

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-36

SCHOOL HEADS' TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND SUPERVISORY ENGAGEMENT: THEIR INFLUENCE ON SCHOOL CLIMATE

*Analyn N. Millamena, Lenie A. Aduana, and MA. Adrilyn R. Lacurom

Guimaras State University.

Article Received: 30 July 2026

*Corresponding Author: Analyn N. Millamena

Article Revised: 20 August 2026

Guimaras State University.

Published on: 10 September 2026

DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.5567>

ABSTRACT

This study examined school heads' transformational leadership and supervisory engagement and their influence on school climate in the Schools Division of Antique, Philippines, during School Year 2025–2026. The study involved 365 randomly selected public elementary school teachers. The independent variables were age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location, and type of school, while the dependent variables were school heads' transformational leadership, supervisory engagement, and school climate. Data were gathered using validated questionnaires. Frequency, percentage, mean, t-test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and Linear Regression Analysis were used for data analysis at the .05 level of significance through SPSS. Results revealed that respondents assessed the level of school heads' transformational leadership as Very High, the extent of supervisory engagement as Very Great, and school climate as Very Highly Favorable when taken as a whole and when classified as to identified variables. Significant differences in the level of school heads' transformational leadership were found when respondents were classified according to highest educational attainment and school size but not age, school location, or type of school. The extent of school heads supervisory engagement differed only when respondents were classified as to their highest educational attainment. School climate significantly differed according to respondents' highest educational attainment, school size, and type of school but not age or school location. Finally, school heads' transformational leadership and supervisory engagement did not significantly influence school climate.

KEYWORDS: *School Heads' Transformational Leadership, Supervisory Engagement, School Climate.*

INTRODUCTION

Transformational leadership within educational settings has emerged as a critical factor influencing organizational effectiveness and overall school environment. Transformational leaders inspire followers through visionary direction, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration, thereby enhancing collective performance and fostering positive school conditions (Warsi et al., 2025). Recent empirical research confirms that transformational leadership practices of school heads significantly shape aspects of school climate such as teacher collaboration, inclusivity, and innovation, which are essential components of a healthy educational environment (Özhan, 2025; Cagulada & Villocino, 2025).

In addition to leadership, supervisory engagement by school heads plays a pivotal role in shaping school functioning and workplace conditions. Academic supervision characterized by active engagement, constructive feedback, and collaborative strategies has been linked to teacher development and a supportive school culture. While transformational leadership focuses on inspiring and empowering followers, supervisory engagement operationalizes leadership through direct support, monitoring, and developmental practices that help sustain instructional improvement and professional growth (Syahrir, Fandir, & Nurfidah, 2025).

School climate, defined as the quality and character of school life reflected in relationships, teaching practices, and shared values, has been consistently linked to leadership and engagement practices of school heads (Yang & Villanueva, 2025). A positive school climate not only enhances teacher morale and professional efficacy but also affects learner engagement and learning outcomes. Transformational leadership and supervisory engagement are associated with environments that encourage collaboration, trust, and a sense of belonging among stakeholders (Young & Villanueva (2025).

In the Schools Division of Antique, school heads continue to implement the Department of Education's initiatives on instructional leadership and continuous professional development to improve school performance and learner outcomes. Despite these efforts, schools differ in terms of geographical location, availability of resources, teacher experience, enrollment size, and organizational culture, which may influence the way transformational leadership and supervisory engagement are practiced. Some schools have demonstrated highly collaborative and supportive working environments, while others continue to encounter challenges related to teacher motivation, communication, instructional monitoring, and organizational cohesion. Since no recent empirical investigation has comprehensively examined how school heads' transformational leadership and supervisory engagement jointly influence school climate

within the Schools Division of Antique, there remains a need to generate localized evidence that reflects the realities experienced by teachers and school heads.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the school heads' transformational leadership and supervisory engagement and their influence to school climate in the Schools Division of Antique, Philippines for school year 2025-2026.

Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of school heads' transformational leadership as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school?
2. What is the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school?
3. What is the school climate as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school?
4. Are there significant differences in the level of school heads' transformational leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school?
5. Are there significant differences in the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school?
6. Are there significant differences in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school?
7. Do school heads' transformational leadership and supervisory engagement significantly influence school climate?

METHODOLOGY

The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to determine school heads' transformational leadership and supervisory engagement and their influence on school climate in the Schools Division of Antique, Philippines, during School Year 2025–2026. The respondents were 365 randomly selected public elementary school teachers from three

clusters. Stratified proportionate random sampling was employed, with clusters serving as strata and a fishbowl technique used to select respondents from participating schools. Data were gathered through a four-part questionnaire. Part I obtained age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location, and type of school. Part II contained 15 items on transformational leadership based on Metaferia (2023); Part III contained 15 items on supervisory engagement based on Ilao and Malaluan (2022); and Part IV contained 15 items on school climate based on Delgado-Galindo et al. (2025). Five experts evaluated the instrument using the Good and Scates criteria. Pilot testing among 30 teachers outside the final sample produced Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .917 for transformational leadership, .901 for supervisory engagement, and .912 for school climate, indicating high reliability. After authorization was obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent and the concerned district and school offices, the questionnaires were distributed, retrieved, checked, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted. Frequency and percentage described the respondents; mean determined transformational leadership, supervisory engagement, and school climate; t-test examined differences for two-category variables; analysis of variance examined differences according to highest educational attainment and school size; and linear regression analysis tested the influence of transformational leadership and supervisory engagement on school climate. All inferential tests used a .05 level of significance, and computations were processed through SPSS.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

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

The level of school heads' transformational 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' transformational leadership as assessed by the respondents is "Very High" with an obtained overall mean score of 4.70. A scrutiny of the means in the same table reveals that respondents obtained a highest mean score in the indicators "Articulates a clear and inspiring vision for the future of their school" (M=4.79), "Encourages teachers to think creatively and consider new ways of instruction" (M=4.76), and "Communicates high expectations for teacher performance and learner success" (M=4.76) described as "Very High" while they obtained the lowest mean score in the indicators "Challenges teachers to solve problems in innovative ways" (M=4.57), "Models ethical behavior and acts as a positive role model for teachers and staff" (M=4.64), and

“Provides individualized support and mentorship to teachers (M=4.65) described also as “Very High.”

This result means that all school heads inspire, motivate, and empower teachers and staff to achieve higher levels of performance, innovate in teaching practices, and commit to the shared vision and goals of the school. This is indicated by articulating a clear and inspiring vision for the future of their school, encouraging teachers to think creatively and consider new ways of instruction and communicating high expectations for teacher performance and learner success.

This finding is supported by the study of Tiongson (2025), which revealed that school heads assigned in far-flung areas exhibited a very high level of transformational leadership.

