teacher performance varies depending on professional support, coaching experiences, and

opportunities for instructional improvement. Their study indicated that teachers' performance can differ based on their professional roles and responsibilities, as those with leadership assignments or advanced positions often engage in additional tasks related to mentoring, instructional supervision, and school improvement.

Table 11. Significant Differences in the Teachers' Performance When Classified According to Age, Position and Length of Teaching Experience.

Variables	*Mean*	*t-test value*	*p-value*	*Remarks*
Age				
Young	*4.85*	*1.613*	*.108*	*Not Significant*
Old	*4.79*			
Position	*Position*	*Position*		
Teacher I-III	*4.85*	*3.262*	*.001*	*Significant*
Master Teacher I-II	*4.71*			
Length of Teaching Experience	*Length of Teaching Experience*	*Length of Teaching Experience*		
Short	*4.86*	*2.320*	*.021*	*Significant*
Long	*4.78*			

p <.05, Significant

p >.05, Not Significant

Differences in the Teachers' Performance When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Location

Table 12 shows that no significant differences existed in the teachers' performance when classified according to highest educational attainment, F = 1.938, p > .05. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the teachers' performance when classified according to highest educational attainment was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that teachers have similar performance regardless of their highest educational attainment.

This finding indicates that teachers' level of academic qualification does not significantly differ their overall performance in carrying out their teaching responsibilities. This means that teachers, whether they hold a bachelor's degree, master's degree, or doctorate degree,

demonstrate comparable levels of competence in areas such as lesson planning, instructional delivery, classroom management, assessment practices, and commitment to learners' development. The result indicates that educational attainment alone may not be the sole determinant of effective performance, as other factors such as teaching experience, professional dedication, instructional strategies, school support, and continuous engagement in professional learning may also contribute to teachers' performance.

This finding is supported by Darling-Hammond et al. (2023), who emphasized that teacher performance is shaped by a combination of professional knowledge, practical teaching experience, reflective practice, and opportunities for continuous learning rather than formal educational attainment alone.

On the other hand, significant differences existed in the teachers' performance when classified according to school location, $F = 3.092$, $p < .05$. Post hoc test results revealed that the significant differences lie between Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 with mean difference of -.151 and between Cluster 1 and Cluster 3 with mean difference of .145. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the teachers' performance when classified according to school location was rejected.

The above findings indicate that teachers differ in their performance when their school location is considered.

This finding indicates that the geographical context and environmental conditions of schools may shape teachers' ability to perform their professional responsibilities. This means that teachers assigned to different school locations experience varying levels of access to instructional resources, technological facilities, professional development opportunities, administrative support, and community involvement, which may affect their teaching practices and overall performance. Schools located in more accessible areas may provide greater opportunities for collaboration, training, and resource utilization, while schools in remote or geographically challenging areas may encounter constraints that can affect teachers' instructional delivery, classroom management, and implementation of educational programs.

This finding is supported by Darling-Hammond et al. (2023), who emphasized that teacher performance is not determined solely by individual competence but is also shaped by the organizational and contextual conditions in which teachers work.

Table 12. Significant Differences in the Teachers' Performance When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Location.

Variables	***Sum of Squares***	***F-value***	***p-value***	***Remarks***
Highest Educational Attainment	*Highest Educational Attainment*			
Between Groups	*.419*	*1.938*	*.146*	*Not Significant*
Within Groups	*34.892*			
Total	*35.310*			
School Location				
Between Groups	*.663*	*3.092*	*.047*	*Significant*
Within Groups	*34.647*			
Total	*35.310*			

p >.05, Not Significant

p <.05, Significant

Relationships Among School Climate, School Heads' Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Performance

This study finally aimed to determine the significant relationships among school climate, school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' performance using Pearson's r correlation.

Results of Pearson's r correlation show that significant relationship existed between school climate and teachers' performance (r =.194, p < .05); between school climate and school heads' instructional leadership (r =.760, p < .05); and between school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' performance (r =.158, p < .05). Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant relationships among school climate, school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' performance was rejected.

This finding indicates that teachers' performance is significantly related to school climate and school heads' instructional leadership.

