

Transformational School Governance and School Culture in District I, Division of Manila: Basis for a Sustainable Localized Development Program

Jackie Claire Calagui Tabunda

Graduate School Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700841>

Received: 30 July 2026; Accepted: 04 August 2026; Published: 13 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Transformational school governance and a supportive school culture are central to effective leadership, stakeholder collaboration, and sustainable school improvement. This study examined transformational school governance and school culture in public elementary schools in District I, Division of Manila; compared the assessments of supervisors, school heads, and teachers; determined the associations between governance and culture; identified implementation challenges; and developed a Sustainable Localized Development Program. A quantitative descriptive-comparative-correlational design involved 338 education personnel comprising six supervisors, 11 school heads, and 321 teachers. Transformational school governance was highly evident overall (WM = 4.49), with inspirational motivation receiving the highest composite assessment. School culture was likewise highly evident (WM = 4.58), led by trust and respect. Aggregate-level ANOVA results showed no significant respondent-group differences in intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, or inspirational motivation, but a significant difference in idealized influence, $F(2, 27) = 58.73$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .813$; Tukey-Kramer comparisons indicated significant differences across all three group pairs. Transformational governance was positively and significantly associated with every school-culture dimension ($r = .7982-.8489$), while school culture was positively associated with all governance dimensions ($r = .7201-.8594$). Governance-related challenges were moderately evident (WM = 2.95), whereas school-culture challenges were generally less encountered (WM = 2.59). The proposed program was highly acceptable (WM = 4.47). The findings support coordinated leadership development, stakeholder participation, professional collaboration, resource support, workload management, and systematic monitoring; however, the nonexperimental design and aggregate-level comparative analysis warrant cautious interpretation and do not support causal claims.

Keywords: transformational school governance, school culture, transformational leadership, educational management, stakeholder collaboration, public elementary schools

INTRODUCTION

Public schools operate in environments shaped by accountability demands, diverse learner needs, resource constraints, and expectations for continuous improvement. In this context, school governance is not limited to administrative compliance; it also involves establishing direction, mobilizing people, distributing responsibility, managing resources, and sustaining conditions that support teaching and learning. A positive school culture complements these functions by shaping the shared values, relationships, norms, and routines through which school personnel interpret and enact institutional goals.

In the Philippines, Republic Act No. 9155, or the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, positions the school as the center of the formal education system and assigns school heads authority, accountability, and responsibility for school operations. DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, further institutionalized the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads, emphasizing strategic leadership, resource management, teaching and learning, professional development, and stakeholder engagement. These policy directions provide a strong governance framework, but effective implementation still depends on the leadership behaviors and organizational conditions experienced within individual schools.

The study is anchored in Transformational Leadership Theory, introduced by Burns (1978) and further developed by Bass and Riggio (2006). The framework emphasizes idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Together, these dimensions describe leadership that models ethical conduct, articulates a compelling direction, encourages professional learning and innovation, and responds to the developmental needs of personnel. The school-culture framework adopted from Gruenert and Whitaker (2024) complements this perspective through shared vision and values, collaborative leadership, professional collaboration, trust and respect, student-centered practices, and recognition and celebration.

Prior research suggests that transformational leadership and school culture are closely connected. Sasan et al. (2023) reported that transformational leadership contributes to school culture, while Çakır and Özgenel (2024) found positive links among transformational leadership, school culture, and school happiness. At the same time, leadership implementation may be constrained by unclear roles, resource limitations, structural barriers, and insufficient professional support (Karami & Barkhoda, 2023). Principals also face continuing challenges in developing and sustaining constructive school cultures, especially in demanding school contexts (Browder, 2023).