Similarly, Esogon, Gumban, and Guitche (2024) found that school heads in public elementary schools were perceived by teachers to have a high to very high level of transformational leadership practices. Their findings showed that school heads demonstrated strong leadership behaviors that encouraged teachers to improve their performance and participate actively in achieving institutional goals.

Table 1. Level of School Heads’ Transformational Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole.

Category	Mean	Description
Articulates a clear and inspiring vision for the future of their school.	4.79	Very High
Models ethical behavior and acts as a positive role model for teachers and staff.	4.64	Very High
Encourages teachers to think creatively and consider new ways of instruction.	4.76	Very High
Provides individualized support and mentorship to teachers.	4.65	Very High
Communicates high expectations for teacher performance and learner success.	4.76	Very High
Recognizes good performance by teachers.	4.72	Very High
Challenges teachers to solve problems in innovative ways.	4.57	Very High
Encourages collaboration and teamwork among personnel.	4.75	Very High
Supports continuous professional growth and development for teachers.	4.73	Very High
Addresses the individual needs and concerns of teachers.	4.68	Very High
Inspires commitment to collective school goals.	4.74	Very High
Fosters a positive school environment where teachers feel valued.	4.68	Very High

Category	Mean	Description
Encourages shared decision-making and participation in school improvement efforts.	4.71	Very High
Provides constructive feedback that helps improve teaching practices.	4.68	Very High
Motivates teachers to go beyond routine expectations in their work.	4.68	Very High
Overall Mean	4.70	Very High

Level of School Heads' Transformational Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, School Size, School Location and Type of School

The level of school heads' transformational leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school was determined by computing the mean scores.

When classified according to age, both respondents who are young (M=4.69) and old (M=4.71) assessed the level of school heads' transformational leadership as "Very High".

When classified according to highest educational attainment, respondents who are holder of bachelor's degree (M=4.73) master's degree (M=4.63) and doctorate degree (M=4.92) assessed the level of school heads' transformational leadership as "Very High".

When classified according to school size, respondents who came from small (M=4.73) medium (M=4.67) and large (M=4.47) schools assessed the level of school heads' transformational leadership as "Very High".

When classified according to school location, respondents who came from upland (M=4.68) and lowland (M=4.72) schools assessed the level of school heads' transformational leadership as "Very High".

When classified according to type of school, respondents who came from central (M=4.57) and non-central (M=4.71) schools assessed the level of school heads' transformational leadership as "Very High".

This result means that regardless of age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school, all school heads inspire, motivate, and empower teachers and staff to achieve higher levels of performance, innovate in teaching practices, and commit to the shared vision and goals of the school.

This affirms the study of Palumar and Cruz (2026) who reported that school heads' transformational leadership practices were assessed at a very high level, with

transformational leadership emerging as the dominant leadership style among school administrators.

However, Luczon (2026) found that public elementary school teachers perceived their school heads' transformational leadership as high, with leadership behaviors significantly associated with teacher job satisfaction. These findings reinforce the idea that school heads who exhibit transformational leadership characteristics are recognized by teachers as capable, supportive, and effective leaders.

Table 2. Level of School Heads' Transformational Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, School Size, School Location and Type of School.

Variables	Mean	Description
Age		
Young	4.69	Very High
Old	4.71	Very High
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	4.73	Very High
Master's Degree	4.63	Very High
Doctorate Degree	4.92	Very High
School Size		
Small	4.73	Very High
Medium	4.67	Very High
Large	4.47	Very High
School Location		
Upland	4.68	Very High
Lowland	4.72	Very High
Type of School		
Central	4.57	Very High
Non-Central	4.71	Very High

Extent of School Heads' Supervisory Engagement as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole

The extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole was determined by computing the mean scores.

When taken as a whole, the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as assessed by the respondents is "Very Great" with an obtained overall mean score of 4.67. A scrutiny of the means in the same table reveals that respondents obtained a highest mean score in the indicators "Provides constructive feedback after classroom observations" (M=4.72), "Recognizes teacher improvement efforts" (M=4.72), and "Addresses teachers' concerns regarding instructional challenges promptly" (M=4.71) described as "Very Great Extent" while they obtained the lowest mean score in the indicators "Models effective teaching practices when supervising instruction" (M=4.57), "Conducts regular classroom observations to monitor teaching and learning" (M=4.59), and "Assists teachers in planning lessons or curriculum adjustments (M=4.59) described also as "Very Great Extent."

This result means that all school heads have active involvement in guiding, monitoring, supporting, and collaborating with teachers and staff to improve instructional practices and professional development. This is indicated by providing constructive feedback after classroom observations, recognizing teacher improvement efforts and addressing teachers' concerns regarding instructional challenges promptly.

This finding is supported by Godes and Dioso (2024), who found that school heads demonstrated strong instructional supervisory practices in public secondary schools. Their study revealed that school heads actively performed supervisory functions such as monitoring instruction, providing guidance, and supporting teachers' professional improvement.

Similarly, Kalon (2025) reported that school heads in the Schools Division of Antique consistently demonstrated strong instructional supervisory practices, particularly in classroom observation, feedback provision, and instructional monitoring.

Table 3. Extent of School Heads' Supervisory Engagement as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole.

Category	Mean	Description
Conducts regular classroom observations to monitor teaching and learning.	4.59	Very Great Extent
Provides constructive feedback after classroom observations.	4.72	Very Great Extent

Category	Mean	Description
Offers guidance on instructional strategies when needed.	4.69	Very Great Extent
Assists teachers in planning lessons or curriculum adjustments.	4.59	Very Great Extent
Supports teachers' professional growth through mentoring or coaching.	4.67	Very Great Extent
Informs teachers about relevant professional development opportunities.	4.69	Very Great Extent
Creates a supportive environment for reflective discussions on teaching practices.	4.66	Very Great Extent
Assesses and discusses teachers' instructional needs regularly.	4.65	Very Great Extent
Models effective teaching practices when supervising instruction.	4.57	Very Great Extent
Collaborates with teachers in developing classroom assessment practices.	4.64	Very Great Extent
Visits learning areas to ensure a conducive learning environment.	4.70	Very Great Extent
Encourages teachers to use data (e.g., performance results) to improve instruction.	4.70	Very Great Extent
Follows up on supervisory recommendations to ensure improvements are implemented.	4.69	Very Great Extent
Recognizes teacher improvement efforts.	4.72	Very Great Extent
Addresses teachers' concerns regarding instructional challenges promptly.	4.71	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.67	Very Great Extent

Extent of School Heads' Supervisory Engagement as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, School Size, School Location and Type of School

The extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school was determined by computing the mean scores.

When classified according to age, both respondents who are young (M=4.65) and old (M=4.67) assessed the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as "Very Great".

When classified according to highest educational attainment, respondents who are holder of bachelor's degree (M=4.70) master's degree (M=4.59) and doctorate degree (M=4.84) assessed the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as "Very Great".

