JRIIE Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education
Center for Research Implications & Practice

Website: www.jriiejournal.com ISSN 2520-7504 (Online) Vol.10, Iss.4, 2026 (pp. 1697 - 1709)

School-related Variables in School Reputation Faith-Based Secondary Schools

Ndahayo Claver
Adventist University of Central Africa, Kigali, Rwanda
Email: ndahayoclaver1968@gmail.com

Abstract: *This study investigated the predictive relationships among school climate, stakeholder partnerships, demographic variables, and institutional reputation within Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools (N = 321) in the Philippines. Data were analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlations and stepwise multiple linear regression. Bivariate analysis revealed a strong, statistically significant positive correlation between overall school climate and school reputation ($r = .75$, $p < .01$, $r^2 = .56$), exceeding the correlation between stakeholder partnerships and reputation ($r = .67$, $p < .01$). Among climate subscales, student–teacher relationships ($r = .67$), staff dedication to student learning ($r = .64$), and school environment ($r = .63$) exhibited the strongest associations with overall reputation. Stepwise multiple regression yielded a strong-fit predictive model accounting for 55% of the variance in overall school reputation (Adjusted $R^2 = .55$, $p < .001$). Significant predictors included parenting partnerships ($\beta = .25$), school environment ($\beta = .24$), student–teacher relationships ($\beta = .20$), staff dedication to student learning ($\beta = .19$), and student religious affiliation ($\beta = –.14$). Subscale regressions further explained between 26% and 50% of the variance across academic integrity, institutional knowledge, philosophical foundations, program effectiveness, and physical environment. These findings demonstrate that institutional reputation in faith-based education is driven primarily by relational quality, instructional commitment, and family–school alignment rather than isolated disciplinary enforcement. Practical implications for educational leadership, institutional policy, and stakeholder engagement are discussed.*

Keywords: *School climate, School reputation, Stakeholder partnerships, Adventist education, Student–teacher relationships, Multiple regression*

How to cite this work (APA):

Ndahayo, C. (2026). School-related Variables in School Reputation Faith-Based Secondary Schools. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education, 10*(4), 1697 – 1709. **https://doi.org/10.59765/bmr92l**

1. Introduction

Institutional reputation has become a decisive strategic asset for educational organizations operating in increasingly competitive and accountable schooling environments (Derevianko, 2019; Mahajan, 2021). For private and faith-based secondary schools in particular, long-term sustainability, enrollment stability, and public trust depend heavily on how internal and external stakeholders perceive institutional quality (Kleinberg et al., 2024; Knight, 2005). Unlike public institutions that rely primarily on state-mandated catchment areas, faith-based schools must continuously demonstrate academic rigor, moral integrity, and holistic student care to attract and retain families from diverse religious and socioeconomic backgrounds (General Conference Education Department, 2026a; North American Division Office of Education, 2004).

A growing body of empirical literature identifies school climate defined as the shared norms, interpersonal relationships, teaching practices, and organizational structures that characterize school life—as a primary driver

of student achievement and institutional standing (Baumsteiger et al., 2023; Wang & Degol, 2016). Positive school climates cultivate student belonging, reduce behavioral disruptions, and strengthen stakeholder confidence in an institution's educational mission (Allen et al., 2018; Daily et al., 2020; Demirtas-Zorbaz et al., 2021). Conversely, fragmented leadership, weak teacher–student rapport, or poorly maintained facilities can rapidly erode public perceptions of school effectiveness (Downes, 2017; Marraccini et al., 2020).

Alongside internal school climate, stakeholder partnerships spanning parenting support, home–school communication, volunteering, home-based learning, and community collaboration—play a critical role in shaping how families evaluate schools (Deslandes, 2020a, 2020b; Epstein, 2000). When educators actively engage parents and local communities as co-partners in holistic child development, families gain firsthand insight into the school's philosophical foundations and instructional commitment (Robertson et al., 2022; White, 1952). Furthermore, in faith-based schools that enroll both denominational and non-denominational students, demographic characteristics such as religious affiliation and gender may moderate how learners experience institutional values and perceive school reputation (Kleinberg et al., 2024; Mahajan, 2021).

Despite extensive theoretical work on Adventist educational philosophy and school climate independently, limited quantitative research has modeled how specific dimensions of school climate, stakeholder partnerships, and student demographics interact to predict multi-dimensional school reputation in Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools. Most existing studies examine academic achievement or student well-being as isolated outcomes rather than evaluating institutional reputation across academic integrity, institutional knowledge, philosophical foundations, program effectiveness, and physical environment.

