

School Culture and Learners' Performance in District VI Schools Division of Manila: Basis for a Proposed Sustainable Development Program

Mary Ann Grace Corpuz-Pastrana

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

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100701083>

Received: 07 August 2026; Accepted: 14 August 2026; Published: 21 August 2026

ABSTRACT

A positive school culture is a fundamental organizational factor that supports learner achievement, inclusive practices, and sustainable school improvement. This study examined the relationship between school culture and learner performance in public schools in District VI, Schools Division of Manila, Philippines. Specifically, it assessed school culture, compared stakeholder assessments, identified challenges affecting school culture development, and proposed a Sustainable Development Program. Employing a quantitative descriptive–comparative–correlational research design, the study involved 281 education personnel, including supervisors, school heads, and teachers. Findings revealed that school culture was highly evident, with teacher–student relationships, academic expectations and standards, and leadership and vision emerging as the strongest dimensions. Analysis of variance revealed significant differences among respondent groups in their assessments of all nine school culture dimensions. Learner performance across 11 schools improved from School Year 2023–2024 to 2024–2025, with an overall two-year mean interpreted as Very Satisfactory. Correlational analysis revealed significant positive associations between teacher collaboration and professionalism, students' well-being and support services, and learner performance, while other dimensions showed positive but nonsignificant relationships. Challenges in strengthening school culture were moderately encountered, particularly in special education personnel availability, assistive resources, guidance services, and sustaining teacher–learner relationships in large classes. The proposed Sustainable Development Program was highly acceptable. The findings emphasize the importance of collaborative professional practices, inclusive learner-support mechanisms, strategic resource management, stakeholder participation, and evidence-based improvement initiatives in developing positive school cultures and enhancing learner outcomes.

Keywords: school culture; learner achievement; teacher collaboration; educational leadership; inclusive education; learner well-being; school improvement

INTRODUCTION

Public schools are expected to provide equitable learning opportunities while responding to accountability requirements, diverse learner needs, resource constraints, and continuing demands for improvement. These expectations make the organizational conditions within schools important because teaching and learning occur within a social environment shaped by leadership, professional relationships, academic expectations, support systems, and access to resources.

School culture refers to the shared values, beliefs, expectations, relationships, routines, and institutional practices that shape how school personnel work and how learners experience schooling. In the present study, school culture is reflected in leadership and vision, teacher collaboration and professionalism, teacher-student relationships, academic expectations and standards, parental and community involvement, school environment and infrastructure, diversity and inclusion, students' well-being and support services, and the use of resources and technology. A constructive culture can strengthen trust, professional learning, learner engagement, high expectations, and collective responsibility, whereas fragmented leadership, weak collaboration, inadequate support services, and resource limitations may constrain school effectiveness.

This concern is particularly relevant in highly urbanized public-school contexts such as Manila, where schools may experience large classes, infrastructure pressures, diverse learner needs, and unequal access to educational support. Although schools operate under common policies and standards, differences in learner performance may persist because the organizational conditions that support instruction and learner development vary across school settings.

The study is anchored in Organizational Culture Theory as discussed by Schein and Schein (2023), which explains how shared assumptions, values, and norms guide institutional behavior. It is also informed by Social Cognitive Theory, which emphasizes reciprocal relationships among personal factors, behavior, and the environment. In school settings, these perspectives suggest that leadership, professional collaboration, supportive relationships, academic expectations, and enabling resources can shape learner engagement and performance (Bandura, 2021).

Related work further emphasizes the importance of supportive learning environments, professional relationships, and whole-school conditions in educational development. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) highlighted the importance of supportive developmental contexts for learning, while Medrano (2021) underscored the contribution of school-home partnership to academic performance. However, district-level evidence examining multiple dimensions of school culture together with learner performance remains limited in the local setting.

Accordingly, this study examined school culture and learner performance in District VI, Schools Division of Manila. It assessed the major dimensions of school culture, tested differences among respondent groups, examined school-level associations with learner performance, identified challenges, and evaluated the acceptability of a Sustainable Development Program designed from the study findings.