Despite this growing literature, limited empirical work has examined transformational school governance and school culture together in public elementary schools in District I, Division of Manila, particularly from the perspectives of supervisors, school heads, and teachers and with findings translated into a localized development program. Accordingly, this study assessed governance and culture, tested respondent-group differences, examined associations between the two constructs, identified implementation challenges, and evaluated the acceptability of a Sustainable Localized Development Program designed from the study findings.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-comparative-correlational research design. The descriptive component determined the extent of transformational school governance, the level of school culture, implementation challenges, and program acceptability. The comparative component examined differences in the assessments of supervisors, school heads, and teachers, while the correlational component examined the associations between governance and culture under naturally occurring school conditions without experimental manipulation.

The respondents comprised 338 personnel from a population of 1,640, including six supervisors, 11 school heads, and 321 teachers. Supervisors and school heads were selected purposively because of their administrative responsibilities and direct involvement in school governance. Teacher-respondents were selected through simple random sampling, with sample size determined using Slovin's formula at a 0.05 margin of error.

Data were gathered using a structured researcher-developed questionnaire aligned with the study objectives, theoretical foundations, and related literature. Transformational school governance was assessed through intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence. School culture was examined through shared vision and values, collaborative leadership, professional collaboration, trust and respect, student-centered practices, and recognition and celebration. Separate item sets assessed implementation challenges and the acceptability of the proposed program. Responses were measured using five-point scales and summarized through weighted means.

Ethical research principles were observed throughout the study. Respondents were informed of the purpose and procedures of the research, participation was voluntary, withdrawal was permitted without penalty, and confidentiality and anonymity were protected. Results were reported in aggregate form and used solely for academic purposes.

Frequencies and percentages described respondent characteristics, while weighted means and rank ordering summarized the principal study variables. One-way ANOVA compared the three respondent groups, followed by Tukey-Kramer post hoc comparisons for significant omnibus results. Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient assessed the strength and direction of associations between governance and culture. Reported

correlation t-tests were recalculated from r and $df = 336$ for internal consistency. All inferential tests used $\alpha = .05$.

A statistical limitation should be noted. The retained ANOVA tables report $df = 2, 27$, which indicates 30 analytic units rather than 338 independent respondent scores. The group-comparison findings are therefore interpreted at the aggregate analytic level represented in the retained output, not as individual-level tests across all respondents. In addition, the correlational design establishes association rather than causation, and the two reported 'overall' correlation rows are arithmetic means of dimension-level coefficients; they are treated descriptively rather than as independent composite-correlation tests.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Transformational School Governance

Table 1. Assessment of Transformational School Governance

Criteria	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Intellectual Stimulation	4.43	HE	4.48	HE	4.45	HE	4.46	HE	4
Individualized Consideration	4.45	HE	4.56	HE	4.44	HE	4.49	HE	2
Inspirational Motivation	4.48	HE	4.55	HE	4.49	HE	4.51	HE	1
Idealized Influence	4.35	HE	4.61	HE	4.47	HE	4.48	HE	3
Overall weighted mean	4.43	HE	4.55	HE	4.46	HE	4.49	HE	—

Transformational school governance was Highly Evident overall ($WM = 4.49$). School heads provided the highest overall assessment ($WM = 4.55$), followed by teachers ($WM = 4.46$) and supervisors ($WM = 4.43$). Inspirational motivation ranked first ($WM = 4.51$), followed by individualized consideration ($WM = 4.49$), idealized influence ($WM = 4.48$), and intellectual stimulation ($WM = 4.46$). The narrow spread among the four composite means indicates that respondents generally perceived the core dimensions of transformational leadership as consistently present.

The prominence of inspirational motivation suggests that school leaders are particularly visible in communicating direction, encouraging commitment, and reinforcing shared goals. Individualized consideration and idealized influence further indicate strong perceptions of professional support and ethical role modeling. Although intellectual stimulation ranked lowest, its Highly Evident rating still indicates substantial encouragement of reflection, innovation, and problem solving. This pattern is consistent with Çakır and Özgenel (2024), who linked transformational leadership with supportive school culture and positive school conditions.

