Leadership Styles of School Administrators and Their Effects on School Culture

Lorna L. Glimada

Student, Medina College
Philippines

Abstract:
Leadership is central to shaping school culture and identity. This study examined the relationship between school administrators' leadership styles and school culture, as well as demographic variations in leadership styles in the Municipality of Balabagan, Lanao del Sur, for the academic year 2024-2025. A quantitative approach was employed, using structured surveys analyzed through correlation analysis and the Kruskal-Wallis test. Findings revealed that school administrators exhibit a standardized leadership style which contributes to stable school administration. School culture was well-established, characterized by positive leadership, innovation, and a harmonious environment. Statistical analysis indicated no significant correlation between leadership style and school culture which suggest that institutional policies, teacher collaboration, and external factors play a stronger role. Additionally, leadership styles did not significantly differ based on demographic attributes such as age, educational attainment, and years of service, reinforcing the influence of professional training and institutional norms over personal characteristics. The study recommends that administrators enhance leadership by focusing on staff motivation, decision-making, and professional development. Teachers, students, and the school community could actively foster a collaborative learning environment. Policymakers could develop leadership programs integrating institutional and cultural dynamics. Future school leaders are encouraged to adopt adaptive leadership practices to navigate complex educational challenges.

Keywords: Leadership Styles, School Culture, Institutional Norms.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is at the core of building the culture and identity of a school. No matter if administrators lead more or less than others, what they do at the top of the organization has a tendency to influence how the teachers, students, and other stakeholders work and relate to each other. School culture, in turn, is a reflection of what the school community believes, their practices, and their values that shape behaviors and attitudes toward collaboration and toward learning. A school leader with purpose, building a positive community, and working together lays the stage for academic success, emotional well-being, and social cohesion. A rich, supportive school culture not only improves student achievement but optimizes teacher commitment and professional growth. Examining the role of leadership styles within these dynamics is central in developing an understanding of how to build schools that flourish and innovate in the face of a changing environment in education.

The influence of school administrator leadership styles on school culture has been extensively discussed in recent literature. Kalkan et al. (2020) explore the influence of varying leadership styles on overall school culture and organizational image, focusing on the leadership's role in structuring the learning environment. Liu et al. (2021) also analyze the instructional and distributed leadership roles, with positive effects of the two on teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction, moderated by positive school culture and collaborative teacher work. Kilag et al. (2023) also identify the servant leadership role in a positive school climate, demonstrating the effects of leadership with a focus on support and service in creating an overall positive school environment. These literature provide evidence that school administrator leadership styles are critical in school culture, with an effect on organizational success perceptions and well-being among teachers.

From initial interviews and observations, one noted that the leadership practices are lacking in the areas of consistency and alignment with the school mission and vision. For instance, some of the administrators lean towards the transactional leadership style, in which they focus on only the accomplishment of tasks and performance indicators at the expense of relational and motivational aspects required to produce an effective school culture. Moreover, there are communication gaps between the administrators and the staff, which result in misunderstandings and lack of cohesion among the school community. These gaps necessitate a critical analysis of the ways in which various leadership styles impact school culture for the sake of developing measures through which the gaps can be reduced and the educational process can be improved for all the stakeholders.

This study aims to explore the school administrators' leadership style and how they influence school culture in Our Lady of Peace High School and San Isidro High School of Balabagan Inc. during the academic year 2024-2025. Specifically, it aims to determine the demographic profile of school administrators in age, educational attainment, and years of service. The study also aims to determine the level of school administrators' leadership style in terms of agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and openness. The study also determines the level of school culture in terms of school leadership, school climate, innovation, teachers' feedback and professional development, and job satisfaction. The study aims to determine whether there is a significant relationship between the level of school administrators' leadership style and school culture, and whether there are significant differences in leadership styles when administrators are grouped according to their demographic profiles.

METHODS
Research Design
This study used a descriptive-correlational research design in gathering data. This is best applied to research on the observing and analyzing of the relationship between variables without influencing them. Creswell and Creswell (2018) explain that the application of this type of design proves to be helpful in describing and measuring the level of correlation between two or more variables or data sets. It gives a snapshot of the situation, and with it, researchers are able to study the manner variables correlate or interact with each other in a sample. In correlational research, researchers can identify the level to which one variable can explain another, a key aspect in measuring the strength and direction of such relationships in naturally occurring settings.