METHODOLOGY

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

The study involved 281 respondents from public elementary schools in District VI, Schools Division of Manila, consisting of 11 supervisors, five school heads, and 265 teachers. The teacher sample was determined using Slovin's formula from a reported population of 785 teachers. Supervisors and school heads were selected purposively because of their leadership and management roles, while teachers were selected through simple random sampling.

Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire developed from relevant literature and aligned with the objectives of the study. The instrument measured school-culture dimensions and implementation challenges using five-point Likert scales. Prior to the actual administration, the instrument underwent a systematic validation process involving expert review to establish content validity and pilot testing to assess reliability and internal consistency. The validation procedures, expert qualifications, and reliability coefficients were documented to ensure methodological transparency and enhance the credibility and rigor of the measurement instrument.

Ethical research principles were observed. Participants were informed of the study purpose and procedures, participation was voluntary, informed consent was secured, and confidentiality and anonymity were protected. Results were reported in aggregate form and used for academic purposes.

Weighted means and rank ordering were used to summarize the major study variables. One-way ANOVA was employed to determine differences among respondent groups, followed by Tukey-Kramer pairwise comparisons for post hoc analysis. Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient and significance tests for correlation coefficients assessed associations between aggregated school-level measures of school-culture dimensions and learner performance. All inferential tests were evaluated at a significance level of $\alpha = .05$.

A statistical limitation should be acknowledged regarding the level of analysis. Comparative findings were interpreted based on the aggregated data structure and reported statistical analyses, while correlational results represent school-level associations derived from the 11 participating schools rather than individual-level relationships. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted as associative rather than causal, and conclusions should be limited to the participating schools and the specific context of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

School Culture

Table 1. *Assessment of School Culture in District VI Schools, Division of Manila*

Criterion	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Leadership and Vision	4.48	HE	4.70	HE	4.37	HE	4.52	HE	3
Teacher Collaboration and Professionalism	4.30	HE	4.80	HE	4.40	HE	4.50	HE	4.5
Teacher-Student Relationship	4.48	HE	4.77	HE	4.44	HE	4.56	HE	1
Academic Expectations and Standards	4.40	HE	4.77	HE	4.44	HE	4.53	HE	2
Parental and Community Involvement	4.52	HE	4.62	HE	4.37	HE	4.50	HE	4.5
School Environment and Infrastructure	4.36	HE	4.63	HE	4.25	HE	4.41	HE	9
Diversity and Inclusion	4.36	HE	4.70	HE	4.38	HE	4.48	HE	6
Students' Well-being and Support Services	4.36	HE	4.65	HE	4.37	HE	4.46	HE	7.5
Use of Resources and Technology	4.40	HE	4.72	HE	4.26	HE	4.46	HE	7.5
Overall weighted mean	4.41	HE	4.70	HE	4.40	HE	4.49	HE	—

School culture was assessed as Highly Evident overall (WM = 4.49). Among the dimensions, teacher-student relationships ranked highest (WM = 4.56), followed by academic expectations and standards (WM = 4.53) and leadership and vision (WM = 4.52). These findings reflect strong relational support, shared academic priorities, and visible leadership practices across the participating schools. Although school environment and infrastructure obtained the lowest composite mean (WM = 4.41), it remained within the Highly Evident category, suggesting an area for continued enhancement to further strengthen learning conditions.

The findings support the view of organizational culture as a shared system of values, beliefs, and practices that influences institutional functioning and collective behavior (Schein & Schein, 2023). The prominence of teacher-student relationships and academic expectations further highlights the importance of supportive learning environments in promoting positive educational experiences (Darling-Hammond et al., 2021).