This finding means that the quality of the school climate and the instructional leadership of school heads play important roles in shaping teachers' performance. This indicates that when teachers perceive their schools as supportive, collaborative, safe, and conducive to professional growth, they are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of performance in their instructional responsibilities. A positive school climate characterized by trust, open

communication, teamwork, recognition, and shared commitment can motivate teachers to improve their teaching practices, engage in professional activities, and work toward achieving school goals. Likewise, effective instructional leadership from school heads, demonstrated through supervision, coaching, provision of feedback, professional support, and monitoring of instruction, can enhance teachers' competence, confidence, and commitment to quality teaching.

This finding is corroborated by Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2022), who emphasized that successful school leadership significantly influences teaching quality by creating conditions that enable teachers to improve their instructional practices.

Similarly, Hallinger and Wang (2023) found that instructional leadership is a critical factor in promoting school improvement and enhancing teacher outcomes. Their research indicated that school heads who engage in instructional supervision, communicate academic expectations, provide professional learning opportunities, and monitor curriculum implementation contribute to stronger teacher performance.

Furthermore, Collie, Granziera, and Martin (2022) revealed that a positive school climate characterized by collegial support, organizational trust, and strong workplace relationships is associated with improved teacher well-being, engagement, and professional performance.

Table 13. Significant Relationships Among School Climate, School Heads' Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Performance.

	School Climate	***School Heads' Instructional Leadership***	***Teachers' Performance***	***Remarks***
School Climate	*1 326*	*.760 .000 326*	*.194 .000 326*	*Significant*
School Heads' Instructional Leadership	*.760 .000 326*	*1 326*	*.158 .004 326*	*Significant*
Teachers' Performance	*.194 .000 326*	*.158 .004 326*	*1 326*	*Significant*

$p < .05$, Significant

CONCLUSIONS

1. All schools in the Schools Division of Antique exhibit very wholesome learning atmosphere.

2. All school heads in the Schools Division of Antique take leadership actions to prioritize, support, and enhance the quality of teaching and learning.

3. Teachers in the Schools Division of Antique consistently demonstrate exemplary instructional practices that exceeded performance standards through effective engagement with learners, utilization of appropriate pedagogical strategies, and creation a highly conducive learning environment.

4. Teachers have similar assessment of the school climate regardless of their age while they differ in their assessment when position, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience and school location are considered.

5. Teachers have similar assessment of the school heads' instructional leadership regardless of their age and length of teaching experience while they differ in their assessment when position, highest educational attainment, and school location are considered.

6. Teachers have similar performance regardless of their age and highest educational attainment while they differ in their performance when position, length of teaching experience and school location are considered.

7. School climate and school heads' instructional leadership are significantly related to teachers' performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Higher officials of the Department of Education may strengthen policies and programs that promote a supportive, inclusive, and collaborative school environment. They may provide clear guidelines and sustained initiatives that encourage school heads, teachers, and stakeholders to build a culture of trust, respect, shared responsibility, and open communication within schools.

2. School heads may continuously strengthen their commitment to improving teaching and learning through consistent supervision, professional support, and collaborative decision-making. They may maintain regular classroom observations, provide constructive feedback, and engage teachers in meaningful discussions about instructional practices and learner outcomes.

3. School heads may provide a supportive professional environment that encourages growth, collaboration, and commitment to quality instruction. They may maintain regular

instructional supervision, provide timely and constructive feedback, and recognize teachers' accomplishments to strengthen motivation and professional confidence. School heads may also ensure that teachers have access to relevant training, mentoring programs, and learning opportunities that enhance their pedagogical skills, classroom management strategies, and ability to respond to changing educational demands.

4. School heads may promote a culture of trust, respect, collaboration, and shared responsibility among all members of the school community to maintain a highly favorable school climate. They may also maintain open and transparent communication with teachers, learners, parents, and other stakeholders to strengthen relationships and encourage active participation in school programs and decision-making processes. School heads may also continue recognizing teachers' contributions, addressing concerns promptly, and creating opportunities for teamwork and professional interaction to ensure that all personnel feel valued and supported.