To address this empirical gap, the present study investigated the correlates and predictors of school reputation in Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools. Specifically, the study was guided by two primary research questions: Is there a statistically significant relationship between school climate (and its constituent subscales) and institutional school reputation? What is the predictive model of Adventist school reputation when considering school climate subscales, stakeholder partnership subscales, and respondent demographic characteristics?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in three complementary conceptual perspectives: Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory, Epstein's Theory of Overlapping Spheres of Influence, and Seventh-day Adventist Educational Philosophy. Ecological systems theory posits that student development and institutional outcomes are shaped by nested layers of environmental interaction, spanning immediate classroom microsystems to broader family and community mesosystems (Wang & Degol, 2016). Complementing this ecological view, Epstein's (2000) framework of overlapping spheres of influence demonstrates that student learning and institutional effectiveness are maximized when families, schools, and local communities share overlapping responsibilities across six domains: parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and collaborating with the community. Within the faith-based context, Seventh-day Adventist educational philosophy further defines holistic education as the harmonious development of physical, mental, social, and spiritual faculties, positioning institutional reputation as an outward reflection of lived moral values and relational care (Knight, 2005; North American Division Office of Education, 2004; White, 1952).

2.2 Institutional Reputation in Educational Settings

In contemporary educational markets, institutional reputation represents the collective perceptual judgment held by internal and external stakeholders regarding a school's academic integrity, leadership, philosophical alignment, program effectiveness, and physical infrastructure (Derevianko, 2019; Mahajan, 2021). Unlike short-term promotional image, reputational stability is built over time through consistent organizational performance, ethical governance, and stakeholder trust (Derevianko, 2019; Downes, 2017). Behavioral research on school choice reveals that prospective families rely heavily on perceived institutional reputation and peer experiences when evaluating educational suitability, particularly when choosing private or faith-based institutions over public alternatives (Kleinberg et al., 2024; Mahajan, 2021). For Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools in the Philippines—which operate alongside competitive public and sectarian school systems—maintaining a strong reputation across both denominational and non-denominational constituencies is critical for enrollment sustainability and mission fulfillment (General Conference Education Department, 2026a; Knight, 2005).

2.3 School Climate and Its Reputational Impact

School climate encompasses the quality and character of school life, reflecting shared norms, interpersonal relationships, teaching and learning practices, leadership support, and physical safety (Baumsteiger et al., 2023; Wang & Degol, 2016). Extensive empirical evidence confirms that positive school climates foster student connectedness, academic achievement, and emotional well-being (Allen et al., 2018; Daily et al., 2020; Demirtas-Zorbaz et al., 2021). Crucially, internal climate dimensions also shape external stakeholder perceptions. Systematic reviews indicate that supportive student–teacher relationships and visible staff dedication to student learning serve as primary indicators of instructional quality for both students and parents (Cardenal et al., 2023; Marraccini et al., 2020). Furthermore, schoolwide leadership and well-maintained physical environments reinforce perceptions of institutional reliability and order (Charlton et al., 2021; Downes, 2017). Conversely, when schools rely excessively on punitive discipline without relational warmth or pedagogical commitment, stakeholder perceptions of institutional values and effectiveness may suffer (Allen et al., 2018; Baumsteiger et al., 2023).

2.4 Stakeholder Partnerships: Family, School, and Community Collaboration

Collaborative partnerships among schools, families, and surrounding communities constitute a vital bridge between internal school climate and public reputation (Deslandes, 2020a, 2020b). When schools actively support parenting practices, facilitate home-based learning, and welcome parent and community volunteers, stakeholders gain direct, transparent knowledge of institutional operations and educational standards (Epstein, 2000; Robertson et al., 2022). Empirical syntheses demonstrate that sustained family–school collaboration strengthens mutual trust, bridges cultural or informational gaps, and elevates parental satisfaction with school programs (Deslandes, 2020a; Robertson et al., 2022). In semi-urban Philippine communities, where secondary academies frequently serve as civic and educational hubs, active engagement with parents and local barangay stakeholders reinforces community goodwill and institutional credibility (Deslandes, 2020b).

Demographic Moderators and Research Gap

Stakeholder perceptions of institutional reputation are not uniform across demographic subgroups. In faith-based secondary schools that enroll significant proportions of non-denominational students, religious affiliation can shape how learners and families interpret institutional philosophy, campus norms, and spiritual programming (Knight, 2005; Mahajan, 2021). Behavioral decision models suggest that stakeholders who are less familiar with an institution's foundational ethos may experience greater perceptual uncertainty unless deliberate orientation and inclusive practices are provided (Kleinberg et al., 2024; Robertson et al., 2022).