Research Setting
The study is set in Balabagan, a coastal municipality in Lanao del Sur, BARMM, covering 230 sq. km with 29,863 residents (2020 census). It comprises 27 barangays with diverse socio-economic and educational needs.

Research Respondents
The respondents of the study were the school administrators and teachers from Our Lady of Peace High School and and San Isidro High School of Balabagan Inc. All administrators in these schools were included, along with teachers from the participating institutions. The entire population of teachers was utilized, no sampling procedure was applied.

Research Instrument
This study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire with three sections: demographic profile, leadership style, and school culture. The first section gathered details such as age, education, and length of service to explore potential links to leadership behaviors. The second assessed administrators' leadership styles using the Big Five personality traits which offers insights into their influence on school climate and culture. The third measured key aspects of school culture, including leadership, climate, innovation, teacher feedback, professional development, and job satisfaction. This tool provided a comprehensive view of how leadership styles shape the overall school environment.

Instrument Validity

The researcher-developed questionnaire underwent expert review in school culture, psychology, and educational leadership to ensure alignment with established theories. Suggestions were incorporated to enhance clarity, relevance, and content accuracy.

Data-Gathering Procedure

The researcher systematically collected data while ensuring ethical compliance, accuracy, and reliability. First, permission was obtained from educational authorities and school administrators for transparency and confidentiality. The questionnaire was then distributed in person and online, accompanied by clear instructions. Participants were given ample time to respond, with clarifications provided as needed. Completed responses were reviewed for accuracy, and incomplete or ambiguous data were addressed accordingly. Responses were coded and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics to examine leadership styles and school culture. Confidentiality was maintained, and findings were systematically presented to ensure meaningful insights.

Ethical Considerations

This study upheld ethical standards to ensure research integrity and respondent welfare. Informed consent was obtained to ensure participants were aware of the study's purpose, procedures, and voluntary nature, with the right to withdraw at any time (Suri., 2020). Confidentiality was maintained by removing personal identifiers and presenting only aggregated data. Participation was voluntary, with no sanctions for non-participation or withdrawal. The study posed no physical, psychological, or emotional risks. Data integrity was strictly observed, ensuring accuracy and truthfulness. Ethical approval was secured from the relevant review board to uphold research ethics.

Data Analysis

The research applied several statistical treatments to guarantee thorough data analysis. Frequency count determined the demographic profile of school administrators by age, educational level, and years of service. The arithmetic mean quantified the extent of leadership styles (Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness) and school culture (School Leadership, School Climate, Innovation, Teacher Feedback & Professional Development, and Job Satisfaction). Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient calculated the correlation between school culture and leadership styles, and the Kruskal-Wallis H test compared differences in leadership styles according to demographic characteristics. A Likert scale was applied to rate responses and classify ratings as Very High (3.26–4.00), High (2.51–3.25), Low (1.76–2.50), and Very Low (1.00–1.75) to provide clear measurement of leadership characteristics and dimensions of school culture.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 - Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile	School Administrators		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Age				
30 and below years old	7	53.85	77	77
31 – 40 years old	3	23.08	15	15
41 – 50 years old	2	15.38	5	5
51 – 60 years old	0	0	0	0
Above 60 years old	1	7.69	3	3
Total	**13**	**100**	**100**	**100**
Educational Attainment				
Bachelor's Degree	10	76.93	82	82

Master's Degree	2	15.38	12	12
Doctorate Degree	1	7.69	1	1
Others	0	0	5	5
Total	**13**	**100**	**100**	**100**
Length of Service				
5 years and less than	7	53.85	67	67
6 – 10 years	5	38.46	29	29
11 – 15 years	1	7.69	3	3
16 – 20 years	0	0	1	1
more than 20 years	0	0	0	0
Total	**13**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 1 shows that 53.85% of school administrators and 77% of teachers were aged 30 and below which highlight a predominantly young workforce. In terms of education, the majority held a bachelor's degree, with 76.93% of administrators, and 82% of teachers, while fewer pursued graduate studies. As to the length of service, over half of both groups had five years or less of experience which portrays a workforce in the early stages of their careers. Overall, these findings suggest that schools are primarily staffed by young professionals with limited experience.