Differences in Respondent-Group Assessments

Table 2. *Aggregate-Level Comparison of School-Culture Assessments*

Dimension	F(2,12)	p	η^2	Decision	Interpretation
Leadership and Vision	20.463	< .001	0.773	Reject H ₀	Significant
Teacher Collaboration and Professionalism	47.895	< .001	0.889	Reject H ₀	Significant
Teacher-Student Relationship	32.288	< .001	0.843	Reject H ₀	Significant
Academic Expectations and Standards	15.516	< .001	0.721	Reject H ₀	Significant
Parental and Community Involvement	4.447	0.036	0.426	Reject H ₀	Significant
School Environment and Infrastructure	17.707	< .001	0.747	Reject H ₀	Significant

Diversity and Inclusion	36.418	< .001	0.859	Reject H ₀	Significant
Students' Well-being and Support Services	22.213	< .001	0.787	Reject H ₀	Significant
Use of Resources and Technology	62.998	< .001	0.913	Reject H ₀	Significant

Note. p-values and η^2 were calculated from the retained F-statistics and df. The retained df structure indicates aggregate-level analysis. $F_{critical}(2,12)$, $\alpha = .05 \approx 3.89$.

The aggregate-level comparison revealed statistically significant differences among supervisors, school heads, and teachers across all nine dimensions of school culture ($p < .05$). The effect size estimates indicated substantial differences among stakeholder groups, with the strongest effects observed in the use of resources and technology ($\eta^2 = .913$), teacher collaboration and professionalism ($\eta^2 = .889$), diversity and inclusion ($\eta^2 = .859$), and teacher-student relationships ($\eta^2 = .843$). These findings suggest that stakeholder groups demonstrate differing perceptions of school culture, potentially reflecting variations in their institutional roles, responsibilities, and experiences within the school organization. Given that the analysis was based on retained aggregate-level outputs, the results should be interpreted cautiously, and further respondent-level validation is recommended to verify the stability and reliability of these observed differences.

Table 3. *Tukey-Kramer Pairwise Comparison Summary*

Dimension	Supervisors–Heads	Supervisors–Teachers	Heads–Teachers
Leadership and Vision	5.862 (S)	3.035 (NS)	8.899 (S)
Teacher Collaboration and Professionalism	13.002 (S)	2.390 (NS)	10.611 (S)
Teacher-Student Relationship	9.105 (S)	1.337 (NS)	10.442 (S)
Academic Expectations and Standards	7.164 (S)	0.744 (NS)	6.420 (S)
Parental and Community Involvement	1.619 (NS)	2.563 (NS)	4.182 (S)
School Environment and Infrastructure	5.820 (S)	2.379 (NS)	8.199 (S)
Diversity and Inclusion	10.813 (S)	0.763 (NS)	10.050 (S)
Students' Well-being and Support Services	8.303 (S)	0.286 (NS)	8.016 (S)
Use of Resources and Technology	10.775 (S)	4.706 (S)	15.481 (S)

Note. S = Significant; NS = Not significant. Pairwise interpretations were based on the Tukey-Kramer critical value of 3.67. The significance labels were standardized according to the reported test values to ensure consistency between statistical results and interpretations.

Tukey-Kramer pairwise comparisons further clarified the significant differences identified in the aggregate-level analysis. The results showed that school heads differed significantly from teachers across all nine dimensions of school culture and from supervisors in most dimensions. Meanwhile, supervisors and teachers generally exhibited comparable assessments, except for the dimension of use of resources and technology, where a significant difference was observed. These findings suggest that perceptions of school culture vary among stakeholder groups, potentially reflecting differences in institutional roles, decision-making involvement, and experiences with school operations. The results underscore the importance of integrating diverse stakeholder perspectives when evaluating school culture and developing organizational improvement initiatives.

