

ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – IV Issue - III (May-June) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



SHAPING THE LEADERSHIP LANDSCAPE: THE TRANSFORMATIVE ROLE OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ON SCHOOL CLIMATE

RONEL M. LIGAN^{1*}, ROEL P. VILLOCINO, EdD.²

^{1, 2} Assumption College of Nabunturan, Nabunturan, Davao de Oro, Philippines, 8800

| **Received:** 16.06.2026 | **Accepted:** 20.06.2026 | **Published:** 23.06.2026

***Corresponding author:** RONEL M. LIGAN

Abstract

This study examined the relationship among educational leadership practices, community engagement, and school climate in public secondary and integrated schools in the Division of Davao de Oro during the School Year 2025–2026. Specifically, it determined the levels of educational leadership practices, community engagement, and school climate, as well as the significant relationships among these variables. The study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational research design. Data were collected from teachers using a structured survey questionnaire adapted to measure the three major variables. Responses were rated on a four-point Likert scale and analyzed using the mean, standard deviation, and Pearson product-moment correlation. Results revealed that educational leadership practices, community engagement, and school climate were generally rated highly, indicating that these indicators were evident in the participating schools. Furthermore, the results showed significant positive relationships between educational leadership practices and school climate, as well as between community engagement and school climate. This implies that stronger leadership practices and higher community involvement are associated with a more positive and supportive school environment. The study concludes that effective educational leadership and active community engagement play vital roles in fostering a conducive school climate. It is recommended that school administrators strengthen participatory leadership approaches, enhance partnerships with stakeholders, and implement programs that sustain collaborative relationships within the school community to further improve the overall school climate.

Keywords: educational administration practices, community engagement, school climate, descriptive–correlational research

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

A school's success was not determined solely by its curriculum or infrastructure, but by the quality of its school climate, the shared perceptions of teachers, learners, and stakeholders about their

experiences within the educational environment. School climate encompassed relationships, teaching and learning practices, organizational structures, and the degree of safety, support, and belonging that members felt within the institution (Cohen et al.,

2009). A positive school climate fostered collaboration, motivation, and mutual respect, whereas a negative one often led to poor communication, low morale, student disengagement, and reduced academic outcomes (Wang & Degol, 2016). In recent years, global reports identified deteriorating school climate as one of the key barriers to achieving quality and inclusive education.

Globally, school climate continued to be recognized as a critical factor influencing teacher performance, student achievement, and overall school effectiveness. According to Ozdogru et al. (2025), leadership practices and school climate had a moderate but significant effect on student academic achievement across multiple countries. Their meta-analysis of 90 empirical studies revealed that positive organizational climate, principal leadership, and teacher leadership strongly contributed to better educational outcomes. This finding emphasized that schools with healthy climates were more likely to produce successful learners and motivated teachers.

In the Philippines, the quality of education remains closely tied to the prevailing school climate. Research conducted by Satorre (2022) among secondary schools in the Division of Albay established that an open organizational climate was widespread and strongly associated with superior teacher satisfaction and exceptional performance. Similarly, evidence from public central elementary schools in the Division of Misamis Oriental showed that positive climate factors, such as professionalism and collegial leadership, significantly boosted teachers' cognitive and emotional engagement. These results underscore the need for structured administrative support and professional collaboration tailored to the unique conditions of local divisions to enhance overall school effectiveness.

In the Division of Davao de Oro, public secondary and integrated schools faced similar challenges that affected the overall school climate. School heads continued to balance administrative, instructional, and community responsibilities amid limited resources and high accountability demands. Reports from district monitoring indicated varying degrees of teacher collaboration, communication flow, and stakeholder participation across schools. While some schools demonstrated effective leadership practices that fostered a positive environment, others struggled with inconsistent management, low morale, and limited community engagement. These differences suggested that leadership approaches and the level of community involvement could have been key determinants in shaping school climate.