Table 2.1 – Extent of School Administrators' Leadership Style in terms of Agreeableness

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The administrator demonstrates empathy and understanding toward staff and students.	0.42	3.77
2. The administrator fosters collaboration and harmony among team members.	0.42	3.77
3. The administrator maintains a respectful and approachable demeanor.	0.49	3.62
4. The administrator resolves conflicts fairly and constructively.	0.72	3.31
5. The administrator promotes a positive and inclusive school environment.	0.36	3.85
Average Mean		**3.66 Very High**

Scale: Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"
As evident from Table 2.1, the leadership style of administrators in terms of agreeableness is rated very high with a mean score of 3.66. This indicates that administrators are always cooperative, empathetic, and considerate and thus build a caring and harmonious school culture. Among the indicators, the most highly rated statement, "The administrator promotes a positive and inclusive school environment", had a mean of 3.85, indicating administrators' strong support for a friendly climate where all individuals feel respected and valued. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated indicator, "The administrator resolves conflicts fairly and constructively", had a mean of 3.31, which still falls within the high category. This confirms that administrators resolve conflicts in the right way while upholding a just and constructive stance, which aids in developing an evenly balanced and harmonious school society. These results validates Bass and Avolio (1993) Transformational Leadership Theory in prioritizing the leadership of interpersonal relationships (Kwan, 2020). Further, Pretorius (2024) confirms that empathetic and equitable leaders develop a harmonious and committed school community. The high ratings across time validate that agreeableness greatly contributes to school leadership through cooperation and respect.

Table 2.2 – Extent of School Administrators' Leadership Style in terms of Conscientiousness

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The administrator effectively plans and organizes school activities.	0.63	3.46

2. The administrator ensures timely and efficient completion of tasks.	0.46	3.69
3. The administrator maintains high standards of professionalism and accountability.	0.36	3.85
4. The administrator pays close attention to detail in decision-making.	0.46	3.69
5. The administrator exhibits consistency and reliability in leadership actions.	0.42	3.77
Average Mean	**3.69 Very High**	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

As shown in Table 2.2, school administrators exhibit a very high level of conscientiousness in leadership, with an average mean of 3.69. This reflects their structured and accountable approach to school management. The highest-rated indicator, "The administrator maintains high standards of professionalism and accountability" had a mean of 3.85 which highlights their strong commitment to ethical leadership. Meanwhile, "The administrator effectively plans and organizes school activities" received the lowest rating with the mean of 3.46 but remains very high, confirming their strong organizational skills. These findings align with conscientious leadership principles, emphasizing planning, reliability, and responsibility (Ahmed Iqbal et al., 2021). Oladimeji (2024) further asserts that conscientious administrators create structured, goal-oriented environments that enhances overall school performance.

Table 2.3 – Extent of School Administrators' Leadership Style in terms of Extraversion

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The administrator communicates actively and openly with staff and students.	0.63	3.46
2. The administrator shows enthusiasm and energy in leading school activities.	0.50	3.46
3. The administrator engages positively with the school community during events.	0.50	3.54
4. The administrator motivates others through a charismatic leadership style.	0.50	3.54
5. The administrator demonstrates confidence when addressing challenges.	0.42	3.77
Average Mean	**3.55 Very High**	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

As presented in Table 2.3, the extent of school administrators' leadership style in terms of extraversion is very high, with an average mean of 3.55. This indicates that administrators have good interpersonal skills, enthusiasm, and confidence in being a leader, and thus they create a dynamic and stimulating school climate. Among the indicators, the highest-rated statement, "The administrator demonstrates confidence when addressing challenges" that had a mean of 3.77 highlights their ability to lead with composure. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated indicators, "The administrator communicates actively and openly with staff and students" and "The administrator shows enthusiasm and energy in leading school activities" both at 3.46, still fall within the very high category which affirms their proactive communication and leadership energy. These findings align with extraverted leadership traits that emphasize communication and motivation (Spark, 2020). Carter et al. (2023) further note that highly extraverted leaders strengthen institutional cooperation and morale which reinforce the administrators' effectiveness in cultivating a vibrant school culture.