5. Teachers may actively participate in instructional programs, embracing professional guidance, and maintaining open communication with school heads. They may cooperate during classroom observations, supervision activities, and feedback sessions by viewing these processes as opportunities for professional growth and improvement. Teachers may also provide constructive feedback and share their insights regarding instructional needs, learner challenges, and effective teaching practices, enabling school heads to make informed decisions and design responsive instructional interventions.

6. Teachers may engage in professional growth, reflective practice, and commitment to quality instruction to sustain their performance. They may regularly update their knowledge and skills through participation in seminars, training programs, professional learning communities, and other development activities that enhance their pedagogical competence and responsiveness to emerging educational needs.

7. Future researchers may conduct further investigations related to school climate, school heads' instructional leadership, and teachers' performance. They may explore other variables that were not included in the current study, such as teachers' motivation, organizational commitment, emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, professional development, digital competence, and school heads' other leadership styles to gain a more comprehensive understanding of factors affecting teachers' performance.

REFERENCES

1. *Abbas, K., & Shabbir, M. (2025). Effect of instructional leadership of heads on school climate: Mediating role of emotional intelligence. The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies.*
2. *Abylay Karinov. (2025). Exploring the effects of professional learning experiences on in-service teachers' growth: A systematic review. Educ. Sci, 15(2), 146.*
3. *Adlawan, M. M., & Quines, L. A. (2025). Instructional leadership of school heads, workplace spirituality and school climate: A causal model on teacher engagement in public schools. European Journal of Education Studies, 12(2), Article 5841.*
4. *Aldridge, J. M., & McChesney, K. (2022). The relationships between school climate and student and teacher outcomes: A systematic review of current research. Educational Review, 74(6), 1159–1180.*
5. *Alog, J. D., & Oco, R. M. (2025). Teachers' Professional Development and Teaching Performance: Basis for an Intervention Plan. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis.*
6. *Antonio, A. L. G., & Eslabon, R. T. (2023). School heads' instructional supervisory skills and teachers' performance. Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends.*
7. *Assessing the impact of instructional leadership. (2024). Excellencia International Multidisciplinary Journal of Education.*
8. *Ayanda, N., & Yaw, A. N. (2025). The influence of instructional leadership on the performance of students in South African schools. Ideguru: Jurnal Karya Ilmiah Guru, 10(2), 1309–1320.*
9. *Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall.*
10. *Bashir Ahmad, & Iqbal Ahmad. (2024). The interplay between principal's instructional leadership and teachers' professional development. Journal for Social Science Archives.*
11. *Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. Free Press.*
12. *Battad, J. L. (2024). Instructional leadership skills of school heads and its relation to the self-efficacy of elementary teachers in Castillejos District. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 5(8), 3071–3086.*
13. *Bellibaş, M. Ş. (2025). Instructional leadership moderating the impact of school context on outcomes. Journal of Educational Administration.*
14. *Bhandari, P. (2023, revised June 22, 2023). Correlational research | When & how to use. Scribbr.*

15. *Borja, J. P., Demalen, J. A., & Borines, M. E. (2025). INSET on teachers' performance: Basis for faculty development. CMU Journal of Science, 1(1), 76–84.*
16. *Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Harvard University Press.*
17. *Budiongan, J., & Corpuz, G. G. (2024). School climate and teachers' work engagement in Misamis Oriental. European Modern Studies Journal, 8(2), 13.*
18. *Caay, M. J. M., & Valle, A. M. (2025). School climate and learners' academic engagement. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 8(11), 6184–6192.*
19. *Cabus, G. Z., & Valle, A. M. (2025). 21st century practices of teachers and their performance. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 8(5), Article 78.*
20. *Calansingin, J. E., Azucena, V. B., & Legaspi, M. J. B. (2022). Work Engagement and Teaching Performance of Public-school Physics Teachers in the New Normal. Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports, 16(11), 97–108.*
21. *Centre for Teacher Quality / RCTQ. (2019, October). No. 2019-002: Policy note: Classroom Observation Tool (COT). RITQ.*
22. *Collie, R. J. (2022). Teacher well-being and school climate: The role of organizational support and workplace relationships. Teaching and Teacher Education, 112, 103645.*
23. *Collie, R. J., Granziera, H., & Martin, A. J. (2022). Teachers' workplace well-being: The role of school climate, leadership support, and professional experience. Teaching and Teacher Education, 112, 103650.*
24. *Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2023). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 27(1), 1–17.*
25. *Delgado-Galindo, P., García-Jiménez, J., Torres-Gordillo, J.-J., & Rodríguez-Santero, J. (2025). School climate and academic performance: Key factors for sustainable education in high-efficacy schools and low-efficacy schools. Sustainability, 17(14), 6497.*
26. *Detalla, M. D. (2024). Instructional leadership capacity of school heads as a leading construct of teacher leadership in public elementary schools of Davao del Norte Division. International Journal of Research in Interdisciplinary Studies, 2(2), 7–12.*
27. *Donque, C. A., & Valle, A. M. (2025). School climate and teamwork of secondary school teachers. IJMRA, 8(3), 45.*