Differences in Respondent-Group Assessments

Table 2. Aggregate-Level Comparison of Transformational School Governance Assessments

Dimension	F(2,27)	p	η^2	Decision	Interpretation
Intellectual Stimulation	0.283	.756	.021	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Individualized Consideration	2.146	.136	.180	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Inspirational Motivation	2.016	.153	.175	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Idealized Influence	58.727	< .001	.813	Reject H_0	Significant

Note. p-values and η^2 were calculated from the retained ANOVA F-statistics and sums of squares. The retained df structure indicates aggregate-level analysis. $F_{critical}(2,27), \alpha = .05 \approx 3.35$.

No significant differences were found for intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, or inspirational motivation ($p > .05$). These results indicate broadly comparable aggregate assessments across the respondent groups for leaders' encouragement of innovation, professional support, and shared motivation. In contrast, idealized influence differed significantly, $F(2, 27) = 58.73$, $p < .001$, with a very large η^2 of .813. This indicates substantial between-group variation in how ethical role modeling, integrity, and exemplary leadership were perceived in the retained aggregate analysis.

Table 3. Tukey-Kramer Pairwise Comparisons for Idealized Influence

Comparison	Tk-test	Critical value	Result
District Supervisors – School Heads	15.3206	3.487	Significant
District Supervisors – Teachers	7.2845	3.487	Significant
School Heads – Teachers	8.0361	3.487	Significant

Note. All retained Tukey-Kramer test values exceeded the reported critical value of 3.487.

All three pairwise comparisons were significant. The finding suggests that supervisors, school heads, and teachers differed in their assessments of idealized influence, likely reflecting their distinct organizational positions and opportunities to observe leadership behavior. Supervisors view leadership across schools, school heads assess leadership from an administrative role, and teachers experience leadership through day-to-day school operations. The result supports the use of common leadership standards, ethical-leadership exemplars, and calibration activities to improve consistency in how idealized influence is understood and demonstrated. Baldoza (2025) similarly emphasized the importance of strengthening awareness and understanding of transformational teaching and leadership principles.

School Culture

Table 4. Assessment of School Culture

Criteria	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Shared Vision and Values	4.47	HE	4.59	HE	4.60	HE	4.55	HE	5
Collaborative Leadership	4.38	HE	4.75	HE	4.56	HE	4.57	HE	4
Professional Collaboration	4.32	HE	4.73	HE	4.55	HE	4.53	HE	6
Trust and Respect	4.50	HE	4.81	HE	4.54	HE	4.62	HE	1
Student-Centered Practices	4.45	HE	4.71	HE	4.57	HE	4.58	HE	3
Recognition and Celebration	4.48	HE	4.75	HE	4.56	HE	4.60	HE	2
Overall weighted mean	4.43	HE	4.72	HE	4.56	HE	4.58	HE	—

School culture was Highly Evident across all six dimensions, with an overall composite weighted mean of 4.58. Trust and respect ranked first (WM = 4.62), followed by recognition and celebration (WM = 4.60), student-centered practices (WM = 4.58), collaborative leadership (WM = 4.57), shared vision and values (WM = 4.55), and professional collaboration (WM = 4.53). School heads consistently reported the highest overall cultural assessment (WM = 4.72).

The pattern indicates a school environment strongly characterized by interpersonal trust, recognition, learner orientation, and collaborative leadership. Professional collaboration, while still Highly Evident, ranked lowest and therefore represents the clearest relative opportunity for improvement. Structured peer mentoring, collaborative planning, professional learning communities, and systematic sharing of effective practices may help deepen this dimension. Wilson Heenan et al. (2024) likewise emphasized that transformational school leadership is enacted through shared vision, relationships, collective goals, and collaborative cultural processes.