Table 2.4 – Extent of School Administrators' Leadership Style in terms of Neuroticism

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The administrator handles stressful situations calmly and effectively.	0.36	3.85
2. The administrator remains composed when faced with criticism or setbacks.	0.62	3.38
3. The administrator manages emotions well, even in high-pressure scenarios.	0.50	3.54
4. The administrator avoids impulsive reactions in decision-making.	0.42	3.77
5. The administrator fosters a sense of stability and reassurance among staff.	0.42	3.77
Average Mean	**3.66 Very High**	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.4 shows that school administrators exhibit a very high level of neuroticism with an average mean of 3.66. This indicates their ability to remain calm, confident, and composed which fosters a reassuring school environment. The highest-rated indicator, "The administrator handles stressful situations calmly and effectively" with a mean of 3.85, highlights their resilience under pressure. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated indicator, "The administrator remains composed when faced with criticism or setbacks" with a mean of 3.38, still falls within the very high category, demonstrating their capacity for professionalism and self-regulation. These findings align with emotionally intelligent leadership, where stability and resilience contribute to a positive work environment (Goleman et al., 2013 as cited in Consten, 2023). Ochoa (2023) also emphasizes that emotionally stable leaders enhance team morale and organizational performance, reinforcing the administrators' ability to lead with confidence and reliability.

Table 2.5 – Extent of School Administrators' Leadership Style in terms of Openness

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The administrator encourages innovative teaching methods and practices.	0.42	3.77
2. The administrator is receptive to new ideas and suggestions from stakeholders.	0.46	3.69
3. The administrator supports professional development and lifelong learning.	0.46	3.69
4. The administrator demonstrates creativity in solving school-related problems.	0.42	3.77
5. The administrator embraces diversity and promotes cultural sensitivity in the school.	0.74	3.62
Average Mean	**3.71 Very High**	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

Table 2.5 indicates that school administrators exhibit a very high level of openness in leadership, with an average mean of 3.71. This highlights their strong commitment to fostering innovation, inclusivity, and continuous learning, which contribute to a progressive school environment. The highest-rated indicators, "The administrator encourages innovative teaching methods and practices" and "The administrator demonstrates creativity in solving school-related problems", had a mean of 3.77. This emphasize their forward-thinking leadership and problem-solving skills. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated indicator, "The administrator embraces diversity and promotes cultural sensitivity in the school" (3.62), still falls within the very high category, reflecting their dedication to fostering inclusivity and respect for cultural differences. These findings align with transformational leadership principles, where openness to change and adaptability drive school success (Negussie & Hirgo, 2023). Jimenez (2024) further asserts that school leaders who embrace innovation and diversity create dynamic and productive learning environments. The consistently high ratings across all indicators affirm the administrators' ability to lead schools toward continuous improvement and excellence.

Table 2.6 – Summary of the Extent of School Administrators' Leadership Style

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Agreeableness	3.66	Very High
Conscientiousness	3.69	Very High
Extraversion	3.55	Very High
Neuroticism	3.66	Very High
Openness	3.71	Very High
Average Mean	**3.655 Very High**	

Scale: 1.0 – 1.75 "Very Low", 1.76 – 2.50 "Low", 2.51 – 3.25 "High", 3.26 – 4.00 "Very High"

As presented in Table 2.6, school administrators' overall strength of leadership style is very high at the average mean of 3.655. It means that school administrators always exhibit strong leadership traits in every aspect, effectively generating a good and productive school culture. These findings are in line with transformational leadership theory where adaptability to change and high people skills are the best predictors of school leadership effectiveness (Bass & Riggio, 2023 as cited by Kiplimo 2023). Brown (2024) also adds that

administrators who express a balanced leadership style promote a collaborative and active learning environment. The high overall scores of all dimensions validate the school administrators' ability to lead with vision, capacity, and commitment, thus enhancing overall school performance.