28. *Elamparo, M. R., & Rafanan, L. E. (2023). Perspectives of Public Secondary School Teachers on the Effectiveness of Performance Review, Training, and Development in a District. American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research, 7(6), 135–154.*
29. *Espinosa, M. P., Reomero, J. I., Deguito, P., Lugatiman, R., & Bantilan, J. (2023). Performance Appraisal of Teachers in Public Secondary Schools: A Systematic Review. International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation.*
30. *Evaluating the effectiveness of faculty teachers' performance at Birzeit University as perceived by students. (2025). Tertiary Education and Management, 30, 277–301.*
31. *Exploring determinants of teacher performance in Karachi's private secondary schools: The roles of subject mastery, organizational leadership, experience, and communication skills. (2025). Discover Education, 4, Article 244.*
32. *Factors influencing teacher performance (systematic analysis). (2025). International Education Research Journal.*
33. *Fayo, C. L., & Hilario, C. R. (2023). Effectiveness of Classroom Observation on Teachers' Performance. Industry and Academic Research Review, 4(1), 472–478.*
34. *Gamuza, R. A., Lachica, R. L., & Bautista, M. A. (2025). Teachers' self-efficacy and performance. IMJ RISE, 2(6), Article 1227.*
35. *Gaston, V. A. (2024). Instructional leadership of school heads and its impact on teachers' professional development. Instabright International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research.*
36. *Gechere, T. (2025). Influence of principals' instructional leadership and teachers' efficacy on students' performance in secondary schools. Discover Sustainability.*
37. *Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. The Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217–247.*
38. *Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2023). Instructional leadership and school improvement: Contemporary perspectives on leadership practices and teacher development. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 51(4), 689–706.*
39. *Halpin, A. W., & Croft, D. B. (1963). The organizational climate of schools. Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.*
40. *Hasanodin, H. S., & Arazo, V. H. (2024). Competencies and performance of teachers in Balo-I District. Psych Educ, 20(4), 483–493.*
41. *He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education.*

42. *Hua, S., Mansor, A. N., Jamaludin, K. A. B., & Chen, X. (2024). The influence of principals' instructional leadership on teachers' Professional Learning Community: The mediating role of school climate. Salud, Ciencia y Tecnología - Serie de Conferencias.*
43. *H Hu. (2025). The impact of perceived school climate and socio-demographic factors on student engagement. [Article]. (Hirata, I., et al. (2024). Multifaceted perception of school climate: Association between teacher and student ratings. Frontiers in Education, 9, 1411503.*
44. *Gamuza, R. A., Lachica, R. L., & Bautista, M. (2025). Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Performance. Zenodo.*
45. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE). (2025). Factors influencing teacher performance in Shanghai high schools in the COVID-19 pandemic. 14(2), 898–909.*
46. *Jelena, et al. (2023). Effect of principal's instructional leadership practices on professional development activities. IJSRA.*
47. *Jiang, X., & Liu, R. (2024). Factors influencing school climate: An empirical study based on the TALIS principal survey. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11, 722.*
48. *Jiang, Y., Yusof, M. R., & Kasa, M. D. (2025). Factors influencing teacher performance in Shanghai high schools in the COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education.*
49. *Juliana Baharuddin, F. M. Z., & S. N. Ismail. (2024). Effective school climate: Teachers' perception in secondary schools in Kelantan, Malaysia. International Journal of Research in Education Humanities and Commerce, 5(5), 2024.*
50. *Khan, S., Ehsan, M., & Shah, F. A. (2023). School climate and its relationship with students' academic achievement. International Research Journal of Education and Innovation, 3(4), 1–23.*
51. *Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2022). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. Review of Educational Research, 92(2), 243–280.*
52. *Ladaran, C. C., & Biol Jr., I. M. (2025). School climate and the manifestation of the core values among Grade 5 learners. Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal, 6(2), 524–541.*
53. *La Salle-Finley, T. (2024). Understanding and promoting school climate, bullying prevention, and school connectedness. School Psychology Review.*