Association Between Transformational School Governance and School Culture

Table 5. Association of Transformational School Governance with School-Culture Dimensions

School-culture dimension	r	Interpretation	t(336)	Decision
Shared Vision and Values	.8431	Very strong	28.74	Significant
Collaborative Leadership	.8435	Very strong	28.79	Significant
Professional Collaboration	.8489	Very strong	29.44	Significant
Trust and Respect	.8059	Very strong	24.95	Significant
Student-Centered Practices	.8379	Very strong	28.14	Significant
Recognition and Celebration	.7982	Strong	24.29	Significant
Mean of reported r values	.8296	Very strong	—	Descriptive summary

Note. Correlation interpretation follows the manuscript legend: .80-.99 = Very Strong; .60-.79 = Strong.

Transformational school governance was positively and significantly associated with every school-culture dimension. The strongest relationship was with professional collaboration ($r = .8489$), followed by collaborative leadership ($r = .8435$), shared vision and values ($r = .8431$), student-centered practices ($r = .8379$), trust and respect ($r = .8059$), and recognition and celebration ($r = .7982$). These results indicate that schools reporting stronger transformational governance also tended to report stronger cultural conditions.

The strongest association with professional collaboration highlights the importance of governance practices that enable teamwork, shared learning, collective problem solving, and professional interaction. Recognition and celebration produced the lowest coefficient but remained strong and statistically significant. The findings are consistent with Sarong (2023), who described transformational leadership as a forward-looking approach that can support inclusive, responsive, and professionally empowering educational environments. Because the design is correlational, these relationships should be interpreted as associations rather than evidence that one construct directly causes the other.

Table 6. Association of School Culture with Transformational-Governance Dimensions

Governance dimension	r	Interpretation	t(336)	Decision
Intellectual Stimulation	.7201	Strong	19.02	Significant
Individualized Consideration	.8025	Very strong	24.65	Significant
Inspirational Motivation	.8594	Very strong	30.81	Significant
Idealized Influence	.8512	Very strong	29.73	Significant
Mean of reported r values	.8083	Very strong	—	Descriptive summary

Viewed by governance dimension, school culture was most strongly associated with inspirational motivation ($r = .8594$) and idealized influence ($r = .8512$), followed by individualized consideration ($r = .8025$). Intellectual stimulation showed a somewhat lower but still strong positive association ($r = .7201$). This pattern suggests that positive cultural conditions are especially closely aligned with leadership that communicates an encouraging

vision, demonstrates integrity, and supports personnel. Browder (2023) similarly emphasized the central role of principals in developing and sustaining positive school culture.

Challenges in Transformational School Governance

Table 7. Challenges Encountered in Transformational School Governance

Indicator	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Inadequate resources/time for current research and evidence-based practices	3.50	E	3.00	ME	3.26	ME	3.25 (ME)	ME	1
Limited opportunities for teacher collaboration/intellectual stimulation	3.00	ME	3.00	ME	2.96	ME	2.99 (ME)	ME	5
Limited time for differentiated instruction/personal attention	3.33	ME	2.82	ME	3.17	ME	3.11 (ME)	ME	2
Difficulty providing additional individualized learner support	3.33	ME	2.73	ME	3.21	ME	3.09 (ME)	ME	3
Overloaded curricular/administrative/compliance expectations	3.17	ME	2.73	ME	3.09	ME	3.00 (ME)	ME	4
Political influences affecting transformational leadership	2.83	ME	2.36	LE	2.91	ME	2.70 (ME)	ME	8
Insufficient leadership-performance monitoring mechanisms	2.83	ME	2.36	LE	2.92	ME	2.71 (ME)	ME	7
Insufficient training in ethics, integrity, and vision development	2.83	ME	2.55	LE	2.94	ME	2.77 (ME)	ME	6
Overall weighted mean	3.10	ME	2.69	ME	3.06	ME	2.95 (ME)	ME	—

Challenges in transformational school governance were Moderately Evident overall (WM = 2.95). The most prominent concerns were inadequate resources or time for engaging with current research and evidence-based practice (WM = 3.25), limited time for differentiated instruction or personal attention (WM = 3.11), difficulty providing individualized support beyond the classroom (WM = 3.09), and overloaded curricular and administrative expectations (WM = 3.00). These concerns indicate that the principal constraints are practical and organizational rather than a lack of perceived value for transformational leadership. The results point to the need for protected professional-learning time, access to updated instructional resources, workload rationalization, collaborative planning, and targeted leadership development. Karami and Barkhoda (2023) similarly identified role clarity, leadership competencies, structural conditions, and organizational support as important challenges in transformational school leadership.