When classified according to school size, respondents who came from small (M=4.68) medium (M=4.66) and large (M=4.45) schools assessed the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as "Very Great".

When classified according to school location, respondents who came from upland (M=4.65) and lowland (M=4.68) schools assessed the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as "Very Great".

When classified according to type of school, respondents who came from central (M=4.50) and non-central (M=4.68) schools assessed the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as "Very Great".

This result means that regardless of age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school, all school heads have active involvement in guiding, monitoring, supporting, and collaborating with teachers and staff to improve instructional practices and professional development.

This is supported by the study of Alba et al. (2025), who emphasized in their study that effective school heads engage in collaborative supervision through trust-building, regular feedback, and sustained professional support for teachers. The study noted that successful supervision requires school heads to establish positive relationships with teachers and create opportunities for instructional enhancement.

Table 4. Extent of School Heads' Supervisory Engagement as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, School Size, School Location and Type of School.

Variables	Mean	Description
Age		
Young	4.65	Very Great Extent
Old	4.67	Very Great Extent
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	4.70	Very Great Extent
Master's Degree	4.59	Very Great Extent

Variables	Mean	Description
Doctorate Degree	4.84	Very Great Extent
School Size		
Small	4.68	Very Great Extent
Medium	4.66	Very Great Extent
Large	4.45	Very Great Extent
School Location		
Upland	4.65	Very Great Extent
Lowland	4.68	Very Great Extent
Type of School		
Central	4.50	Very Great Extent
Non-Central	4.68	Very Great Extent

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 4.72. A scrutiny of the means in the same table reveals that respondents obtained a highest mean score in the indicators “Learners feel a sense of belonging within the school community” (M=4.79), “There are positive teacher-learner relationships” (M=4.79), and “The environment promotes inclusion and respect for diversity” (M=4.79) described as “Very Highly Favorable” while they obtained the lowest mean score in the indicators “There is mutual respect between teachers and school head” (M=4.63), “Teachers work collaboratively and support one another” (M=4.64), and “Leadership promotes open communication and trust among personnel (M=4.67) described also as “Very Highly Favorable.”

This result means that all of the schools exhibit very wholesome learning atmosphere. This is shown by learners feel a sense of belonging within the school community, there are positive

teacher-learner relationships and the environment promotes inclusion and respect for diversity.

This finding is supported by Masunag and Guhao (2024), who revealed in their study that the level of organizational climate was very high.

Similarly, it aligns with the findings of Pasandalan and Cerado (2025) who found that school climate plays an important role in shaping teachers' workplace experiences, particularly their motivation, satisfaction, and commitment.

Table 5. School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken as a Whole.

Category	Mean	Description
Teachers work collaboratively and support one another.	4.64	Very Favorable Highly
There is mutual respect between teachers and school head.	4.63	Very Favorable Highly
Leadership promotes open communication and trust among personnel.	4.67	Very Favorable Highly
The administration supports learner learning and engagement.	4.68	Very Favorable Highly
Teachers feel safe and supported in their work environment.	4.70	Very Favorable Highly
Creative and innovative teaching practices are encouraged.	4.74	Very Favorable Highly
Learners feel a sense of belonging within the school community.	4.79	Very Favorable Highly
Procedures and rules are applied fairly and consistently.	4.74	Very Favorable Highly
There are positive teacher-learner relationships.	4.79	Very Favorable Highly
The environment promotes inclusion and respect for diversity.	4.79	Very Favorable Highly
Teachers have access to professional development opportunities that strengthen teaching.	4.70	Very Favorable Highly
Classroom environments are organized and conducive to effective teaching.	4.75	Very Favorable Highly
Teachers feel comfortable raising concerns or suggestions to school leaders.	4.68	Very Favorable Highly
Teachers are recognized or appreciated for their contributions to school improvement.	4.72	Very Favorable Highly

Category	Mean	Description
There is a clear sense of shared goals and vision among teachers and school head.	4.74	Very Highly Favorable
Overall Mean	4.72	Very Highly Favorable

School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, School Size, School Location and Type of School

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

When classified according to age, both respondents who are young (M=4.74) and old (M=4.71) assessed the school climate as “Very Highly Favorable”.

When classified according to highest educational attainment, respondents who are holder of bachelor’s degree (M=4.76) master’s degree (M=4.65) and doctorate degree (M=4.87) assessed the school climate as “Very Highly Favorable”.

When classified according to school size, respondents who came from small (M=4.77) medium (M=4.58) and large (M=4.61) schools assessed the school climate as “Very Highly Favorable”.

When classified according to school location, respondents who came from upland (M=4.76) and lowland (M=4.69) schools assessed the school climate as “Very Highly Favorable”.

When classified according to type of school, respondents who came from central (M=4.54) and non-central (M=4.73) schools assessed the school climate as “Very Highly Favorable”.

This result means that regardless of age, highest educational attainment, school size, school location and type of school, all of the schools exhibit very wholesome learning atmosphere.

The study of Gamala and Marpa (2022) affirms the above findings who found that the school environment was perceived as very favorable.

Table 6. School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, School Size, School Location and Type of School.

Variables	Mean	Description
Age		
Young	4.74	Very Highly Favorable
Old	4.71	Very Highly Favorable

Variables	Mean	Description
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	4.74	Very Highly Favorable
Master's Degree	4.65	Very Highly Favorable
Doctorate Degree	4.87	Very Highly Favorable
School Size		
Small	4.77	Very Highly Favorable
Medium	4.58	Very Highly Favorable
Large	4.61	Very Highly Favorable
School Location		
Upland	4.76	Very Highly Favorable
Lowland	4.69	Very Highly Favorable
Type of School		
Central	4.54	Very Highly Favorable
Non-Central	4.73	Very Highly Favorable

Differences in the Level of School Heads' Transformational Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, School Location and Type of School

As reflected in Table 7, no significant differences existed in the level of school heads' transformational leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, $t = -.378$, $p > .05$; school location, $t = -.726$, $p > .05$ and type of school, $t = -1.553$, $p > .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the level of school heads' transformational leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, school location and type of school was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents have similar assessment of the level of school heads' transformational leadership regardless of their age, school location and type of school.

This finding means that these demographic variables do not significantly differ how respondents evaluate the transformational leadership of their school heads. Whether the respondents are young or old, assigned in upland or lowland schools, or working in central or non-central schools, they tend to observe and experience similar levels of transformational leadership. Such consistency means that school heads demonstrate relatively uniform leadership practices across diverse educational settings, resulting in comparable perceptions among respondents.

This finding is corroborated by the study of Esogon, Gumban, and Guitche (2024) who found that school heads were perceived to exhibit a high level of transformational leadership practices, and comparative analyses showed that respondents' assessments did not significantly vary across several profile variables.

Table 7. Significant Differences in the Level of School Heads' Transformational Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, School Location and Type of School.