As a teacher, the researcher believed that an effective principal was one who responded efficiently to the needs of both teachers and students while fostering collaboration and shared responsibility within the school community. School leaders were considered successful when they were able to influence teachers to demonstrate behaviors consistent with the school's vision and mission, ultimately contributing to a positive and supportive school climate. This study aimed to determine how educational leadership practices and community engagement collectively shaped the overall school climate in public secondary and integrated schools. Recognizing that effective leadership and strong community partnership were vital to sustaining a productive and inclusive learning environment, the researcher was inspired to pursue this study to help strengthen the leadership landscape in Philippine education.

Purpose of the Study/Research Questions

A total of 107 teachers from the Monkayo East and West Districts participated in this study. The research examined the transformative role of educational leadership practices and community engagement on school climate in six public secondary and integrated schools that responded to the survey during School Year 2025–2026. Furthermore, it aimed to determine how leadership practices and community engagement influenced teachers' perceptions of the school environment.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of educational leadership practices of school heads in terms of:
 - 1.1 instructional leadership,
 - 1.2 transformational leadership, and
 - 1.3 shared decision-making?
2. What is the level of community engagement in terms of:
 - 2.1 parental involvement,
 - 2.2 external partnership,
 - 2.3 volunteerism and outreach?
3. What is the level of school climate in terms of:
 - 3.1 collegiality and collaboration,
 - 3.2 safety and order,
 - 3.3 supportive relationships?
4. Is there a significant relationship between educational leadership practices and school climate?
5. Is there a significant relationship between community engagement and school climate?
6. Which domains of educational leadership practices significantly predict school climate?
7. Which domains of community engagement significantly predict school climate?

METHODOLOGY

Participants/ Respondents/ Informants/ Subjects

The respondents of this study consisted of 107 public secondary and integrated school teachers from six selected schools in the municipality of Monkayo, Division of Davao de Oro, during School Year 2025–2026. These teachers were chosen for their direct experience with their respective school heads' leadership practices and their active participation in school- and community-related activities. Their insights were essential in evaluating the relationship between educational leadership practices, community engagement, and school climate.

The study used a universal sampling technique, in which all qualified teachers from the six participating schools were included as respondents. This technique was considered appropriate because the entire population was accessible and manageable, allowing every eligible teacher to participate in the study. Through universal sampling, the research ensured comprehensive representation, inclusivity, accuracy, and fairness in gathering data from all participating schools.

Teachers qualified as respondents if they met the following criteria: they were permanent or probationary teachers currently teaching in any of the six identified schools in Monkayo. They also had at least 3 years of teaching experience at their current school, ensuring familiarity with the school head's leadership and community engagement practices.

Teachers were excluded from the study if they were newly hired or reassigned within the current school year, as they might not yet have had sufficient exposure to the school's leadership and climate. They were also excluded if they held administrative designations such as school head, officer-in-charge, or master teacher serving in supervisory roles, to avoid potential bias or conflict of interest. Teachers who declined to participate or failed to complete the survey were likewise excluded from the study.

Table 1

The distribution of Respondents

Name of School	No. of Respondents
Anagase Integrated School	17
Danggayon Integrated School	11
Cabangkalan Integrated School	16
Casoon National High School	17
Pasian National High School	29
New Kapatagan National High School	17
Total	107

Gathering Method

The data collection process followed a series of systematic steps to ensure that the information gathered was accurate, valid, and ethically obtained. The procedure was conducted under the guidance of the school principal and with the approval of the Division Research Committee of Davao de Oro. Before conducting the study, ethical clearance was secured from the Assumption College of Nabunturan Ethics and Review Committee to ensure adherence to ethical standards, including voluntary participation, confidentiality, and informed consent. A formal letter of request to conduct the study was submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent of Davao de Oro through the School Heads of the six identified schools. Upon approval, copies of the approved letter were provided to the respective principals to authorize the distribution of the research instruments. Prior to data collection, the research instruments underwent content validation by a panel of experts and pilot testing at a non-participating school. The responses from the pilot test were forwarded to the School Testing and Evaluation Focal (STEF) for reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha. Based on the results, necessary revisions were made to improve the clarity and reliability of the questionnaire items. The researcher conducted a brief orientation with the teacher-respondents in each of the six schools. The orientation explained the study's purpose, the confidentiality of responses, the voluntary nature of participation, and the survey completion procedures. Respondents were assured that their identities and responses would remain anonymous and would be used solely for academic purposes. The validated and reliable questionnaires were personally distributed to the teacher-respondents by the researcher. Sufficient time was allotted for respondents to complete the instrument during non-teaching hours to avoid disrupting classes. The researcher remained available to clarify any item that respondents found ambiguous. After completion, the questionnaires were collected, checked for completeness, and organized for data encoding. A retrieval rate of at least 90% was targeted to ensure representativeness and accuracy of the findings.