Challenges in School Culture

Table 8. Challenges Encountered in School Culture

Indicator	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Limited stakeholder involvement in developing vision and values	3.17	ME	2.36	LE	3.02	ME	2.85	ME	1

Short-term focus on cultural goals	3.00	ME	2.09	LE	3.04	ME	2.71	ME	2
Overburdened leadership limits relationship-building/collaboration	2.83	ME	2.00	LE	2.94	ME	2.59	LE	6.5
Limited authority for context-responsive decisions	2.67	ME	2.00	LE	2.89	ME	2.52	LE	9.5
Limited dedicated time for teacher collaboration	2.83	ME	2.00	LE	2.94	ME	2.59	LE	6.5
Insufficient training in effective collaboration	3.00	ME	1.73	VLE	2.92	ME	2.55	LE	8
Limited teacher/staff involvement in key decisions	2.67	ME	1.73	VLE	2.85	ME	2.41	LE	12
Communication breakdowns among school personnel	2.83	ME	1.73	VLE	3.00	ME	2.52	LE	9.5
Limited resources for interactive learning methods	2.83	ME	2.27	LE	3.00	ME	2.70	ME	3.5
Inadequate training in student-centered approaches	2.83	ME	2.27	LE	2.98	ME	2.70	ME	3.5
Inconsistent recognition practices across grade levels	2.83	ME	2.09	LE	2.91	ME	2.61	ME	5
Overemphasis on external recognition	2.83	ME	1.73	VLE	2.98	ME	2.51	LE	11
Overall weighted mean	2.86	ME	1.95	LE	2.94	ME	2.59	LE	—

School-culture challenges were generally Least Encountered (WM = 2.59), although supervisors (WM = 2.86) and teachers (WM = 2.94) rated them as Moderately Encountered, whereas school heads reported a lower level (WM = 1.95). The leading concerns were limited stakeholder involvement in developing vision and values (WM = 2.85), short-term cultural goals (WM = 2.71), limited resources for interactive learning (WM = 2.70), and inadequate training in student-centered approaches (WM = 2.70).

The results suggest that positive school culture is generally established, but its sustainability depends on broader stakeholder participation, long-term cultural planning, sufficient instructional resources, and continuing teacher development. Llanos et al. (2024) similarly highlighted resource constraints, teacher preparation, curriculum adaptation, and parent/community participation as continuing considerations in sustaining inclusive and responsive elementary-school environments.

Proposed Sustainable Localized Development Program

Based on the findings, the Sustainable Localized Development Program is designed to reinforce the strongest existing governance and cultural practices while addressing the most prominent constraints identified by respondents. The program focuses on ethical and transformational leadership, protected professional collaboration, evidence-informed practice, stakeholder co-ownership of school vision, student-centered instructional support, workload management, and monitoring. Rather than introducing a separate stand-alone project, the program is intended to be integrated into existing school improvement, professional development, and stakeholder-engagement mechanisms.