Table 3.1 – Extent of School Culture in terms of School Leadership

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The school leadership promotes a shared vision and mission for the school community.	0.50	3.70
2. The leadership fosters transparency and fairness in decision-making processes.	0.59	3.54
3. The administrators provide guidance and support to staff in achieving school goals.	0.55	3.60
4. The leadership maintains open and effective communication with all stakeholders.	0.53	3.61
5. The administrators serve as role models for professionalism and ethical behavior.	0.56	3.61
Average Mean	**3.61**	**Very High**

Scale: : 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

The extent of school culture in terms of school leadership is very high, with an average mean of 3.61. This reflects strong leadership practices that foster a positive educational environment. The highest-rated indicator, "The school leadership promotes a shared vision and mission" with a mean of 3.70, highlights administrators' commitment to clear direction and unity. Meanwhile, "The leadership fosters transparency and fairness in decision-making" with a mean of 3.54 remains very high emphasizing dedication to equitable governance. These findings align with Leithwood et al. 2023 and Thimmaraju 2024, who stress that visionary, ethical, and transparent leadership strengthens school culture, promoting trust, collaboration, and institutional growth.

Table 3.2 – Extent of School Culture in terms of School Climate

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The school provides a safe and welcoming environment for all members.	0.64	3.64
2. Respect and collaboration are evident among teachers, students, and staff.	0.74	3.50
3. The school fosters inclusivity and values diversity in its practices.	0.68	3.54
4. Positive relationships are encouraged and maintained across all levels of the school.	0.56	3.63
5. The school prioritizes the well-being and emotional safety of its members.	0.73	3.50
Average Mean	**3.56**	**Very High**

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

As shown in Table 3.2, the school climate is very high, with an average mean of 3.56. This reflects a supportive, inclusive, and well-being-centered environment. The highest-rated indicator, "The school provides a safe and welcoming environment" with a mean of 3.64, highlights its commitment to security and inclusivity. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated indicators, "Respect and collaboration" and "Emotional safety", both at 3.50, remain very high, which suggest ongoing efforts to strengthen these aspects. These findings align with Bradshaw et al. 2021 and Burnett 2024, who emphasize that a secure and inclusive school climate fosters engagement, collaboration, and overall institutional growth.

Table 3.3 – Extent of School Culture in terms of Innovation

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. The school encourages the use of innovative teaching methods and technologies.	0.49	3.66
2. Teachers and staff are given opportunities to experiment with creative approaches to learning.	0.64	3.52
3. The school leadership supports initiatives that improve educational outcomes.	0.47	3.68

	SD	Mean
4. The school adapts quickly to new trends and changes in the educational landscape.	0.54	3.52
5. Collaboration and brainstorming for innovative ideas are encouraged among staff.	0.55	3.59
Average Mean		**3.59 Very High**

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

As reflected in Table 3.3, the school demonstrates a very high culture of innovation, with an average mean of 3.59. This reflects its commitment to creativity, adaptability, and continuous improvement. The highest-rated indicator, "Leadership supports initiatives for better educational outcomes" at 3.68, highlights strong administrative backing. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated indicators, "Opportunities for creative teaching" and "Adaptability to changes", both at 3.52, remain very high. This suggests that while innovation is highly encouraged, there may be opportunities to further enhance support for creative teaching practices and adaptability to educational advancements. These findings align with Kussainova et al. (2023) and Ribeiro et al. (2024), emphasizing that leadership-driven innovation enhances engagement, learning outcomes, and overall school progress.

Table 3.4 – Extent of School Culture in terms of Teachers' Feedback and Professional Development

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. Teachers receive regular and constructive feedback on their performance.	0.72	3.22
2. Professional development programs are tailored to meet teachers' individual needs.	0.61	3.56
3. Opportunities for growth, such as workshops and training, are frequently offered.	0.56	3.70
4. Teachers are encouraged to set and achieve personal and professional goals.	0.68	3.54
5. Feedback mechanisms are in place to ensure continuous improvement in teaching practices.	0.73	3.47
Average Mean		**3.50 Very High**

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

As reflected in Table 3.4, the school exhibits a very high level of support for teachers' growth, with an average mean of 3.50. This emphasize a strong professional development and feedback mechanisms. The highest-rated indicator, "Workshops and training are frequently offered" at 3.70, highlights the school's commitment to enhancing teaching effectiveness. The lowest-rated, "Teachers receive regular and constructive feedback", at 3.22, falls within the high category, suggesting room for improvement in feedback consistency. These findings align with Martinez and Roberts (2023) and Rivera (2024), reinforcing that structured feedback and professional learning significantly enhance teacher effectiveness and student outcomes.