Variables	Mean	t-test value	p-value	Remarks
Age				
Young	4.69	-.378	.706	Not Significant
Old	4.71			
School Location	School Location	School Location		
Upland	4.68	-.726	.468	Not Significant
Lowland	4.72			
Type of School	Type of School	Type of School		
Central	4.57	-1.553	.130	Not Significant
Non-Central	4.71			

p > .05, Not Significant

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

Table 8 shows that significant differences existed in the level of school heads' transformational leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment, $F = 3.804$, $p < .05$ and school size, $F = 3.040$, $p < .05$. Results of post hoc test revealed that the significant differences lie between bachelor's degree and master's degree with mean difference of .101; between master's degree and doctorate degree with mean difference of -.289; and between small and large schools with mean difference of .262. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the level of school heads' transformational leadership as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment and school size was rejected.

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

This finding indicates that these variables shape how respondents perceive and evaluate the transformational leadership of their school heads. Respondents with varying educational backgrounds may have different expectations, standards, and levels of understanding of transformational leadership. Those with advanced academic qualifications may possess greater knowledge of leadership theories and educational management principles, enabling them to assess transformational leadership more critically than those with lower educational attainment.

The significant difference based on school size likewise indicates that the organizational context affects respondents' perceptions of transformational leadership. School heads in small, medium, and large schools encounter varying administrative responsibilities, resource availability, teacher populations, and organizational complexities. In smaller schools, school heads often have more frequent and direct interactions with teachers, making transformational leadership behaviors such as individualized consideration and inspirational motivation more visible. In contrast, school heads in larger schools may face greater managerial demands that limit personal interactions with every teacher, leading respondents to perceive their leadership differently.

Overall, the finding emphasizes that highest educational attainment and school size are important considerations in understanding how transformational leadership is perceived in

schools. It means that school heads may need to adopt context-responsive leadership strategies and communication approaches that address the diverse expectations of teachers with different educational backgrounds and the unique organizational demands of schools of varying sizes.

This finding is supported by Tongol (2021) who examined the transformational leadership attributes of school heads and found significant differences in transformational leadership when grouped according to educational attainment.

Table 8. Significant Differences in the Level of School Heads' Transformational Leadership as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Size.

Variables	Sum of Squares	F-value	p-value	Remarks
Highest Educational Attainment	Highest Educational Attainment			
Between Groups	1.562	3.804	.023	Significant
Within Groups	74.325			
Total	75.887			
School Size				
Between Groups	1.254	3.040	.049	Significant
Within Groups	74.634			
Total	75.887			

$p < .05$, Significant

Differences in the Extent of School Heads' Supervisory Engagement as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, School Location and Type of School

As reflected in Table 9, no significant differences existed in the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, $t = -.367$, $p > .05$; school location, $t = -.531$, $p > .05$ and type of school, $t = -1.731$, $p > .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, school location and type of school was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents have similar assessment of the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement regardless of their age, school location and type of school.

This finding means that these demographic and school-related characteristics do not significantly differ how respondents perceive the supervisory engagement of their school heads. Whether respondents are young or old, assigned in upland or lowland schools, or employed in central or non-central schools, they generally observe comparable levels of supervisory engagement. Such consistency means that school heads carry out their supervisory responsibilities in a relatively uniform manner across different educational contexts, resulting in similar perceptions among respondents.

This is consistent with the findings of Kalon (2025) that variations in school context do not necessarily influence the extent to which school heads engage in supervision.

Table 9. Significant Differences in the Extent of School Heads' Supervisory Engagement as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, School Location and Type of School.

Variables	Mean	t-test value	p-value	Remarks
Age				
Young	4.65	-.367	.714	Not Significant
Old	4.67			
School Location	School Location	School Location		
Upland	4.65	-.531	.596	Not Significant
Lowland	4.68			
Type of School	Type of School	Type of School		
Central	4.50	-1.731	.094	Not Significant
Non-Central	4.68			

$p > .05$, Not Significant

Differences in the Extent of School Heads' Supervisory Engagement as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Size

Table 10 shows that significant differences existed in the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment, $F = 3.604$, $p < .05$. Results of post hoc test revealed that the significant

differences lie between bachelor's degree and master's degree with mean difference of .115. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment was rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents differ in their assessment of the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement when their highest educational attainment is considered.

This finding indicates that highest educational attainment significantly differ how respondents perceive and evaluate the supervisory engagement of their school heads. Respondents with different academic qualifications may possess varying levels of knowledge, professional experience, and expectations regarding effective instructional supervision. As a result, they may interpret the frequency, quality, and effectiveness of supervisory engagement differently, leading to significant variations in their assessments.

This finding is supported by Bertomo (2026), who revealed that significant differences existed in instructional supervision when respondents were grouped according to educational attainment.

On the other hand, no significant differences existed in the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as assessed by the respondents when classified according to school size, $F = 1.890$, $p > .05$. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement as assessed by the respondents when classified according to school size was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents have similar assessment of the extent of school heads' supervisory engagement regardless of school size.

This finding indicates that whether respondents belong to small, medium, or large schools, they generally perceive the supervisory engagement of their school heads in the same way. The absence of a significant difference means that school size does not substantially shape respondents' evaluation of how school heads perform their supervisory responsibilities. Despite variations in the number of teachers, learners, and administrative demands associated with different school sizes, respondents consistently observe comparable levels of supervision and instructional support from their school heads.

This aligns with the findings of Godes and Dioso (2024) that supervisory engagement is a fundamental component of instructional leadership that must be exercised across various school contexts.

Table 10. Significant Differences in the Extent of School Heads' Supervisory Engagement as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Size.

Variables	Sum of Squares	F-value	p-value	Remarks
Highest Educational Attainment	Highest Educational Attainment			
Between Groups	1.580	3.604	.028	Significant
Within Groups	79.368			
Total	80.949			
School Size				
Between Groups	.837	1.890	.153	Not Significant
Within Groups	80.112			
Total	80.949			

$p < .05$, Significant

$p > .05$, Not Significant

Differences in the School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, School Location and Type of School

As reflected in Table 11, significant differences existed in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to type of school, $t = -2.665$, $p < .05$. 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 type of school was rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents differ in their assessment of the school climate when type of school is considered.

This finding indicates that the type of school shapes how respondents perceive the overall school climate. Because different types of schools operate under varying conditions, resources, student populations, and organizational structures, respondents may experience and evaluate the school climate differently, resulting in statistically significant variations in their assessments.

One possible explanation for this finding is that each type of school presents unique opportunities and challenges that shape the daily experiences of teachers and other school personnel. For example, schools may differ in terms of enrollment size, staffing patterns,

availability of instructional resources, stakeholder involvement, and administrative support. These contextual differences can influence the quality of communication, collegial relationships, decision-making processes, and professional collaboration, all of which are important dimensions of school climate. Consequently, respondents from different types of schools are likely to develop distinct perceptions of their working environment.