Learner Performance

Table 4. *Learner Performance for the Last Two School Years*

School	2023–2024	VI	2024–2025	VI	Two-Year Average	VI
Bacood Elementary School	4.32	VS	4.46	VS	4.39	VS
Bagong Barangay Elementary School	4.18	VS	4.27	VS	4.23	VS
Bagong Diwa Elementary School	3.86	VS	4.05	VS	3.96	VS

Beata Elementary School	4.24	VS	4.39	VS	4.32	VS
Fernando Amorsolo Elementary School	3.72	VS	3.91	VS	3.82	VS
Geronimo Santiago Elementary School	4.08	VS	4.21	VS	4.15	VS
Pio Del Pilar Elementary School	4.41	VS	4.53	O	4.47	VS
Sta. Ana Elementary School	4.58	O	4.64	O	4.61	O
Tomas Earnshaw Elementary School	4.17	VS	4.31	VS	4.24	VS
Jacinto Zamora Elementary School	4.29	VS	4.42	VS	4.36	VS
Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo Integrated School	4.12	VS	4.26	VS	4.19	VS
Overall average	4.18	VS	4.31	VS	4.25	VS

Learner performance across the participating schools was assessed as Very Satisfactory overall, with a positive improvement trend observed over the two-year period. The overall mean increased from 4.18 in School Year 2023–2024 to 4.31 in School Year 2024–2025, resulting in a two-year average of 4.25 (Very Satisfactory). Among the participating schools, Sta. Ana Elementary School obtained the highest two-year average (WM = 4.61, Outstanding), whereas Fernando Amorsolo Elementary School recorded the lowest average (WM = 3.82, Very Satisfactory). The observed improvement in learner performance indicates continued progress in academic outcomes and underscores the importance of sustained learning support strategies, targeted interventions, and school-based improvement initiatives.

Association Between School Culture and Learner Performance

Table 5. *School-Level Association of School Culture with Learner Performance*

School-culture dimension	r	Interpretation	t(9)	p	Decision
Leadership and Vision	.494	Moderate	1.706	.122	Not significant
Teacher Collaboration and Professionalism	.633	Strong	2.452	.037	Significant
Teacher-Student Relationship	.415	Moderate	1.367	.205	Not significant
Academic Expectations and Standards	.432	Moderate	1.436	.185	Not significant
Parental and Community Involvement	.405	Moderate	1.330	.216	Not significant
School Environment and Infrastructure	.298	Weak	0.937	.372	Not significant
Diversity and Inclusion	.342	Weak	1.113	.294	Not significant
Students' Well-being and Support Services	.690	Strong	2.860	.019	Significant
Use of Resources and Technology	.528	Moderate	1.916	.088	Not significant

Note. Correlation coefficients were calculated using 11 school-level observations (df = 9). The reported t-values and p-values correspond to the retained school-level analysis. Results represent associations among school-level indicators and should not be interpreted as individual-level relationships.

School-level correlation analysis revealed that all nine school-culture dimensions demonstrated positive associations with learner performance. However, only teacher collaboration and professionalism ($r = .633$, $p = .037$) and students' well-being and support services ($r = .690$, $p = .019$) reached statistical significance at the .05 level. Among the significant relationships, students' well-being and support services demonstrated the strongest association, followed by teacher collaboration and professionalism.

These findings indicate that schools with stronger professional collaboration and learner-support systems tend to report higher learner performance outcomes. The results align with perspectives emphasizing the role of collaborative practices, supportive learning environments, and learner-centered interventions in promoting educational effectiveness (Darling-Hammond et al., 2021; Medrano, 2021). Nevertheless, the findings should be interpreted cautiously, as the analysis was conducted at the school level using 11 observations; therefore, the relationships identified should not be interpreted as causal effects.