Table 3.5 – Extent of School Culture in terms of Job Satisfaction

Indicators	SD	Mean
1. Teachers feel valued and appreciated for their contributions to the school.	0.67	3.30
2. There is a good balance between teachers' workloads and their personal lives.	0.79	3.33
3. The school provides opportunities for career growth and advancement.	0.63	3.61
4. Teachers are satisfied with the support provided by school leadership.	0.68	3.54
5. The school environment fosters a sense of belonging and purpose among staff.	0.68	3.56
Average Mean		**3.47 Very High**

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 "Very High"; 2.51 – 3.25 "High"; 1.76 – 2.50 "Low"; 1.00 – 1.75 "Very Low"

As reflected in Table 3.5, the school fosters a very high level of job satisfaction, with an average mean of 3.47. This emphasizes a supportive and fulfilling work environment. The highest-rated indicator, "Opportunities for career growth and advancement" at 3.61, highlights the institution's commitment to professional development. The lowest-rated, "Teachers feel valued and appreciated", at 3.30, remains very high, which suggest opportunities to further enhance recognition efforts. These findings align with Moreno

(2024) and Tran & Kelley (2024), emphasizing that career growth and recognition significantly contribute to teacher motivation, satisfaction, and retention.

Table 3.6 – Summary of the Extent of School Culture

Components	Mean	Interpretation
School Leadership	3.61	Very High
School Climate	3.56	Very High
Innovation	3.59	Very High
Teachers' Feedback and Professional Development	3.50	Very High
Job Satisfaction	3.47	Very High
Average Mean	**3.547 Very High**	

Scale: 1.0 – 1.75 "Very Low", 1.76 – 2.50 "Low", 2.51 – 3.25 "High", 3.26 – 4.00 "Very High"

As shown in Table 3.6, the school exhibits a very high overall school culture, with an average mean of 3.547. This indicates a strong and supportive environment for educators. School leadership, rated the highest at 3.61, underscores the administrators' effectiveness in fostering a clear vision and ethical leadership. Job satisfaction, while the lowest at 3.47, remains very high, suggesting potential areas for enhancing teacher appreciation and work-life balance. These findings align with Hardy et al. (2024), emphasizing leadership's role in cultivating a thriving school culture, and Martínez et al. (2024), highlighting job satisfaction as essential for sustaining teacher motivation and performance.

Table 4 – Test of Significant Relationship Between School Administrators' Leadership Style and School Culture

Test Variables	Correlation Coefficient	P value	Decision
School Administrators' Leadership Style and School Culture	-0.180	0.557	retain the H_o

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant relationship

The analysis presented in Table 4 reveals a correlation coefficient of -0.180 and a p-value of 0.557 between school administrators' leadership styles and school culture. Since the p-value exceeds the conventional threshold of 0.05, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating no statistically significant relationship between these variables. This outcome suggests that variations in leadership style do not directly or significantly impact the overall school culture. While leadership is undeniably vital in school operations, other factors—such as institutional policies, teacher collaboration, and external influences—may play more substantial roles in shaping school culture. These findings contrast with Ontong's (2022) study, which emphasized leadership style as a key determinant of school climate and overall culture. However, they align with research highlighting the influence of broader organizational and environmental factors on school culture. For instance, a study by Kareem et al. (2024) underscores the importance of both intangible cultural components (like corporate values, beliefs, and norms) and tangible structural components (such as organizational structure and workflow systems) in fostering a conducive learning environment. In light of these findings, it is essential to adopt a comprehensive approach when evaluating the various influences that contribute to the development of school culture, rather than focusing solely on leadership styles.