This finding is corroborated by the study of Perzigian and Braun (2023) investigated differences in school climate ratings across different types of secondary schools and found statistically significant variations in specific dimensions of school climate.

On the other hand, no significant differences existed in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to age, $t = .705$, $p > .05$ and school location, $t = 1.768$, $p > .05$. 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 and school location was not rejected.

The above findings indicate that respondents have similar assessment of the school climate regardless of age and school location.

This finding means that neither the respondents' age nor the geographical location of their schools significantly shapes how they perceive the overall school climate. Whether respondents are young or old, or whether they work in upland and lowland schools, they generally share comparable perceptions of the school climate. This consistency implies that respondents experience similar working conditions and organizational practices despite differences in their personal characteristics and school settings.

This finding is supported by Pasandalan and Cerado (2025), who revealed that school climate was generally perceived positively, and age-related characteristics of teachers did not significantly influence their assessment of the school environment.

Table 11. Significant Differences in the School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Age, School Location and Type of School.

Variables	Mean	t-test value	p-value	Remarks
Age				
Young	4.74	.705	.481	Not Significant
Old	4.71			
School Location	School Location	School Location		

Variables	Mean	t-test value	p-value	Remarks
Upland	4.76	1.768	.078	Not Significant
Lowland	4.69			
Type of School	Type of School	Type of School		
Central	4.54	-2.665	.012	Significant
Non-Central	4.73			

$p < .05$, Significant

$p > .05$, Not Significant

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

Table 12 shows that significant differences existed in the school climate as assessed by the respondents when classified according to highest educational attainment, $F = 3.464$, $p < .05$ and school size, $F = 9.191$, $p < .05$. Result of post hoc test revealed that the significant differences lie between bachelor's degree and master's degree with mean difference of .093; between master's degree and doctorate degree with mean difference of -.219; and between small and medium schools with mean difference of .195. 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 size 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 these factors shape how respondents perceive the overall school environment that facilitate teaching and learning. Respondents with different educational qualifications and those assigned to schools in different locations may have varying experiences and expectations, leading to significant differences in their evaluations of the school climate.

One possible explanation is that respondents with higher educational attainment, such as those who have completed graduate studies, may possess a broader understanding of effective school organizations and leadership practices. Their advanced academic preparation may expose them to contemporary theories and best practices in educational management, causing them to evaluate the school climate using more comprehensive or critical standards.

Conversely, respondents with lower educational attainment may base their assessments primarily on their day-to-day experiences and immediate interactions within the school. These differences in professional knowledge and expectations can result in varying perceptions of school climate.

Differences based on school location may likewise reflect the unique realities faced by schools in different geographical settings. Schools located in geographically isolated areas like upland schools often vary in terms of access to resources, infrastructure, stakeholder support, teacher availability, and opportunities for professional development. These contextual factors can influence communication, collaboration, leadership effectiveness, and the overall working environment, thereby shaping respondents' perceptions of the school climate. As a result, teachers assigned to different locations may experience organizational conditions differently, leading to statistically significant variations in their assessments.

This finding is supported by Tindowen and Macanang (2023), who found that respondents' perceptions of school climate varied significantly when grouped according to educational attainment.

In relation to school size, Kraft and Papay (2024) found that school organizational characteristics, including the size and structure of schools, influence teachers' workplace experiences, professional collaboration, and perceptions of their working environment.

Table 12. Significant Differences in the School Climate as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Highest Educational Attainment and School Size.

Variables	Sum of Squares	F-value	p-value	Remarks
Highest Educational Attainment	Highest Educational Attainment			
Between Groups	1.081	3.464	.032	Significant
Within Groups	56.483			
Total	57.564			
School Size				
Between Groups	2.782	9.191	.000	Significant
Within Groups	54.782			
Total	57.564			

$p < .05$, Significant

Influence of School Heads' Transformational Leadership and Supervisory Engagement on School Climate

The Linear Regression Analysis ($\alpha=.05$) was utilized to determine the influence of school heads' transformational leadership and supervisory engagement on school climate.

As shown in Table 13, school heads' transformational leadership has no significant influence on school climate with obtained R^2 value of .473. This explains that 47.30% of the variances in school climate is attributed by school heads' transformational leadership ($F = 325.876$, $p < .05$) while 52.70% attributed by factors other than school heads' transformational leadership.

This result indicates that school heads' transformation leadership has no significant influence on school climate.

This finding means that variations in the level of transformational leadership demonstrated by school heads do not significantly influence or explain variations in the school climate as perceived by the respondents. Although school heads may exhibit transformational leadership behaviors such as inspiring a shared vision, motivating teachers, encouraging innovation, providing individualized support, and fostering professional growth, these practices alone are not sufficient to produce measurable changes in the overall school climate within the context of the study.

One possible explanation for this finding is that school climate is a multidimensional construct influenced by numerous organizational and contextual factors beyond the leadership style of the school head. Factors such as teacher collaboration, organizational culture, availability of resources, stakeholder involvement, student behavior, school policies, working conditions, and community support may collectively have a greater impact on shaping the school's climate than transformational leadership alone. As a result, even when school heads demonstrate strong transformational leadership, the presence or absence of these other factors may diminish its overall influence on the school environment.

Overall, the finding indicates that while transformational leadership remains an important leadership approach, it may not independently determine the quality of school climate in the Schools Division of Antique. Improving school climate may require a more comprehensive strategy that integrates effective leadership with strong organizational support systems, collaborative professional relationships, adequate resources, teacher well-being initiatives, and active stakeholder participation. Such a holistic approach is more likely to foster a positive, inclusive, and sustainable school climate than relying solely on the transformational leadership practices of school heads.

This corroborates the findings of Bellibaş, Gümüş, and Liu (2021) who found that leadership practices were related to some aspects of school functioning; however, leadership was not the sole determinant of school climate. They highlighted that school climate is influenced by broader organizational conditions, including teacher capacity, professional collaboration, school structures, and shared norms.

On the other hand, school heads' supervisory engagement has no significant influence on school climate with obtained R² value of .475. This explains that 47.50% of the variances in school climate is attributed by school heads' supervisory engagement ($F = 327.960$, $p < .05$) while only 52.50% is attributed by factors other than school heads' supervisory engagement. This result indicates that school heads' supervisory engagement has no significant influence on school climate.

This finding means that the extent to which school heads engage in supervisory functions—such as classroom observation, instructional monitoring, mentoring, coaching, performance feedback, and professional support—does not significantly predict or influence the overall school climate as perceived by the respondents. Although supervisory engagement is essential for improving instructional quality and supporting teachers' professional development, the results suggest that it does not independently account for differences in the school climate.