While prior literature has extensively examined school climate (Wang & Degol, 2016), family–school partnerships (Deslandes, 2020a), and corporate reputation management (Derevianko, 2019) as distinct constructs, few empirical studies have integrated these variables into a unified predictive model within Philippine Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools. Moreover, existing research rarely disaggregates institutional reputation into specific operational dimensions—such as academic integrity, institutional knowledge, philosophical foundations, program effectiveness, and physical environment—across multi-stakeholder samples comprising students, teachers, parents, and community members. This study addresses that gap by quantifying the relative predictive power of school climate, stakeholder partnerships, and demographic factors on overall and subscale school reputation.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study employed quantitative, descriptive-correlational and predictive research design (Creswell & Guetterman, 2018). The descriptive component documented respondent demographics and baseline perceptions of school climate, stakeholder partnerships, and school reputation using frequencies, means, and standard deviations. The correlational and predictive components examined the strength and direction of bivariate relationships among study variables and established multivariate regression models to identify significant predictors of overall institutional reputation and its constituent dimensions.

3.2 Study Setting, Population, and Sampling Techniques

The target population comprised internal and external stakeholders across four selected Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) secondary academies (two boarding and two non-boarding schools) operating under the North Philippine Union Mission in the Philippines. Participating schools were purposively selected based on four institutional criteria: (a) offering a complete four-year secondary education cycle, (b) operating independently without direct structural influence from an adjacent higher education institution, (c) maintaining co-educational enrollment (both male and female students), and (d) being situated in

semi-urban locales—neither inside major metropolitan centers nor in isolated rural areas.

To capture a comprehensive institutional perspective, respondents were drawn from four distinct stakeholder groups:

Students (n = 152): Restricted to junior (third year) and senior (fourth-year) high school students. Upperclassmen were purposively targeted because their extended tenure provided deeper familiarity with school operations and sufficient English proficiency to complete the English-language survey accurately. Stratified purposive selection ensured balanced representation across gender (male and female) and religious affiliation (SDA and non-SDA).

Teachers (n = 44): Because the total teaching faculty across all four academies numbered 44 educators, a total enumeration (census) approach was utilized, inviting every full-time faculty member to participate.
Parents (n = 63): Comprised parents of third year and fourth-year students who demonstrated functional English literacy. To minimize response bias and intra-family dependency, parents were purposefully recruited from among families whose junior or senior children were not included in the student sample.
Community Members (n = 62): Comprised adult residents living within the immediate vicinity of the participating academies for at least one year who possessed sufficient English reading and writing proficiency to complete the instrument independently.

Convenience and purposive sampling strategies were combined to satisfy these group-specific eligibility criteria while maintaining balanced representation of SDA and non-SDA respondents across parent and community cohorts.

3.3 Sample Size Determination

A *priori* statistical power analysis was conducted using *Power and Precision* software (Borenstein et al., 2001; Lakens, 2022) to ensure adequate sensitivity for multivariate modeling. Parameters were set to detect a small-to-medium effect size (r = .15, equivalent to R^2 = .0225) at 80% statistical power with a conservative alpha level of α = .01 (Bonferroni-adjusted to account for five repeated regression analyses across the reputation subscales) and 16 candidate independent variables. The power calculation indicated a minimum required sample size of N = 321 participants.

The final sample allocation reflected stakeholder accessibility and direct operational familiarity with daily school life: 152 students (47.4%), 44 teachers (13.7%), 63 parents (19.6%), and 62 community members (19.3%). Students formed the largest subgroup due to their continuous daily exposure to classroom climate and their immediate availability during school-hour administration.

3.4 Instrumentation and Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected using a structured, English-language questionnaire measuring demographic characteristics alongside three core constructs: school climate (seven subscales), stakeholder partnerships (six subscales), and institutional school reputation (five subscales) rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Content validity was established through expert panel review, and pilot testing confirmed acceptable internal consistency reliability across all subscales (Cronbach's $\alpha > .70$).

Administrative clearance was obtained from the principals of all four participating academies as well as local *barangay* (village) captains prior to data collection. Student questionnaires were administered directly by the principal investigator during scheduled classroom sessions to ensure standardized instructions and immediate retrieval. For teachers, parents, and community members, questionnaires were distributed in sealed envelopes—handed directly to teachers and community residents by the investigator and sent to parents via their children. Follow-up appointments and daily reminders facilitated prompt retrieval of completed envelopes, achieving the target sample of 321 valid responses.