Table 9. Illustrative Sustainable Localized Development Program Activities

Key Result Area	Illustrative Activity	Implementation Strategy	Performance Evidence
Ethical and Transformational Leadership	Idealized Influence Calibration and Ethical Leadership Clinic	Use common leadership scenarios, PPSSH-aligned reflection, peer feedback, and mentoring among supervisors and school heads.	Leadership reflection logs; calibrated observation notes; mentoring records
Professional Collaboration and Evidence Use	Protected Collaborative Inquiry and Evidence Hour	Schedule periodic LAC/PLC sessions for research updates, collaborative planning, case discussion, and peer sharing using existing school resources.	Session outputs; lesson adaptations; participation records; peer feedback
Stakeholder Co-ownership and School Culture	Shared Vision and Culture Renewal Forum	Engage teachers, non-teaching staff, parents, and community partners in reviewing school values, cultural priorities, recognition practices, and annual commitments.	Updated shared commitments; stakeholder attendance; action matrix; feedback summary
Student-Centered and Support and Workload Management	Differentiation, Resource, and Workload Support Cycle	Provide short training on differentiated/student-centered practices, curate digital/print resources, and review task distribution to protect instructional time.	Resource bank; sample differentiated tasks; workload review; classroom implementation evidence
Monitoring and Sustainability	Quarterly Governance-Culture Pulse Review	Track implementation indicators, emerging barriers, professional-development needs, and selected culture/governance measures for iterative improvement.	Quarterly dashboard; corrective-action log; implementation review minutes

The program should be implemented through a monitored pilot before broader institutionalization. Each activity should have designated responsible persons, realistic timelines, resource requirements, implementation-fidelity indicators, and outcome measures. This approach allows program components to be refined on the basis of implementation evidence rather than acceptability ratings alone.

Acceptability of the Proposed Program

Table 10. Acceptability of the Proposed Sustainable Localized Development Program

Indicator	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Completeness of facts	4.50	HA	4.45	HA	4.40	HA	4.45	HA	4
Practicality for adoption and implementation	4.50	HA	4.18	A	4.38	HA	4.35	HA	5
Benefit in identifying governance/culture weaknesses	4.50	HA	4.73	HA	4.40	HA	4.54	HA	1
Guidance for developing/enhancing policy guidelines	4.67	HA	4.36	HA	4.53	HA	4.52	HA	2

Knowledge for implementing corrective actions	4.50	HA	4.36	HA	4.53	HA	4.46	HA	3
Overall weighted mean	4.53	HA	4.42	HA	4.45	HA	4.47	HA	—

The program was Highly Acceptable overall (WM = 4.47). Respondents rated most highly its potential benefit in identifying weaknesses in governance and school culture (WM = 4.54), followed by its usefulness for policy guidance (WM = 4.52) and corrective action (WM = 4.46). Practicality ranked lowest (WM = 4.35) but remained Highly Acceptable overall; school heads rated this single indicator as Acceptable (WM = 4.18).

The high acceptability ratings indicate strong perceived relevance and usability, but they should not be interpreted as evidence of program effectiveness. Pilot implementation should therefore use clear timelines, responsibilities, resource requirements, fidelity indicators, and outcome measures. Foster and Kober (2024) emphasized that leadership development is continuous and depends on institutional support, accessibility, and a culture of ongoing learning.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The transformational school governance practices are constantly manifested across public elementary schools in District I, Division of Manila. This shows that there is a strong alignment between leadership practices and transformational leadership theory.
2. The transformational school governance shows generally consistent results across the indicators, except for idealized influence. The difference observed in idealized influence indicates that respondents perceive variations in how leadership demonstrates role modeling, ethical behavior, and professional integrity across different hierarchical levels.
3. The school culture of public elementary schools in District I, Division of Manila is strongly embedded and consistently practiced and the schools have institutionalized positive organizational values and teamwork among stakeholders.
4. The schools with higher levels of transformational governance tend to have positive school culture. The transformational leadership practices directly influence organizational values and behaviors which are core elements positive school culture.
5. There are some challenges related to transformational school governance and school culture. Transformational school governance revealed a more significant area of concern highlighting issues such as limited time, resources and administrative workload compared to school culture.
6. The Sustainable Localized Development Program is evidence-based and considered as a comprehensive and strategic approach to overcoming the problems encountered in transformational school governance and school culture in public elementary schools in District I, Division of Manila.
7. The Proposed Sustainable Localized Development Program receives a high level of appropriateness and may be attributed to the program's alignment with identified needs, the use of realistic and achievable strategies, clearly defined performance indicators, and the active involvement of key stakeholders in its development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The supervisors, in collaboration with school heads and teachers may pilot the Sustainable Localized Development Program at Isabelo Delos Reyes Elementary School and later expand it to other schools within the Division of Manila.