One possible explanation for this finding is that school climate is a complex and multifaceted construct shaped by numerous factors beyond supervisory engagement. Elements such as interpersonal relationships among teachers, organizational culture, communication patterns, availability of resources, teacher morale, stakeholder participation, student behavior, and institutional policies collectively influence how respondents perceive the school climate. Consequently, even when school heads actively engage in instructional supervision, these other organizational and contextual factors may exert a stronger influence on the overall school climate, reducing the measurable effect of supervisory engagement alone.

This corroborates the findings of Fontanilla et al. (2026) that instructional supervision was implemented at a high level, its relationship with school climate was very weak, indicating that supervision contributes only minimally to creating a positive school environment.

Table 13. Summary of the Linear Regression Analysis on the Influence of School Heads' Transformational Leadership and Supervisory Engagement on School Climate.

Variable	R	R ²	R ² Change	F	Sig. F	SE B	Beta	t	Sig.
Transformational Leadership	.688	.473	.472	325.876	.000	.599	.688	18.052	.000
Supervisory Engagement	.689	.475	.473	327.960	.000	.581	.689	18.110	.000

CONCLUSIONS

1. All school heads in the Schools Division of Antique inspire, motivate, and empower teachers and staff to achieve higher levels of performance, innovate in teaching practices, and commit to the shared vision and goals of the school.
2. All school heads in the Schools Division of Antique have active involvement in guiding, monitoring, supporting, and collaborating with teachers and staff to improve instructional practices and professional development.
3. All schools in the Schools Division of Antique exhibit very wholesome learning atmosphere.
4. Teachers have similar assessment of the school heads' transformational leadership regardless of their age, school location and type of school while they differ in their assessment when their highest educational attainment and school size are considered.
5. Teachers have similar assessment of the school heads' supervisory engagement regardless of their age, school size, school location and type of school while they differ in their assessment when their highest educational attainment is considered.
6. Teachers have similar assessment of school climate regardless of their age and school location while they differ in their assessment when their highest educational attainment, school size and type of school are considered.
7. School climate is not significantly influence by school heads' transformational leadership and supervisory engagement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Higher officials of the Department of Education may provide leadership development programs, capacity-building activities, and professional learning opportunities focused on strengthening transformational leadership competencies. Regular training on strategic visioning, instructional leadership, change management, emotional intelligence, stakeholder engagement, and data-driven decision-making can help school heads enhance their ability to inspire and empower teachers. The Department may also institutionalize mentoring and

coaching programs where experienced and effective school leaders can guide newly appointed or aspiring school heads in developing and sustaining positive leadership practices.

2. School heads may consistently strengthen their role as instructional leaders through regular classroom observations, constructive feedback, coaching, and mentoring. They may maintain a systematic supervision process that focuses on supporting teachers' professional growth rather than merely evaluating performance. By providing timely, specific, and developmental feedback, school heads can help teachers enhance their instructional practices, address teaching challenges, and improve learning outcomes.

3. School heads may foster a positive, inclusive, and collaborative school environment where teachers, learners, and stakeholders feel valued, respected, and supported. They may strengthen communication systems within the school by promoting transparency, active listening, and open dialogue among members of the school community. By demonstrating fairness, empathy, and respect in decision-making, school heads can create an environment where everyone feels a sense of belonging and shared responsibility.

4. School heads may continuously engage in professional growth and lifelong learning activities that enhance their leadership knowledge, skills, and competencies. They may actively participate in leadership training, seminars, coaching sessions, and professional networks that focus on instructional leadership, strategic planning, change management, and people-centered leadership. By continuously improving themselves, school heads can remain responsive to the changing needs of teachers, learners, and stakeholders while maintaining their capacity to inspire and guide the school community toward shared goals.

5. School heads may design mechanisms to enable teachers to actively participate in the instructional supervision process and maintaining open, constructive communication with school leaders. They may provide honest feedback regarding supervisory activities, classroom observations, coaching sessions, and professional support received from school heads. By expressing their needs, challenges, and suggestions, teachers can help school heads develop more responsive and relevant supervisory engagement that address the actual conditions of the teaching-learning process.

6. Teachers may actively contribute to the development of a positive, respectful, and collaborative school environment. They may cultivate supportive relationships with fellow teachers, learners, and other school stakeholders by practicing open communication, empathy, respect, and cooperation. They may actively participate in school programs and initiatives to create a more harmonious and supportive workplace.

7. Future researchers may conduct further investigations related to school heads' transformational leadership, supervisory engagement, and school climate. They may explore other variables that were not included in the present study, such as organizational culture, teachers' motivation, school heads' emotional intelligence, stakeholder participation, resource management practices, and teacher well-being, which may provide additional explanations for variations in school climate. Since the findings revealed that transformational leadership and supervisory engagement did not significantly influence school climate, future studies may examine other contextual and organizational factors that contribute to the development of a positive school environment.

REFERENCES

1. Acedo, M. J. P., & Jomud, P. D. (2025). Experiences of public schools district supervisors in supervising school heads: A phenomenological study. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 8(1), 63–75.
2. Adolfo, J. V., & Tudlasan, R. T. (2025). Linking school heads' transformational leadership to teachers' job performance: Shared instruction goal achievement. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education*.
3. Agung, A. M., & Rosmaladewi, O. (2025). Transformational Leadership Management of School Principals in Enhancing the Professional Competence of Primary School Teachers. *Journal of Science and Education*.
4. Akpalu, R., Owusu, J., Asare, E. A., & Boateng, P. A. (2025). Influence of head-teachers' instructional supervision practices on teacher performance in primary schools in Ghana: An integrated theoretical model. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(03), 151–159.
5. Alba, C. R. S., Abayon, R. M., Alcaraz, R. J. M., Antipolo, R. N., Aparejado, B. R. M., Galan, R. N., Gueta, L. D., Tumbaga, C. A., Ydian, R. E., & Daguro, N. G. (2025). Best practices of school heads in providing instructional supervision to public elementary school teachers. *Psych Educ*, 37(10), 1055–1061.
6. Al Hammadi, M. (2025). How does transformational leadership improve instructional practice? *SAGE Open*.
7. Antonio, A. D. G., & Eslabon, R. T. (2024). School heads' instructional supervisory skills and teachers' performance. *Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends*, 3(1), 104–110.

8. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Third edition manual and sampler set. Mind Garden.
9. Assessing students' perceptions of school climate in primary schools. (2024). *Learning Environments Research*, 27, 579–602.
10. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
11. Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19–31.
12. Bellibaş, M. Ş., Gümüş, S., & Liu, Y. (2021). The moderation effect of transformational leadership on the relationship between instructional leadership and school climate. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(5), 746–765.
13. Bertomo, R. M. (2026). School heads' instructional supervision, management, and performance in the implementation of Alternative Delivery Mode (ADM). *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(2).
14. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
15. Cabildo, G. S. (2025). Empowering school leaders: An exploration of supervisory practices and challenges among public elementary school heads in the Schools Division of Ilocos Sur. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 8(03).
16. Cagulada, R. V., & Villocino, R. P. (2025). Impact of transformational leadership and school climate on organizational commitment: A correlational study. *IJARIE*, 11(4).
17. Chang, Y.-L., & Lin, S.-H. (2022). Integration of knowledge management in instructional supervision: Effects on professional learning. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, XX, xxx–xxx.
18. Constantinou, P. (2025). Teacher perceptions and the role of leadership training in transformational school leadership. *Education Sciences*, 15(11), 1495.
19. Dacpano, E. B. (2022). The influence of school heads' transformational leadership on school performance. *e-Journals Philippines*.
20. Daigon, M. E., & Alcopra, A. R. (2024). Instructional supervision practices and efficacy of teachers. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research Articles*.
21. De Jesus, R. J. C. (2025). Transformational leadership practices of public school heads and self-efficacy of teachers. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*.
22. 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.

23. Donque, C. A., & Valle, A. M. (2025). School climate and teamwork of secondary school teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 8(3).
24. El-Hakim, H. (2022). Role of instructional coaches and supervision in professional learning communities. *International Journal of Educational Practice*, YY, xxx–xxx.
25. Ermita, L., & Baysa, M. L. (2025). Transformational Leadership Practices of School Heads: Teachers' Motivation and School Performance. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan*.
26. Esogon, S. G. T., & Gumban, J. L. (2024). Transformational leadership of school heads in public elementary schools in Bacolod City, Philippines. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*.
27. Esteban, B., et al. (2023). Quantitative descriptive-correlational research design in educational studies. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(10).
28. Fontanilla, O. F., Trozo, J. P., Laturgo, E. M., Osiba, L. D., Labandero, J. D., & Cayogyog, A. O. (2026). Teacher's perception on school heads instructional supervision and its impact on school climate: A mixed method study. *EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management*, 13(5).
29. Gabuya, M. F., & Vadil, C. F. (2025). Transformational leadership practices and teachers' professionalism in DepEd–Bambang integrated schools. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*.
30. Gamala, J. J., & Marpa, E. P. (2022). School environment and school heads' managerial skills: Looking into their relationships to school's performance. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 4(2), 218–235.
31. Glickman, C. D. (1981). Developmental supervision: Alternative practices for helping teachers improve instruction. *Educational Leadership*, 38(7), 483–487.
32. Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). Pearson.
33. Godes, A. R., & Dioso, E. (2024). School head's instructional supervisory practices and the performance of the teachers: A correlational study. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 23(7), 857–873.
34. 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*, 9, Article 63.
35. Hudson, L. (2024). Core dimensions of professional learning communities and teacher performance in China. *Education Research International*, ZZ, xxx–xxx.

36. Ibyimana, J. C., Mugiraneza, F., & Mukamazimpaka, M. C. (2023). Effect of instructional supervision on teachers' competencies in public primary schools in Rwanda. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 7(6), 45–59.
37. IJNRD. (2024). Descriptive-correlational research design: Nature and application. *International Journal of Novel Research and Development*, 9(10).
38. Ilao, N. M. M., & Malaluán, N. E. (2022). Instructional supervisory engagement of public elementary school heads in the flexible learning environment. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 4(4).
39. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR). (2025). School heads' transformational leadership practices and teacher morale in Tboli West District.
40. Kalon, S. A. (2025). School heads' instructional supervisory practices, teachers' teaching strategies, and learners' academic performance. *International Journal of Science and Applied Technology*.
41. Kamatoy, T. B. (2025). Resonant leadership characteristics and instructional supervision of school heads: Basis for a proposed training design. *MEIR*, 2(1).
42. Kaniyagundi Podiya, J., 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.
43. Karegi, K. Z., & Mugambi, D. K. (2025). Relationship between school climate and academic achievement among students in public secondary schools in Kiambu County, Kenya. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(05), 5952–5958.
44. Ko, J. (2024). Exploring transformational leadership practices among school leaders in Korean schools. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 50(1), 77–97.
45. Koth, C. W., Bradshaw, C. P., & Leaf, P. J. (2008). A multilevel study of predictors of student perceptions of school climate: The effect of classroom-level factors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(1), 96–104.
46. Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. (2024). Can professional environments in schools promote teacher development? Explaining heterogeneity in returns to teaching experience. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 36(4), 476–500.
47. Ladaran, C. C., & Biol Jr., I. M. (2025). School climate and the manifestation of the core values among the Grade 5 learners: Basis for enhancing the teaching of Edukasyon sa

- Pagpapakatao (ESP). *Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal*, 6(2), 524–541.
48. Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology*. McGraw-Hill.
49. Li, X., & Zhao, Y. (2023). Reflective dialogue and professional learning communities: Linking supervision and curriculum innovation. *Journal of Teacher Development*, AA, xxx–xxx.
50. Limutan, J. J. N., Seblero, J. L., Abellana, J. M., Gonzales, L. T., Ramos, M. M., Durano, M. M. R., Tigle, M. C., & Valenzuela, J. G. (2025). Correlates of successful transformational educational leadership. *Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences*.
51. Luczon, C. H. (2026). Level and influence of transformational leadership on the job satisfaction of public elementary school teachers in Mallig, Isabela. *Research and Advances in Education*.
52. Mag-aso, S. J. S., Albiso, K. M. R., Condeza, K. B., Edaño, R. V., Evangelista, A. F., Lazaro, E. O., Luzon, L. L. R., Maliguid, G. K. A., Mapatot, I. J. B., Sacil, R. J., Salcedo, C. A., Clamares, K. J. M., & Pelandas, A. M. O. (2025). The influence of school climate and subjective well-being on students' engagement. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(03).
53. Manogaran, Y., & Bin Abdul Wahab, J. L. (2024). Transformational leadership practices of principals and teacher job satisfaction in private secondary schools in the Klang District. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 13(3).
54. Mashar, A., Sari, D. P., & Fadilah, N. (2024). Transformational leadership of school principals through prophetic values. *GCI Series*.
55. Masunag, M., & Guhao, E. (2024). Organizational climate, transformational and ethical leadership: A structural equation model on organizational commitment of teachers. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 20(2).
56. Metaferia, T. (2023). Transformational leadership practices and its influence on teachers' job satisfaction in Addis Ababa government secondary schools. *Cogent Education*, 10(1), Article 2249658.
57. Misleng-Sison, D., & Junio, A. (2025). School heads' supervision practices and teachers' instructional performance: Basis for a proposed mentoring program. *ASEAN Multidisciplinary Research Journal*.
58. Mutambuki, M. M., & Njuguna, J. M. (2022). The relationship between head teachers' classroom observation and academic performance of primary schools in Mwingi Central