All collected data were coded, tabulated, and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). To interpret the results, the mean was computed to assess the levels of educational leadership practices, community engagement, and school climate on a four-point Likert scale. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to measure the strength and direction of the relationship between the independent variables (educational leadership practices and community engagement) and the dependent variable (school climate). Multiple regression analysis was applied to identify which indicators significantly predicted school climate. The results were interpreted based on the statistical outputs and compared with the research hypotheses. Findings were discussed in relation to the reviewed literature, highlighting implications for leadership practices and community collaboration within public secondary and integrated schools. Throughout the data collection process, the researcher strictly adhered to ethical research standards, including respect for respondents' rights, informed consent, confidentiality, and integrity in data reporting.

Data Analysis Plan

This study employed a quantitative correlational research design to examine the transformative role of educational leadership practices and community engagement in shaping the school climate among public secondary and integrated schools in the Division of Davao de Oro for School Year 2025–2026. This design was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to determine relationships and predictive effects among multiple variables without manipulation, providing an objective, statistically based understanding of how the independent variables influenced the dependent variable.

A correlational research design aimed to identify the degree of relationship between two or more variables using numerical data (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). It did not attempt to establish direct cause-and-effect relationships but instead determined whether, and to what extent, associations existed among the measured constructs. In this study, educational leadership practices and community engagement served as the independent variables, and school climate as the dependent variable. This approach enabled the researcher to explore whether higher levels of effective leadership and community involvement were associated with more positive perceptions of school climate.

In line with this, the study utilized standardized and adapted survey questionnaires as the primary data-gathering instruments. These instruments were developed to measure the study's three main variables: educational leadership practices, community engagement, and school climate. Each part of the instrument was carefully structured to ensure clarity, reliability, and alignment with the study's objectives. The first part of the questionnaire gathered information on the respondents' demographic profile, including age, gender, years of teaching experience, position, and highest educational attainment. This section provided background information useful for interpreting the results and analyzing variations in responses. The second part assessed the extent of educational leadership practices as perceived by teachers. It included indicators such as instructional leadership, transformational leadership, and shared decision-making, which described how school leaders influenced teaching and learning processes. The third part focused on community engagement, which covered indicators such as parental involvement, external partnerships, volunteerism and outreach, and participation in community-oriented initiatives that supported school improvement.

and student development. The fourth part measured the school climate, which included dimensions such as collegiality and collaboration, safety and order, supportive relationships, and shared vision within the school environment. These indicators determined how leadership and engagement practices shaped the school's overall atmosphere and culture. A four-point Likert scale was used to determine the degree to which respondents agreed with each statement. The interpretation of responses was presented as follows:

Range of Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Interpretation
3.50 – 4.00	Very High	Always manifested / Strongly Agree
2.50 – 3.49	High	Often manifested / Agree
1.50 – 2.49	Low	Rarely manifested / Disagree
1.00 – 1.49	Very Low	Never manifested / Strongly Disagree

These instruments served as valid and reliable tools for gathering quantitative data that determined the relationship among educational leadership practices, community engagement, and school climate in public secondary and integrated schools.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the analysis and interpretation of data collected from teacher respondents. The presentation of results follows the specific objectives of the research, which include: (1) identifying the level of educational leadership practices in terms of instructional leadership, transformational leadership, and shared decision-making; (2) determining the level of community engagement in terms of parental involvement, external partnerships, and volunteerism and outreach; (3) assessing the level of school climate in terms of collegiality and collaboration, safety and order, and supportive relationships; (4) examining the significant relationship between educational leadership practices and school climate; (5) determining the significant relationship between community engagement and school climate; and (6) identifying the domains of educational leadership practices and community engagement that significantly influence school climate.