3.5 Data Analysis

Survey responses were coded and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations) summarized demographic distributions and variable levels. Bivariate Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r) tested linear associations between school climate and school reputation subscales, interpreted using standard behavioral effect size thresholds (Cohen, 1988; Field, 2024). Finally, stepwise multiple linear regression analyses were performed to construct predictive models for overall school reputation and each of its five subscales, evaluating unstandardized (B) and standardized (β) coefficients, R^2 change, adjusted R^2, and variance inflation factors (VIF) to verify absence of multicollinearity (Hair et al., 2022).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Relationship Between School Climate and School Reputation

Research Question 1 asked, "Is there a significant relationship between school climate and school reputation?" This researcher hypothesized that "there is no significant relationship between school climate and schools' reputation" Analyses were completed using bivariate (Pearson's product-moment) correlations (see Table 1).

A strong significant positive correlation (Pallant, 2001) with $r = .75$, $p < .01$ was found between overall school climate and school reputation. This means that more than half the variance is mutually explained in the other since ($r^2 = .56$, representing 56%). As Table 31 shows, school climate seems to have a slightly stronger relationship to reputation ($r = .75$) than partnerships ($r = .67$). For this reason, administrators or other stakeholders should work to prioritize increasing overall school climate rather than only focusing on developing school partnerships or focusing on it more.

In addition, the strong relationship between school climate and school partnerships should also be developed but only considered as one aspect of a broader school climate and school partnership interaction with linkages potentially able to enhance the overall reputation of the school.

Furthermore, the school climate subscale most related to overall school reputation is student-teacher relation ($r = .67$), with slightly lower correlations to staff dedication to students' learning ($r = .64$) and school environment ($r = .63$). From this finding, it would appear that the influences that most affect the relationships between the students and their teachers, together with those factors affecting the teachers' dedication to student learning and the creation of an optimal school environment that is conducive to teaching and learning are the subscales most likely to be supportive of the overall school reputation. This also means that variations that may occur in these factors would be most associated with changes in the overall school reputation. For these reasons the allocation of resources should prioritize enhancing these aspects of school climate before other competing interests represented by other subscales.

This study also found that other subscales relationships (the highest with $r = .64$) of school climate and school reputation were found to be significantly positively correlated but with weaker correlations than the overall correlations between the school climate and school reputation variables (r = .75). As Table 1 shows, correlations between these subscale variables ranged from weak to strong with Pearson's r values of .23 to .64. That is, they mutually explain between 5% and 41% of the variance in each other.

Table 1: Relationship Between School Climate and School Reputation (N = 321)

	Correlation coefficients *r***					
Reputation / Climate	Academic integrity	Knowledge about school	Philosophical foundation	Program effectiveness	Physical environment	Reputation total
Order and discipline	.38* (medium)	.27* (weak)	.23* (weak)	.44* (medium)	.55* (strong)	.51* (strong)
Student interpersonal relation	.29* (weak)	.27* (weak)	.23* (weak)	.40* (medium)	.42* (medium)	.44* (medium)
Student-teacher relation	.43* (medium)	.49* (medium)	.48* (medium)	.58* (medium)	.51* (strong)	.67* (strong)
School parent community relation	.33* (medium)	.43* (medium)	.30* (medium)	.46* (medium)	.47* (medium)	.54* (strong)
Staff dedication to student learning	.39* (medium)	.50* (strong)	.47* (medium)	.52* (strong)	.49* (medium)	.64* (strong)
Leadership	.43* (medium)	.44* (medium)	.35* (medium)	.50* (strong)	.40* (medium)	.56* (strong)

School environment	.36* (medium)	.43* (medium)	.33* (medium)	.52* (strong)	.64* (strong)	.63* (strong)
Climate Total	.48* (medium)	.53* (strong)	.44* (medium)	.64* (strong)	.65* (strong)	.75* (strong)

Note. * Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). ** Values in the table refer to Pearson's correlation coefficients (r); $r < 0.30$ is considered weak correlation, $r \geq 0.30$ but < 0.50 is medium correlation, and $r \geq 0.50$ is strong correlation.

Finding correlations between school climate and school reputation suggests that improvement in the overall school reputation may be derived from allocating adequate resources to school environment potentially improving the most associated reputation subscales-program effectiveness and physical environment, raising the overall school reputation perceptions of stakeholders. According to this study, the administrators are likely to change reputation less effectively if time and other resources are spent in the least rewarding weakly associated subscales of school climate and school reputation such as for example by wanting to raise the perceptions of the stakeholders on philosophical foundations of the school reputation by attempting to allocate resources and effort to the order and discipline school climate subscale.