2. The school heads may continue to strengthen transformational school governance, especially in enhancing idealized influence. A conduct of trainings that is focused on ethical leadership programs and transparency initiatives to standardize the perception of “idealized influence” across the public elementary schools in District I, Division of Manila may be implemented.
3. The study may serve as a guide in the policy reinforcement of Schools Division Office of Manila for school heads and supervisors. Leadership training programs and mentoring sessions may be conducted to ensure consistency in perceptions of transformational leadership among supervisors, school heads and teachers.
4. School heads, in collaboration with teachers, non-teaching personnel, may continue fostering a strong culture through programs that encourage collaboration, respect, inclusivity, and stakeholders’ engagement.
5. School heads may implement programs that foster positive school culture through regular team building, GAD activities and recognition activities.
6. If budget warrants, school heads may encourage the use of digital resource program like DepEd Manila E-Library to help teachers use a variety of resources that will support effective teaching and learning process.
7. School Administrators may always ensure that teachers’ workload is in accordance with the Republic Act No. 4670 and DepEd Order No. 05, (2024) to address issues regarding administrative workload. The school head may monitor the distribution of tasks among their school personnel.
8. Future researchers may conduct a parallel study using same variables but with different respondents and settings to validate the reliability of the findings of the present study.

REFERENCES

1. Baldoza, C. A. (2025). Perceptions of English teachers on transformational teaching strategy: Basis for transformative learning program [Paper presentation]. Annual Research Congress for High School and Elementary Teachers, Researchers, and Scholars, De La Salle University.
2. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617095>
3. Browder, Y. T. (2023). Administrators’ perceptions of their roles and challenges in building a positive school culture in Title I schools [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/14824>
4. Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. Harper & Row.
5. Çakır, T., & Özgenel, M. (2024). The relationship between transformational leadership and school happiness: The mediating role of school culture. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, 9(3), 253–293. <https://doi.org/10.30828/real.1377849>
6. Department of Education. (2020). National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf
7. Department of Education. (2024). Rationalization of teachers’ workload in public schools and payment of teaching overload (DepEd Order No. 005, s. 2024). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2024_005.pdf
8. 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*, 8(3S), 3244–3255. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803231S>
9. Foster, D., & Kober, G. (2024, February 23). How to create a successful leadership development program. Harvard Business Impact. <https://www.harvardbusiness.org/insight/how-to-create-a-successful-leadership-development-program/>
10. Gruenert, S., & Whitaker, T. (2024). School culture rewired: Toward a more positive and productive school for all (2nd ed.). ASCD.
11. Karami, P., & Barkhoda, S. J. (2023). Challenges of transformational leaders: A narrative approach. *Journal of School Administration*, 11(2), 1–23.

12. Llanos, A., Baluyot, L., & Besin, J. M. (2024). Challenges and opportunities in implementing inclusive education in Philippine elementary schools. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence*, 1(4), 103–110.
13. Republic Act No. 4670. (1966, June 18). Magna Carta for Public School Teachers. The Lawphil Project. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1966/ra_4670_1966.html
14. Republic Act No. 9155. (2001, August 11). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. The Lawphil Project. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2001/ra_9155_2001.html
15. Sarong, J. S. (2023). Exploring transformative leadership approaches in modern educational institutions. *Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal*, 4(4), 868–876. <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v4i4.845>
16. Sasan, J. M. V., Escultor, G. R., & Larsari, V. N. (2023). The impact of transformational leadership on school culture. *International Journal of Social Service and Research*, 3(8), 1899–1907. <https://doi.org/10.46799/ijssr.v3i8.334>
17. Wilson Heenan, I., Lafferty, N., & McNamara, P. M. (2024). Enactment of transformational school leadership—Insights from primary school and system leaders. *Education Sciences*, 14(6), Article 557. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14060557>