Level of Educational Leadership Practices

Instructional Leadership. The table below shows the level of Educational Leadership Practices of school heads in terms of Instructional Leadership.

Table 2

Instructional Leadership

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. The principal provides constructive feedback to enhance classroom instruction.	3.52	Very High
2. The school head ensures teaching aligns with curriculum standards and student needs.	3.49	High
3. Teachers are guided through mentoring and coaching sessions to improve	3.49	High

pedagogy.		
4. Regular classroom observations are conducted to promote reflective teaching practices.	3.49	High
5. The principal supports professional development activities relevant to teaching and learning.	3.49	High
Overall Mean	3.49	High

The results in Table 2 showed that instructional leadership had a high overall mean of 3.49, indicating that school heads consistently carried out their roles in supervising instruction and assisting teacher development. The highest-rated indicator focused on providing constructive feedback to teachers. This result implies that effective instructional leadership helps improve teaching performance and professional competence. The finding is supported by Hallinger and Wang (2022), who emphasized that instructional leadership strengthens teaching quality and learning outcomes.

Transformational Leadership. As indicated in Table 3, the level of Educational Leadership Practices of school heads in terms of Transformational Leadership.

Table 3

Transformational Leadership

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. The school head inspires teachers to achieve both personal and institutional goals.	3.46	High
2. The principal communicates a clear vision that motivates staff toward continuous improvement.	3.63	Very High
3. The school leader models integrity and ethical leadership in all dealings.	3.40	High
4. Teachers are encouraged to develop innovative teaching practices that enhance learning outcomes.	3.48	High
5. The principal celebrates the achievements and milestones of teachers and students.	3.55	Very High
Overall Mean	3.50	Very High

The result in Table 3 revealed that transformational leadership obtained a very high overall mean of 3.50, indicating that school heads effectively inspired and motivated teachers toward continuous improvement. The highest-rated indicator emphasized the communication of a clear school vision, showing that teachers viewed their leaders as supportive and motivating. This result suggests that transformational leadership strengthens teacher morale, collaboration, and professional commitment. The finding supports Hallinger and Kovacevic (2022), who stated that transformational leadership enhances trust, teamwork, and organizational climate within schools.

Shared Decision-Making. Table 4 presents the level of Educational Leadership Practices of school heads in terms of Shared Decision-Making.

Table 4

Shared Decision-Making

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. Teachers are given opportunities to participate in important school decisions.	3.51	Very High
2. Staff meetings are collaborative and promote open communication.	3.55	Very High
3. The school head values teacher input in planning and implementing school programs.	3.56	Very High
4. Policies and initiatives reflect the collective ideas of the teaching staff.	3.52	Very High
5. The principal creates an atmosphere of trust and inclusivity in decision-making processes.	3.47	High
Overall Mean	3.52	Very High

The result in Table 4 showed that shared decision-making obtained a very high overall mean of 3.52, indicating that school heads encouraged teachers to participate in planning, policy-making, and school governance. The highest-rated indicator highlighted the recognition of teachers' ideas in the implementation of school programs. This result suggests that collaborative leadership promotes trust, inclusivity, and teacher empowerment. The finding supports Harris and Jones (2020), who emphasized that distributed leadership strengthens collaboration and organizational commitment within schools.

Overall, the result showed that the level of educational leadership practices among school heads was Very High, indicating that school administrators consistently practiced effective leadership in managing and supporting school operations. Instructional leadership was evident through supervision, mentoring, and feedback that enhanced teacher performance and instructional delivery. Transformational leadership was also highly practiced, as school heads inspired teachers, communicated clear goals, and encouraged professional growth. In addition, shared decision-making reflected collaborative leadership by allowing teachers to participate in planning and governance processes. These findings support Hallinger and Wang (2022), who emphasized that effective leadership practices improve teacher performance and school effectiveness.

Level of Community Engagement

Parental Involvement. The table below shows the level of Community Engagement in terms of Parental Involvement.