54. *Learning Environments Research. (2024). Assessing students' perceptions of school climate in primary schools. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-024-09492-2*
55. *Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2022). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 42(2), 123–149.*
56. *Mag-aso, S. J. S., Albiso, K. M. R., Condeza, K. B., et al. (2025). The influence of school climate and subjective well-being on students' engagement. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS).*
57. *McCombes, S. (2023, June 22). Descriptive research | Definition, types, methods & examples. Scribbr.*
58. *Meng, W. (2024). The effect of perceived principal's instructional leadership on teacher occupational well-being. Open Psychology Journal. (turn1search16)*
59. *Moon, O. (2023). Teachers' Readiness and Teaching Performance in Inclusive Education: Their Relationship to the Implementation of Inclusive Education Program. AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 6(1).*
60. *National School Climate Center. (2025). What is school climate and why is it important? https://schoolclimate.org/school-climate/ (schoolclimate.org)*
61. *Navarro, R. E. (2025). Determinants of teachers' performance among public secondary school teachers in Southwest District, Butuan City. Pantao: The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 4(3), 3430–3439.*
62. *Nazareno, G., & Montañez, M. C. A. (2025). Assessing public elementary teachers' competence in planning, management, and instruction amid adaptive education. International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 15(9), 1804–1815.*
63. *Nguyen, H. T. (2025). Principal instructional leadership and its influence on teacher professional learning and development. International Journal of Educational Leadership.*
64. *Niculescu, A. I., Ehnen, J., Yi, C., Jiawei, D., Chiat Pin, T., Tianyi Zhou, J., Subbaraju, V., Kah Kuan, T., Huy Dat, T., Komar, J., & Chee, G. S. (2025). On the development of an AI performance and behavioural measures for teaching and classroom management.*
65. *Nuzzolo, R., Du, L., Buttigieg, S., et al. (2025). The teacher performance rate and accuracy measure as a teacher training intervention. Journal of Behavioral Education.*
66. *Ortiz Jr., O. E., Blancia, H. M., Pamittan-Gabaran, M., Corpin-Garcia, V. L., & Dela Cruz, J. M. (2025). School heads' instructional leadership styles and administrative challenges as perceived by school heads and teachers in the Philippines. Pedagogy Review.*

67. *Pal, R. K., Dey, A., & Roy, N. R. (2024). The effect of school climate on teaching satisfaction: The role of teacher engagement. Voices of Teachers and Teacher Educators, 13(1), 80–91.*
68. *Pana, E. P. (2024). School heads' instructional leadership and performance: Basis for strategic leadership program. International Journal of Scientific and Management Research, 7(2), 26–40.*
69. *Panga, K. (2025). Instructional leadership, teachers' participation and K to 12 curriculum: impact on teacher engagement. Journal GEHU.*
70. *Parcon, B. S. (2025). Teachers' performance and experiences (Unpublished manuscript).*
71. *Perceptions versus performance: Assessing teacher learning in asynchronous online professional development. (2025). Education and Information Technologies, 30, 4751–4776.*
72. *Per Verner-Filion, J. et al. (2023). Perceived school climate and school grades in secondary students. Learning and Individual Differences, 106, 102337.*
73. *Podiya, J. K., Navaneetham, J., & Bhola, P. (2025). Influences of school climate on emotional health and academic achievement of school-going adolescents in India: A systematic review. BMC Public Health, 25, 54.*
74. *Prestoza, M. J. (2025). Challenges and practices of instructional leadership. PNU Research Portal.*
75. *Professional learning communities and their impact on teacher performance: Empirical evidence from public primary schools in Guiyang. (2024). Teaching and Teacher Education, 148, Article 104715.*
76. *Putri, L., Rezani, M. R., & Hermina, D. (2025). Correlational research design. Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi, 2(6), 306–317.*
77. *Quilala, R. L., & Tantiado, R. C. (2025). Instructional supervision and teachers' efficacy. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 8(3).*
78. *Relationship between instructional leadership practices and learners' reading abilities. (2025). International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI).*
79. *Rodulfa, L. (2023). School heads' instructional leadership and teachers' sense of efficacy in the implementation of blended teaching modality in Sarangani Province. AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 2(1), Article 35.*
80. *Rodriguez, L. A. (2024). School climate, teacher characteristics, and school discipline. ERIC.*