Table 5 – Test of Significant Difference in School Administrators' Leadership Style

Kruskal Wallis Test	P value	Decision
School Administrators' Leadership Style Vs. Age	0.210	retain the H_o
School Administrators' Leadership Style Vs. Educational Attainment	0.480	retain the H_o
School Administrators' Leadership Style Vs. Length of Service	0.270	retain the H_o

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant difference

As shown in Table 5, the test for a significant difference in school administrators' leadership styles when grouped according to demographic profile yielded p-values of 0.210 for age, 0.480 for educational attainment, and 0.270 for length of service. Since all p-values are greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is retained, indicating no significant difference in leadership styles across these demographic factors. This suggests that

school administrators exhibit similar leadership styles regardless of their age, educational attainment, or length of service. The consistency in leadership approaches implies that professional experience and institutional expectations may play a more substantial role in shaping leadership behaviors than individual demographic characteristics. As per Iqbal et al. (2020), the demographic characteristics of school heads, such as age and gender, do not significantly impact their leadership styles. Their study found no substantial differences in the adoption of autocratic, democratic, Islamic Model, or laissez-faire leadership styles based on these demographic factors

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Conclusion
Based on the findings, it can be asserted that school administrators possess uniform leadership styles, which reflect a systematic and standardized leadership style in the school administration. This uniformity reflects that leadership behaviors are guided by institutional needs and professional standards rather than personal preferences. Furthermore, the fact that there is no significant correlation between leadership style and school culture reflects that even though leadership is a central element in school administration, other institutional and environmental determinants play a stronger role in the school culture as a whole. This necessitates the consideration of broader organizational determinants such as policy, teacher collaboration, and external educational dynamics in the formulation of an efficacious school culture. The study also concluded that leadership styles are not influenced by demographic factors such as age, education level, and years of service. This finding supports the argument that leadership behaviors are guided more by professional training, acquired experience, and institutional standards rather than personal demographic data.

Recommendation
To enhance school culture and foster a positive learning environment, school administrators can focus on leadership dimensions beyond traditional styles, such as staff motivation, collective decision-making, and professional development programs. Teachers and staff can actively engage in professional growth and contribute to school culture through feedback and collaboration, aligning their goals with the school's mission. Students should be encouraged to participate in school activities, provide input, and promote inclusivity to create a dynamic learning environment. Parents and the broader school community can support a healthy culture by actively engaging in school initiatives and collaborating with administrators and staff to strengthen community ties. Educational policymakers should develop leadership programs that consider cultural influences and align with institutional goals while supporting further research on teacher and student engagement in shaping school culture. Lastly, future school leaders should adopt adaptive leadership practices that address cultural and contextual school needs, emphasizing cross-cultural sensitivity and effective school management.

REFERENCES:
1. Ahmed Iqbal, Z., Abid, G., Arshad, M., Ashfaq, F., Athar, M. A., & Hassan, Q. (2021). Impact of authoritative and laissez-faire leadership on thriving at work: The moderating role of conscientiousness. European journal of investigation in health, psychology and education, 11(3), 667-685.
2. Bradshaw, C. P., Cohen, J., Espelage, D. L., & Nation, M. (2021). Addressing school safety through comprehensive school climate approaches. School psychology review, 50(2-3), 221-236.
3. Brown, M. (2024). Transformational school district leaders: the characteristics of long-standing school district leaders that have successfully navigated educational reform efforts in Ohio. Youngstown State University.
4. Burnett, S. (2024). Transformative Leadership: Creating and Sustaining a Thriving School Culture. iUniverse.
5. Carter, L. (2023). Leadership Strategies to Reduce Employee Turnover in Mental Health Facilities (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
6. Consten, J. (2023). The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Leadership Success for Women. Westcliff University.

7.   Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D. (2018) Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Sage, Los Angeles.

8.   Hardy, I., Poed, S., Gowlett, C., Heimans, S., Edwards, E. J., Armour, D., ... & Ocriciano, M. (2024). Shaping School Success: Empowering Educational Leaders. Taylor & Francis.

9.   Iqbal, A., Javed, Z., & Muhammad, N. (2020). The impact of school heads' demographic characteristics on their leadership styles. Competitive Social Science Research Journal, 1(2).