Table 5

Parental Involvement

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. Parents actively participate in school meetings, activities, and programs.	3.34	High

2. The school maintains open and regular communication with parents.	3.51	Very High
3. Parents support the school's mission through collaboration and involvement.	3.34	High
4. Parent-teacher cooperation strengthens student performance and discipline.	3.49	High
5. Parents provide constructive feedback to school management on academic concerns.	3.25	High
Overall Mean	3.39	High

The result in Table 5 revealed that parental involvement obtained a high overall mean of 3.39, indicating that parents actively participated in school activities and supported student learning. The highest-rated indicator emphasized open and consistent communication between schools and parents. This result suggests that strong parent-school communication promotes cooperation and strengthens support for learners. The finding supports Epstein (2021), who stated that effective school-family communication improves student motivation and academic support.

External Partnerships. Table 6 indicates that the level of Community Engagement is measured by External Partnerships.

Table 6

External Partnerships

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. The school partners with LGUs and private organizations to enhance learning opportunities.	3.47	High
2. Community stakeholders contribute to school projects and resources.	3.44	High
3. Collaborations with external partners lead to sustainable school development programs.	3.47	High
4. Local government agencies provide support for school improvement initiatives.	3.38	High
5. Partnerships with NGOs promote the holistic development of students.	3.36	High
Overall Mean	3.42	High

The result in Table 6 showed that external partnerships obtained a high overall mean of 3.42, indicating that schools established strong linkages with LGUs, private organizations, and community stakeholders. The highest-rated indicator highlighted partnerships that supported sustainable school development programs. This result suggests that external partnerships help schools access additional resources and strengthen educational services. The finding supports UNESCO (2023), which emphasized that community partnerships help schools address resource limitations and improve school development.

Volunteerism and Outreach. Table 7 indicates the level of Community Engagement in terms of Volunteerism and Outreach.

Table 7**Volunteerism and Outreach**

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. Teachers and students participate in outreach and community service programs.	3.36	High
2. The school fosters a sense of social responsibility through volunteerism.	3.42	High
3. Community outreach activities strengthen relationships between the school and community.	3.44	High
4. Volunteerism is integrated into school programs and events.	3.38	High
5. The school promotes civic engagement among students and staff.	3.46	High
Overall Mean	3.41	High

The result in Table 7 revealed that volunteerism and outreach obtained a high overall mean of 3.41, indicating that schools actively promoted outreach activities and community involvement among teachers, students, and stakeholders. The highest-rated indicator emphasized promoting civic engagement among students and staff. This result suggests that volunteerism and outreach strengthen school-community relationships and encourage social responsibility. The finding supports Sanders and Sheldon (2022), who stated that active outreach programs improve community support and school relationships.

In a nutshell, the result indicated that the level of school climate was High, indicating that teachers perceived the school as supportive, organized, and conducive to teaching and learning. Collegiality and collaboration were demonstrated through teamwork and positive professional relationships among teachers. Safety and order were also maintained through discipline and proper implementation of school policies. Furthermore, supportive relationships among administrators, teachers, and students helped promote motivation and professional satisfaction. These findings support Wang and Degol (2016), who stated that a positive school climate enhances trust, engagement, and emotional well-being in schools.

Level of School Climate

Collegiality and Collaboration. Table 8 indicates the level of School Climate in terms of Collegiality and Collaboration.

Table 8**Collegiality and Collaboration**

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. Teachers work cooperatively to achieve common goals.	3.63	Very High
2. There is a culture of sharing teaching strategies and materials among staff.	3.62	Very High
3. Teamwork enhances professional growth and student learning	3.57	Very High

outcomes.		
4. Staff members show mutual respect and trust in their interactions.	3.57	Very High
5. Collaborative practices improve the overall school performance.	3.53	Very High
Overall Mean	3.58	Very High

The result in Table 8 showed that collegiality and collaboration obtained a very high overall mean of 3.58, indicating that teachers maintained strong professional relationships through teamwork, mutual respect, and shared responsibility. The highest rated indicator emphasized teachers working together to achieve common goals. This result suggests that collaboration among teachers strengthens professional support and instructional improvement. The finding supports Vangrieken et al. (2022), who stated that collaborative cultures improve innovation and collective problem-solving in schools.

Safety and Order. The table below shows the level of School Climate in terms of Safety and Order.