Challenges in Sustaining Positive School Culture

Table 6. *Challenges Encountered Relative to School Culture*

Indicator	Sup.	VI	Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Unclear leadership vision or weak alignment with long-term goals	3.20	ME	2.25	LE	2.88	ME	2.78	ME	5
Centralized decision-making with limited teacher/stakeholder input	3.20	ME	2.08	LE	2.93	ME	2.74	ME	8.5
Limited time for meaningful teacher collaboration	3.40	E	1.75	LE	2.93	ME	2.69	ME	14
Unhealthy competition or unresolved conflict among teachers	3.20	ME	2.00	LE	2.77	ME	2.66	ME	15
Large class sizes hinder teacher-learner rapport	3.20	ME	2.42	LE	2.91	ME	2.84	ME	3
Fear/strict discipline used instead of mutual respect	3.20	ME	2.25	LE	2.84	ME	2.76	ME	7
Inconsistent interpretation of academic standards	2.60	ME	1.92	LE	2.94	ME	2.49	ME	18
Pressure for outputs over actual understanding	3.40	ME	2.17	LE	2.74	ME	2.77	ME	6
Low parental engagement in school activities	3.20	ME	2.17	LE	2.80	ME	2.72	ME	10.5
Difficulty building partnerships with local stakeholders	3.40	E	2.08	LE	2.74	ME	2.74	ME	8.5
Overcrowded/deteriorating classrooms	3.00	ME	2.58	LE	2.80	ME	2.80	ME	4
Limited access to clean and safe facilities	3.20	ME	1.75	LE	2.70	ME	2.55	ME	17
Lack of trained SPED teachers/assistive tools	3.00	ME	2.75	LE	3.05	ME	2.93	ME	1
Low extracurricular participation among marginalized learners	2.80	ME	2.42	LE	2.73	ME	2.65	ME	16
Insufficient licensed guidance/counseling support	3.20	ME	2.58	LE	2.98	ME	2.92	ME	2
Limited peer-support/wellness outlets	3.00	ME	2.33	LE	2.80	ME	2.71	ME	12
Limited digital tools and internet connectivity	3.00	ME	2.25	LE	2.92	ME	2.72	ME	10.5
Insufficient training/follow-up in technology integration	2.80	ME	2.33	LE	2.67	ME	2.60	ME	17
Overall weighted mean	3.11	ME	2.23	LE	2.84	ME	2.73	ME	—

School-culture challenges were assessed as Moderately Encountered overall (WM = 2.73). The most prominent challenges identified were lack of trained SPED teachers and assistive tools (WM = 2.93), insufficient licensed guidance and counseling support (WM = 2.92), large class sizes affecting teacher-learner rapport (WM = 2.84), and overcrowded or deteriorating classrooms (WM = 2.80). Descriptive patterns indicate that supervisors and teachers tended to report higher levels of encountered challenges compared with school heads.

The findings highlight priority areas for school improvement, particularly in inclusive education, learner support systems, classroom conditions, and specialized services. These results complement the observed association between students' well-being and support services and learner performance, emphasizing the importance of strengthening coordinated learner-centered interventions and support mechanisms.

Proposed Sustainable Development Program

The proposed Sustainable Development Program was developed based on the study findings and responds to the identified strengths and challenges in school culture. The program prioritizes collaborative professional learning,

inclusive learner support systems, resource-responsive school environments, stakeholder alignment, and continuous monitoring. These strategic areas aim to strengthen organizational capacity while addressing priority areas for enhancement, particularly in teacher collaboration, learner support services, and resource utilization. Integrated within existing school improvement structures, the program provides an evidence-informed framework for sustaining positive school culture and promoting continuous improvement in learner outcomes.

Table 7. Illustrative Sustainable Development Program Activities

Key Result Area	Illustrative Activity	Implementation Strategy	Performance Evidence
Teacher Collaboration and Professional Learning	Collaborative Learning and Peer Support Cycle	Use scheduled LAC/PLC sessions for lesson study, peer mentoring, common academic expectations, and shared problem solving while protecting collaborative time.	Session records; shared lesson outputs; peer feedback; implementation logs
Learner Well-being, SPED, and Guidance Support	Inclusive Learner Support Network	Map learners requiring support; strengthen referral pathways; coordinate SPED, guidance, health, and classroom support; provide short capacity-building sessions for teachers.	Referral and follow-up records; support plans; training records; learner/parent feedback
Learning Environment and Resource Use	Safe, Inclusive, and Resource-Responsive School Review	Conduct periodic facility and accessibility checks; prioritize minor repairs, space optimization, assistive resources, and practical technology access using available school/community support.	Facility checklist; resource inventory; corrective-action log; utilization evidence
Stakeholder Alignment and Participation	School Culture Alignment Forum	Hold periodic calibration, parent/community dialogue, and shared planning sessions to align expectations, roles, resource priorities, and school-culture goals.	Attendance; action matrix; stakeholder feedback; updated commitments
Monitoring and Sustainability	Quarterly School Culture and Learner Support Pulse Review	Track selected school-culture indicators, learner-support concerns, performance trends, resource gaps, and implementation progress; use results for iterative improvement.	Quarterly dashboard; review minutes; corrective-action matrix; trend summaries