10. Jimenez, M. (2024). Resistance Capital as a Cultural Asset That Supports Latina Leadership Development & Address Environmental Leadership Challenges in K-12 Schools. Journal of Latinos and Education, 1-19.

11. Kalkan, Ü., Altınay Aksal, F., Altınay Gazi, Z., Atasoy, R., & Dağlı, G. (2020). The relationship between school administrators' leadership styles, school culture, and organizational image. Sage Open, 10(1), 2158244020902081. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020902081

12. Kareem, J., Patrick, H.A. and Prabakaran, N. (2024), "Exploring the factors of learning organization in school education: the role of leadership styles, personal commitment, and organizational culture", Central European Management Journal, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/CEMJ-12-2023-0457

13. Kilag, O. K. T., Diano Jr, F. M., Malbas, M. H., Mansueto, D. P., Villar, S. P., & Arcillo, M. T. (2023). The role of servant leadership in creating a positive school climate. Science and Education, 4(5), 933-942. https://doi.org/10.46352/se.2023.v4i5.092

14. Kiplimo, J. J. (2023). Leadership Creates a Compelling Vision, Translates into Action and Sustains It. Journal of Human Resource & Leadership, 7(4), 21-29.

15. Kussainova, R. E., Urazbayeva, G. T., Kaliyeva, A. B., & Denst-Garcia, E. (2023). Innovative teaching: A bibliometric analysis from 2013 to 2023.

16. Kwan, P. (2020). Is transformational leadership theory passé? Revisiting the integrative effect of instructional leadership and transformational leadership on student outcomes. Educational administration quarterly, 56(2), 321-349.

17. Leithwood, K., Sun, J., Schumacker, R., & Hua, C. (2023). Psychometric properties of the successful school leadership survey. Journal of Educational Administration, 61(4), 385-404.

18. Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Gümüş, S. (2021). The effect of instructional leadership and distributed leadership on teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Mediating roles of supportive school culture and teacher collaboration. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 49(3), 430-453. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220954739

19. Martínez Cañas, R., Bañón Gomís, A. J., Silva, G., & Opute, J. (2024). Determining job satisfaction through the personal growth experience: the detrimental effects of supervisors who un-dignify the workplace. Cogent Business & Management, 11(1), 2429014.

20. Moreno, J. R. (2024). A Qualitative Study of School Leadership Perceptions on Teacher Retention (Doctoral dissertation, Saint Leo University).

21. Negussie, D., & Hirgo, J. (2023). Impact of transformational leadership on the achievement of objectives in the implementation of new educational policies: A literature review. International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology, 466-472.

22. Ochoa, A. S. (2023). An Examination of Employees' Perceptions of the Impact of Leadership Styles: A Qualitative Case Study. Northcentral University.

23. Oladimeji, R. M. (2024). Assessing Administrative Effectiveness: The Impact of Personality Traits and Organisational Climate. International Journal of Kita Kreatif, 1(4).

24. Ontong, L. L. (2022). School Culture, Leadership Style, and Emotional Intelligence: Impact on School Climate. Liceo Journal of Higher Education Research, 18(1).

25. Pretorius, A., Gcelu, N., & Plaatjies, B. O. (2024). Approaches to enhance the emotional intelligence skills of School Management Team members for improved leadership practices (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State).

26. Ribeiro, M. F., Costa, C. G. D., & Ramos, F. R. (2024). Exploring Purpose-Driven Leadership: Theoretical Foundations, Mechanisms, and Impacts in Organizational Context. Administrative Sciences, 14(7), 148.

27. Rivera, K. C. (2024). Journal of Educational Science and Technology. Journal of Educational Science and Technology, 10(3), 173-187.
28. Spark, A. M. (2020). Why extraverts become leaders more often than introverts and the implications for psychological well-being (Doctoral dissertation, Queensland University of Technology).
29. Suri, H. (2020). Ethical considerations of conducting systematic reviews in educational research. Systematic reviews in educational research: Methodology, perspectives and application, 41-54.
30. Thimmaraju, T. (2024). EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND LEADERSHIP. Laxmi Book Publication.
31. Tran, H., & Kelley, C. (2024). Strategic human resources management in schools: Talent-centered education leadership. Taylor & Francis.