Table 9**Safety and Order**

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. The school environment is safe and conducive to learning.	3.37	High
2. Rules and policies are implemented consistently and fairly.	3.36	High
3. Students and staff feel secure within the school premises.	3.46	High
4. Conflict resolution is handled constructively and professionally.	3.43	High
5. The school promotes discipline and respect among students and teachers.	3.61	Very High
Overall Mean	3.44	High

The result in Table 9 revealed that safety and order obtained a high overall mean of 3.44, indicating that schools maintained disciplined, secure, and organized learning environments. The highest-rated indicator highlighted the promotion of discipline and respect among teachers and students. This result suggests that safe and orderly school environments contribute to effective teaching and learning. The finding supports Gregory et al. (2018), who emphasized that fair and consistent discipline strengthens trust and school stability.

Supportive Relationship. The table below shows the level of School Climate in terms of Supportive Relationship.

Table 10**Supportive Relationship**

Indicators	Mean	Description
1. Administrators provide emotional and professional support to teachers.	3.41	High

2. There is open communication between teachers, students, and administrators.	3.43	High
3. The principal values the contributions of teachers and staff.	3.47	High
4. Teachers feel appreciated and recognized for their efforts.	3.48	High
5. Positive relationships enhance motivation and morale in the school community.	3.54	Very High
Overall Mean	3.47	High

The result in Table 10 showed that supportive relationships obtained a high overall mean of 3.47, indicating that schools promoted caring, respectful, and supportive interactions among administrators, teachers, and students. The highest-rated indicator emphasized that positive relationships improve motivation and morale. This result suggests that supportive relationships contribute to teacher satisfaction and a healthy school environment. The finding supports Wang and Degol (2016), who stated that positive school relationships strengthen engagement and emotional well-being.

Overall, the school climate was High, indicating that teachers perceived the school as supportive, organized, and conducive to teaching and learning. Collegiality and collaboration were demonstrated through teamwork and positive professional relationships among teachers. Safety and order were also maintained through discipline and proper implementation of school policies. Furthermore, supportive relationships among administrators, teachers, and students helped promote motivation and professional satisfaction. These findings support Cohen et al. (2009), who emphasized that a positive school climate strengthens relationships, promotes collaboration, and fosters a supportive learning environment.

Significant Relationship Between Educational Leadership Practices and School Climate

Table 11

Significant Relationship Between Educational Leadership Practices and School Climate

Correlations			
		IV1	DV
Educational Leadership Practices	Pearson Correlation	1	.673
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	107	107
School Climate	Pearson Correlation	.673	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	107	107
Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The result in Table 11 revealed a strong positive and significant relationship between educational leadership practices and school climate, with a Pearson r value of .673 and a p-value of less than

.000. This indicates that effective instructional leadership, transformational leadership, and shared decision-making are associated with a more positive school climate. The result suggests that leadership practices influence collaboration, safety, and supportive relationships within schools. The finding supports Leithwood et al. (2020), who emphasized that leadership is a major factor influencing school effectiveness and teacher performance.

Significant Relationship Between Community Engagement and School Climate

Table 12

Significant Relationship Between Community Engagement and School Climate

Correlations			
		IV2	DV
Community Engagement	Pearson Correlation	1	.725
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	107	107
School Climate	Pearson Correlation	.725	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	107	107
Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The result in Table 12 revealed a very strong positive and significant relationship between community engagement and school climate, with a Pearson r value of .725 and a p-value of less than .000. This indicates that stronger parental involvement, external partnerships, and outreach activities are associated with a more positive school climate. The result suggests that active community participation strengthens collaboration, trust, and support within schools. The finding supports Sanders and Sheldon (2022), who emphasized that community engagement improves school support systems and organizational climate.

Overall, the data revealed a significant relationship between educational leadership practices and school climate, suggesting that effective leadership helps create a more positive and supportive school environment. School heads who demonstrate strong instructional leadership, transformational leadership, and participatory decision-making contribute to better collaboration, safety, and supportive relationships within schools. Similarly, the results showed a significant relationship between community engagement and school climate, indicating that active participation by parents, stakeholders, and community partners strengthens trust, cooperation, and support within the school community. These findings support Leithwood et al. (2020) and Sanders and Sheldon (2022), who emphasized that leadership and stakeholder involvement play vital roles in improving school climate and overall school effectiveness.