The proposed program operationalizes the study findings into targeted strategies for school improvement. Collaborative professional learning responds to the identified importance of teacher collaboration, while inclusive learner support mechanisms address challenges related to SPED services, guidance support, and learner well-being. Resource-responsive strategies and stakeholder alignment initiatives further promote coordinated decision-making and sustainable school development. Through systematic monitoring and continuous refinement, the program provides a practical framework for sustaining positive school culture and supporting improved educational outcomes.

Acceptability of the Proposed Program

Table 8. Acceptability of the Proposed Sustainable Development Program

Indicator	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Completeness of facts	4.00	A	4.58	HA	4.30	HA	4.30	HA	4.5
Practicality for adoption and implementation	4.00	A	4.67	HA	4.22	HA	4.30	HA	4.5
Benefit in identifying school-culture weaknesses	4.00	A	4.67	HA	4.33	HA	4.33	HA	1
Guidance for developing/enhancing policy guidelines	4.00	A	4.67	HA	4.31	HA	4.32	HA	2.5

Knowledge for implementing corrective actions	4.00	A	4.67	HA	4.31	HA	4.32	HA	2.5
Overall weighted mean	4.00	A	4.65	HA	4.29	HA	4.31	HA	—

The proposed Sustainable Development Program was assessed as Highly Acceptable overall (WM = 4.31). Among the evaluated indicators, benefit in identifying school-culture weaknesses obtained the highest rating (WM = 4.33), followed by guidance for developing or enhancing policy guidelines and knowledge for implementing corrective actions (both WM = 4.32). School heads provided the highest overall assessment (WM = 4.65), whereas supervisors rated the program as Acceptable (WM = 4.00). These findings indicate that stakeholders perceive the proposed program as relevant, feasible, and potentially valuable in addressing identified school-culture priorities. However, acceptability ratings should be interpreted as indicators of stakeholder support rather than evidence of actual program effectiveness, which requires future implementation, process monitoring, and outcome-based evaluation.

CONCLUSIONS

1. School culture is consistently recognized as well-established and exemplary, reflecting a cohesive, positive, and supportive environment that underpins teaching and learning.
2. The three respondent groups show statistically noteworthy variation in every aspect of the institution's organizational environment.
3. Learners demonstrate sustained academic success over the period of evaluation, with results indicating gradual and continuous improvement in their scholastic outcomes.
4. School culture has a generally positive influence on students' academic performance, with teacher collaboration and students' well-being and support services emerging as the most significant contributing factors.
5. There is school culture-related challenges, indicating that while the overall environment is generally supportive, certain areas still require attention and continuous improvement.
6. The implementation of the Proposed Sustainable Development Program is a vital initiative for sustaining school culture in District VI schools, offering systematic and targeted strategies that effectively address existing challenges and enhance the overall learning environment and educational practices.
7. The Proposed Sustainable Development Program is an exemplary framework for implementation, effectively aligned with its intended objectives, designed for its target users, and tailored to address the specific needs and challenges of local schools within the Division of Manila.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. School administrators and teachers may adopt and implement the Proposed Sustainable Development Program in District VI schools under the Schools Division of Manila, and eventually expand across other schools, to address the identified gaps in school culture and student support, thereby enhancing leadership, teacher collaboration, academic standards, and the overall learning environment.
2. The school heads and Division Supervisors may continue to nurture and sustain the well-established school culture by promoting collaborative activities, recognizing exemplary practices, and reinforcing policies that support a positive and cohesive teaching and learning environment.
3. The Division of Manila Education Office may conduct regular calibration sessions, workshops, or focus group discussions among supervisors, school heads, and teachers to align understanding and expectations regarding

school culture across all dimensions.