81. *Sabellona, D. C., & Dioso, E. D. (2025). Predicting school climate through social and emotional intelligence of teachers. IJARIIE, 11(4), 27334. (*
82. *Saji, C. G., & Harikrishnan, M. (2024). Redefining school climate: Engaging students, teachers, and parents for positive change. International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education.*
83. *Satur, C. D., Labadan, C. B., Elbanbuena, C. O., & Comon, J. D. (2025). Teaching-learning skills on teachers' performance: Basis for LAC training design. American Journal of Arts and Human Science, 4(2), Article 4231.*
84. *Sayman, A. M., & Atienzar, E. A. (2023). The influence of school climate and leadership style of principals on the performance of public elementary teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic. American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation, 2(2), 58-63.*
85. *Sejuela, B., & Roa-Bagtas, L. (2025). Performance of Teachers Utilizing Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS): Basis for Faculty Enhancement Plan. Journal of Tertiary Education and Learning, 3(2), 73–80.*
86. *Shaked, H. (2024). Enabling factors of instructional leadership in subject coordinators.*
87. *Sollesta, J. G., & Despojo, A. G. B. (2025). Competency in assessment and reporting of elementary teachers: Teachers' and pupils' performance. Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 3(7).*
88. *Subekti, M. A., Suryadi, S., & Ahmad, M. (2024). Transforming teacher performance: The impact of training and professional development on competence improvement. Proceeding of International Conference on Islamic Education (ICIED), 9(1), 218–229.*
89. *Suh, R. (2024). Instructional leadership. In Research Starters: Instructional Leadership. EBSCOhost.*
90. *Tagaban, M. M. V. (2025). Stakeholders assessment on the school climate of secondary schools in the Province of Apayao. AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 11(1), 174.*
91. *Tatoy, A. M. T. (2024). School heads' instructional leadership, collaboration and performance. IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 6(4), 110–113.*
92. *Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Higgins-D'Alessandro, A., & Guffey, S. (2023). School climate research: Conceptualization, measurement, and implications for educational practice. Educational Psychology Review, 35, 1–25.*
93. *Tion, M. A. A., & Tantiado, R. C. (2024). School climate and pupils' progress. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 7(4), 31–?*

94. *Tomaszewski, W., Xiang, N., & Huang, Y. (2024). School climate, student engagement, and academic achievement across school sectors in Australia. Australian Educational Researcher, 51, 667–695.*
95. *Ulit, J. (2025). Impact of school heads' instructional leadership on teaching and learning outcomes: Philippine's context. Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities, 4(3), 2109–2126.*
96. *Usmanov, N. (2024). Impact of instructional leadership on teacher development and student performance. Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education.*
97. *Villarino, I. M. V. (2025). School climate and teachers performance in an elementary school in a resettlement area. International Journal for Innovation Education and Research, 6(12), 1256.*
98. *Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. Wiley.*
99. *Wang, M. T., & Degol, J. L. (2022). School climate and student/teacher outcomes: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and research. Educational Psychology Review, 34, 1–32.*
100. *Yang, H., & Villanueva, L. E. (2025). The impact of school climate on teachers' self-efficacy towards a comprehensive program for professional development. Journal of Education and Educational Research.*