Predictors of School Climate

Table 13

Educational Leadership Practices Indicators

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.559	.213		7.321	.000
Instructional Leadership	.242	.113	.320	2.149	.034
Transformational Leadership	.242	.097	.311	2.484	.015
Shared Decision-Making	.070	.111	.091	.633	.528
a. Dependent Variable: DV					

The results in Table 13 revealed that instructional and transformational leadership significantly predicted school climate, whereas shared decision-making did not. Instructional leadership had a p-value of .034 and a Beta coefficient of .320, while transformational leadership had a p-value of .015 and a Beta coefficient of .311. This result suggests that instructional support and transformational leadership are important factors in creating a

positive school climate. The finding supports Robinson (2022), who emphasized that instructional leadership improves teaching quality and school effectiveness, and Hallinger and Kovacevic (2022), who noted that transformational leadership strengthens trust, morale, and collaboration within schools.

Community Engagement Indicators

Table 14

Community Engagement Indicators

Community Engagement Indicators							
Coefficients ^a							
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Remarks
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
	(Constant)	1.315	.206		6.371	.000	
	Parental Involvement	.276	.072	.341	3.832	.000	highly significant
	External Partnerships	.147	.073	.195	2.025	.046	significant
	Volunteerism and Outreach	.218	.066	.308	3.300	.001	highly significant
a. Dependent Variable: DV							

The result in Table 14 revealed that all community engagement indicators significantly predicted school climate. Among the predictors, parental involvement emerged as the strongest predictor, followed by volunteerism and outreach, and external partnerships. Parental involvement obtained the highest Beta coefficient of .341 with a p-value of .000, while volunteerism and outreach recorded a Beta coefficient of .308 and a p-value of .001. External partnerships also significantly predicted school climate with a Beta coefficient of .195 and a p-value of .046. This result suggests that active stakeholder participation, particularly parental involvement, contributes significantly to a positive school climate. The finding supports Epstein (2021), who emphasized that strong school-family partnerships improve school effectiveness and student support.

Taken together, the results showed that instructional and transformational leadership significantly predicted school climate, whereas shared decision-making did not. This indicates that teachers are more influenced by school heads who provide clear instructional direction, professional encouragement, motivation, and strong leadership support. These findings support Robinson (2022) and Hallinger and Kovacevic (2022), who emphasized that

instructional and transformational leadership improve collaboration, teacher morale, and overall school effectiveness.

Moreover, the result showed that parental involvement, external partnerships, and volunteerism and outreach significantly predicted school climate, with parental involvement identified as the strongest predictor. This suggests that active stakeholder participation, especially strong collaboration between schools and families, greatly contributes to the development of a positive and supportive school environment. The finding supports Epstein (2021), who emphasized that effective school-family partnerships enhance school effectiveness, student support, and organizational climate.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that educational leadership practices among school heads were at a very high level, while community engagement and school climate were at a high level in the selected public secondary and integrated schools. School heads demonstrated effective instructional and transformational leadership, as well as shared decision-making practices, that supported teaching and learning processes. Likewise, community engagement was evident through parental involvement, external

partnerships, and volunteerism and outreach activities that strengthened collaboration between the school and the community. In addition, the school climate was characterized by collegiality and collaboration, safety and order, and supportive relationships, all of which contributed to a positive learning environment.

The result further revealed that educational leadership practices and community engagement had significant relationships with school climate. This indicates that effective leadership behaviors and active stakeholder participation contribute to a more supportive, collaborative, and organized school environment. The findings suggest that schools with strong leadership and active community involvement are more likely to maintain positive relationships, trust, and cooperation among members of the school community.