4. The school heads and instruction supervisors may continue to monitor and evaluate student performance trends, identify gaps, and provide targeted interventions to support learners in achieving higher academic outcomes.
5. The Division Supervisors and School Administrators may implement programs that strengthen leadership, teacher collaboration, and supportive learning environments, as these factors are shown to positively influence student achievement.
6. The school heads and supervisors may address the moderate challenges encountered by educators by providing professional development, mentoring, and support systems that improve leadership communication, teacher collaboration, and student support services.
7. School administrators in District VI schools, Division of Manila, are encouraged to prioritize practical measures such as setting aside funds for school maintenance and minor construction, optimizing available classroom and storage space, coordinating with teachers, parents, and local stakeholders for school improvement projects, and assigning trained personnel to handle routine facility upkeep. These realistic steps can strengthen the school environment, support a positive school culture, and help ensure the effective implementation of the Proposed Intervention Program.
8. School administrators may devise a monitoring and evaluation tool in the implementation of the Proposed Sustainable Development Program and make necessary adjustments, as needed.
9. Future researchers are encouraged to further explore the relationship between school culture and student performance to provide deeper insights and evidence-based strategies that can enhance teaching, learning, and overall school development in similar educational settings.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, M., & Wilkins, S. (2024). Purposive sampling in qualitative research: A framework for the entire journey. *Quality & Quantity*, 59(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-024-02022-5>
2. An, X., Wang, L., & Tang, J. (2024). Development and application of descriptive statistics in modern educational research analysis. *Journal of Mathematics and Data Science*, 4(2), 142–155. <https://doi.org/10.55885/jmds.v4i2.512>
3. Aragones, C. A. (2026). 21st century skills and academic performance of Grade Six pupils. *International Journal of Sustainability and Advanced Integrated Research*, 2(1), 18–32.
4. Bandura, A. (2021). *Social cognitive theory and human learning*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Cariaso, B. (2025). Revised SHS program fully implemented in 2026. *The Philippine Star*. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2025/05/23/2445139/revised-shs-programfully-implemented-2026>
6. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
7. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2021). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 25(1), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
8. Garcia, M. A., & Santos, J. E. (2025). Quantitative data treatment models for descriptive-correlational school management research. *Philippine Journal of Educational Statistics*, 14(1), 74–89.
9. Medrano, L. R. (2021). Parental involvement and academic performance: Bases for an intervention scheme toward empowered instructional leadership. *International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management*, 4(8), 7–11. <https://journal.ijresm.com/index.php/ijresm/article/view/1139>
10. Mendoza, E., & Cruz, T. M. (2024). Parametric statistical tools in multi-stakeholder educational assessments. *Journal of Philippine Exemplary Research*, 7(2), 115–129.
11. Nainggolan, L., Sinaga, R. S., & Batubara, B. M. (2025). Implementation of the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 1 of 2021 concerning online admission of new students for secondary education

- level at SMAN 1 Sunggal. *Journal of Public Representative and Society Provision*, 5(1), 168–175. <https://doi.org/10.55885/jprsp.v5i1.493>
12. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://www.oecd.org>
13. Reyes, E. C. (2024). Inferential testing models and hypothesis validation in institutional education studies. *Journal of Educational Evaluation and Statistics*, 8(2), 143–156.
14. Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2023). *Organizational culture and leadership* (6th ed.). Wiley.
15. Talan, J., & Paredes, J. P. (2021). Fostering cultural responsiveness in an urban high school: A case study. *NASSP Bulletin*, 105(3), 187–206. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01926365211036513>
16. Untalan, S. (2026). DepEd reports 4.5M struggling readers improved in one school year. *GMA News Online*. <https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/topstories/nation/986653/depd-reports-readers-literacy-school-year/story/>
17. World Bank. (2022). *Designing effective education programs: A results-based approach*. World Bank Group. <https://www.worldbank.org>