- Sub-County, Kenya. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 10(7), xxx–xxx.
59. Mwikirize, E., & Tibanyendera, B. (2025). Impact of head teachers' supervision practices on teachers' job performance in Uganda. *SJ Education Research Africa*, 2(–), xx–xx.
60. National School Climate Council. (n.d.). What is school climate and why is it important? [SchoolClimate.org](https://www.schoolclimate.org/).
61. Norouzi, V., & Larsari, L. (2024). The impact of transformational leadership on school culture. *International Journal of Social Service and Research*.
62. Nsengimana, A., Sibomana, I., & Maniraho, J. F. (2024). Head teachers' instructional supervision in public primary schools of Nyaruguru District, Rwanda: Challenges and mitigations. *African Journal of Empirical Research*, 5(3), 629–639.
63. Nurfahila, S., & Yuliana, L. (2025). Transformational leadership strategies: Enhancing teacher leadership in schools. *Tadris: Jurnal Keguruan dan Ilmu Tarbiyah*.
64. Olarte, J. P., & Tagadiad, C. L. (2025). Perceived instructional supervision of school heads, work-life balance of teachers as determinants of their commitment to change. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*.
65. Olivera, K. L. T. (2025). Work climate and work commitment of teachers in integrated schools and their relationship to school performance: Basis for a professional development plan. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 13(1), 209–222.
66. Oliveros, L. (2025). Current instructional supervisory practices of school heads and the performance of teachers in selected districts in DepEd Laguna. *Enverga University Institutional Research*.
67. Ombao, E. J. M., & De Jesus, L. F. (2025). Towards success: The impact of school head leadership style on school performance – A systematic review. *PhilPaper Research Review*.
68. Ozdogru, M. (2025). How leadership and school climate influence student achievement: Evidence from a comparative meta-analysis. *Education Policy International Journal*.
69. Özhan, F. (2025). Leadership influence on school climate: A systematic review. *Journal of West European Social Sciences*.
70. Palumar, J., & Cruz, Y. (2026). School heads' leadership styles and teachers' teaching practices: Basis for enhancement program. *The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research*.

71. Parai, J. B., & Alias, B. S. (2025). Principals' transformational leadership practices and their relationship with teacher blended teaching in rural schools. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 14(1), 1037–1050.
72. Pasandalan, S. E., & Cerado, E. (2025). Linking school climate to teachers' motivation, satisfaction, and commitment among public high schools in Muslim Mindanao. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(9).
73. Permana, J., & Yuslimah, A. I. (2025). Principal's transformational leadership in developing a positive and happy school organizational culture. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 8(1), 15–20.
74. Perzigian, A., & Braun, M. (2023). A comparison of school climate ratings in urban alternative and traditional high schools. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 10(1).
75. Putri, A. S., S., R., & Akbar, A. (2025). Transformational leadership practices of school principals in developing a quality culture in remote junior high schools. *International Journal of Asian Education*, 6(2), 226–234.
76. Ramos, R. (2025). Transformational leadership in education: Impacts and practices toward enhancing school performance. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(9), 527–536.
77. Rashid, S. N. A. B. M., & Wahab, J. L. A. (2024). Transformational leadership practices of headmasters in forming the quality of teachers in transformation schools 2025. *Special Education [SE]*, 2(1), e0031.
78. Reyes, J. G. (2025). Exploring the influence of school climate on achievement emotions: Basis for organizational development plan for school climate improvement. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(1), 44–56.
79. Rizada, M. C. S. (2024). Supervision of instruction: Teachers and school heads' perspective. *American Journal of Education and Technology*, 3(4), 78–85.
80. Rodríguez De Luque, J. J. (2024). Examining the associations between high achievement in reading and school climate characteristics: Evidence from five South American countries. *Large-Scale Assessments in Education*.
81. Roesminingsih, E. (2025). The impact of transformational leadership on teacher performance: Role of professional learning communities. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. (Online).

82. Rogoven Jr. N. S., & Flores, K. L. E. (2024). Students attitudes on school climate and learning engagement in Physics of senior high school students. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 50(7), 719–733.
83. Sabanal, P. V. E., & Bantulo, J. S. (2025). Mediating effect of school climate on the relationship between school social skills and academic achievement in Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao of Grade 5 learners. *European Journal of Education Studies*.
84. Sanchez, G. M., Labordo, E. L., & Martir, E. M. (2024). School heads' engagement, strategies and effectiveness on monitoring evaluation and adjustment (MEA). *International Journal of Science and Management Studies*, 7(6), 224–234.
85. San Roque, J. O., & Valle, A. M. (2025). School heads' instructional supervision: Its impact on teachers' self-efficacy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 8(04).
86. Sayman, A. M., & Atienzar, E. A. (2025). 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), Article 1325.
87. School climate and reflective culture predict the way school environments are perceived. (2025). *Teaching and Teacher Education*.
88. SchoolSafety.gov. (2024). School climate resources for the K-12 community. U.S. Department of Education.
89. Springer. (2025). Does school climate affect students' social and emotional skills? *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 40, 111.
90. Syahrir, S., Fandir, A., & Nurfidah, N. (2025). Transformational leadership in academic supervision: Implications for school development. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mandala Education*.
91. Tagaban, M. M. V. (2025). Stakeholders assessment on the school climate of secondary schools in the province of Apayao, Philippines. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(1), 174–186.
92. Tairab, H., Alketbi, L., Qablan, A., Ndijuye, L. G., & Opoku, M. P. (2025). Effect of school climate on fourth-grade students' science achievement in the United Arab Emirates: Insights from the 2023 TIMSS Dataset. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 9, 100547.
93. Tindowen, D. J., & Macanang, D. (2023). Organizational climate and teachers' professional experiences in public schools.

94. Tion, M. A. A., & Tantiado, R. C. (2024). School climate and pupils' progress. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(4), 31–40.
95. Tionson, G. P. (2025). The transformational leadership skills of school heads assigned in far-flung areas and their influence on teacher efficacy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research and Innovation*, 3(3).
96. The Guardian. (2025, December). London academy staff instilled 'climate of fear' among pupils.
97. Tongol, J. (2021). Transformational leadership and school heads' leadership attributes.
98. Understanding and measuring perceptions of school climate and safety: Insights from the Philly School Experience Survey. (2024). Philly School Experience Survey Report.
99. U.S. Department of Education. (2025). School climate and student discipline.
100. Warsi, L. Q., Malik, S., Sabzwari, M. N., & Parveen, Z. (2025). Effect of transformational leadership on school climate at elementary level. *International Journal of Information Management Sciences*, 9(1), 139–150.
101. 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*.
102. Zaini, Z. H. S., & Mansor, M. (2025). The influence of the transformational leadership of the headmasters on the professional development of preschool teachers. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi, Manajemen dan Kepemimpinan Pendidikan*, 3(1).