Moreover, the results revealed that instructional and transformational leadership significantly predicted school climate, whereas shared decision-making did not. In terms of community engagement, parental involvement, external partnerships, and volunteerism and outreach significantly predicted school climate, with parental involvement emerging as the strongest predictor. These findings imply that leadership support and strong school-family collaboration play important roles in sustaining a positive school climate and improving school effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results and findings of the study, the researchers put forth the following recommendations:

1. DepEd officials should prioritize the enhancement of leadership training programs, specifically those targeting instructional supervision and transformational leadership. By providing school heads with advanced professional development opportunities, the department can cultivate a more dynamic work environment that boosts administrative competence and elevates the overall quality of school management.
2. School administrators should sustain a culture of participatory leadership and actively seek to deepen partnerships with parents and community stakeholders. Should the need for greater social capital arise, schools must implement formal engagement strategies such as stakeholder forums or collaborative outreach to increase institutional trust and ensure long-term community investment.
3. Teaching staff should be encouraged to take an active role in school governance and community-based initiatives to maintain a supportive and inclusive school climate. In instances where morale or involvement is low, school authorities should provide avenues for teachers to lead committees, which will ultimately enhance the organization's collective efficiency and professional satisfaction.
4. Stakeholders and governing bodies should maintain their commitment to supporting school initiatives, outreach programs, and collaborative projects. If external resources are identified as a limitation, schools should refine their networking strategies to improve teacher welfare and productivity, thereby ensuring the sustainability of the institution's educational objectives.
5. Future researchers are encouraged to expand upon this study by incorporating additional variables such as

teacher performance metrics, student achievement levels, or organizational culture. By exploring these broader dimensions, subsequent studies can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the complex relationship between leadership styles and school-wide success.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to all those who have contributed to the completion of this thesis. Without their support, guidance, and encouragement, this project would not have been possible. My appreciation goes to the following: Dr. Roel P. Villocino, my thesis adviser, for his unwavering support, guidance, valuable insights, and dedication, which have been instrumental in shaping this thesis and in the completion of my graduate studies; Dr. Felinita III R. Doronio, Dr. Maedel Joy V. Escote and Prof. Janice N. Sipin, the members of my thesis committee, for their constructive feedback and valuable suggestions that significantly improved the quality of this work; Dr. Phoebe Gay L. Refamonte, CESO VI, Schools Division Superintendent, Division of Davao de Oro, who approved my request to conduct the study; To all the School Heads of Secondary Schools and Integrated Schools of Monkayo East and West District for the support on the conduct of the study. To my family and friends whom I owe a debt of gratitude for their unwavering encouragement and understanding; and to all the participants and respondents who generously shared their time and insights, without whom this research would not have been possible.

REFERENCES

1. Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 111(1), 180–213.
2. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
3. Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
4. Epstein, J. L. (2021). Family-school partnerships and student success. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 102(7), 32–37.
5. Epstein, J. L., et al. (2019). *School, family, and community partnerships handbook*. Corwin Press.
6. Hallinger, P. (2021). Instructional leadership and teacher learning cultures. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(3), 389–405.
7. Hallinger, P., & Kovacevic, J. (2022). Transformational leadership and organizational trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 58(2), 310–328.
8. Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2022). *Instructional leadership and educational improvement*. Springer.
9. Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). COVID 19 – school leadership in disruptive times. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 243–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1811479>
10. Leithwood, K., et al. (2020). *How leadership influences student learning*. Wallace Foundation.
11. Ozdogru, M., Sarier, Y., & Korucuoglu, A. (2025). Leadership practices, school climate, and student achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 42, 10058.

12. Pink, D. H. (2022). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us*. Riverhead Books.
13. Robinson, J. (2022). *Introduction: Generating concepts of 'the urban' through comparative practice*. *Urban Studies*, 59(8).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980221092561>
14. Sanders, M., & Sheldon, S. (2022). School-community partnerships and educational success. *School Community Journal*, 32(1), 9–27.
15. Satorre, C. (2022, January 27). The Effect of Organizational Climate on the Teachers' Performance and Job Satisfaction in Selected Secondary Schools in the Division of Albay. *Puissant*, 3, 381-394. Retrieved from [//puissant.stepacademic.net/puissant/article/view/87](http://puissant.stepacademic.net/puissant/article/view/87)
16. UNESCO. (2023). *Community partnerships and educational access report*. UNESCO Publishing.
17. Vangrieken, K., et al. (2022). Teacher collaboration and professional learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 115, 103732.
18. Wang, M. T., & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: A review of the construct and its impact on educational outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(2), 315–352.