The above findings align with the literature claim that the way teachers and students interact in the school may strongly affect the way the parents of students perceive the school's reputation (Nembhard, 2005). In fact, since in general, parents trust their children with regard to how the school treats the students, (DeJong, 1990; Naperville Community Unit School District, 2005) when parents hear that a school has a good school climate that is conducive to positive relationships between teachers and their children, these parents may re-evaluate their perceptions on school reputation. Enrolling their children in schools may depend on their current perceptions of the overall school reputation.

Based on the findings that are related to Research Question 8, the null hypothesis that stated, "there is no significant relationship between school climate and school reputation," was rejected.

In summary, the strong positive relationships and even those that are weak between school partnership with stakeholders, school climate, and school reputation subscales are indicators to school administrators and teachers that there are interactions between areas of school partnership with stakeholders, school climate, and school reputation that enhance each other (Epstein, 1995, 2000) and could continue to do so. Furthermore, the subscale correlations provide some awareness of relationships contributing to the overall school climate and school partnership, school partnership and school reputation, and school climate and school reputation as discussed earlier. Epstein (2000) and National Network of Partnership Schools (2006) talk of the influence that one aspect may have on the other. Based on the above findings, this study shows that improvements in both partnership and school climate may improve the reputation of the school (Nembhard, 2005; Naperville Community Unit School District, 2005).

4.2 Predictive Model of Adventist School Reputation

Research Question 9 asked, "What is the predictive model of Adventist schools' reputation when considering school climate, school partnership with stakeholders and demographic variables for students (gender, religion), and teachers (academic qualification, years of service in the school)?" This researcher hypothesized that "there is no predictive model of Adventist school reputation when considering the relationship between school climate, partnership, and demographic variables." Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis was used to provide answers to the above research question. Table 32 shows which of the school climate, partnership, and students' and teachers' demographic variables significantly predicted school reputation.

Based on the results shown in Table 2, the predictive model for Adventist school reputation is School reputation = 2.17 + .14 (School Climate-Student-teacher relation) + .16 (School climate—School environment) + .17 (Partnership-Parenting) -.22 (Religion of student) + .12 (School climate-Staff dedication to student learning).

4.3 Discussion on the Predictive Model of Adventist School Reputation

There were five subscales for school reputation, the criterion or dependent variable (DV): academic integrity, knowledge about the school, philosophical foundation, program effectiveness, and physical environment. There were two independent variables-partnership and school climate. Partnership had six subscales: parenting, communication, volunteering, learning at home,

collaboration with community and school environment. School climate had seven subscales-order and discipline, student interpersonal relation, teacher-student relation, school parent community relation, staff dedication to students learning, leadership, and physical environment. The demographic variables that were entered into the regression equation were gender (male and female) and religion (SDA and non-SDA). All the subscales of school partnership and school climate-a total of 13 subscales-were entered into the regression equation as predictor variables.

Table 2: Predictors of School Reputation (Overall)

Predictors	B	*SEB*	β	R^2 Change	*p*-value
Climate: student-teacher relation	.14	.04	.20	.45	< .001
Climate: school environment	.16	.03	.24	.04	< .001
Partnership: parenting	.17	.03	.25	.03	< .001
Religion of student	-.22	.06	-.14	.02	< .001
Climate: staff dedication to students' learning	.12	.03	.19	.02	< .001
Constant = 2.17				Total R^2 = .56 (.55*)	

* Adjusted R^2

Table 2 shows five significant predictors of school reputation (overall): parenting (β = .25) which has the highest influence on reputation closely followed by school environment (β = .24), then student-teacher relation (β = .20), staff dedication to students learning (β = .19); and one demographic variable-religion (being non-SDA) (β = -.14). All these significant predictors accounted for 55% (adjusted R^2) of the total variance in school reputation, with school climate-student-teacher relation-as the variable that provided the best prediction since it accounted for the most variance

(R^2 = .45). Though this researcher had expected all the school partnership and school climate variables to be predictors of the Adventist school reputation-and this expectation follows the reason why these variables were chosen-the model that was produced was satisfying. In fact, according to Muijs (2004), with an adjusted R^2 > .5, this model is a "strong fit" (p. 166), since the total variance accounted for by the predictors amounted to about 55%.

The model indicates that the more the school is perceived by the stakeholders to create healthy student-teacher relationships, commitment of teachers to help students succeed in school, school environment that is conducive to teaching and learning, involving families in what students learn at home and in school, and the more SDA students perceive the school initiating teaching and learning aspects of partnership and school climate, the better the reputation of the school could be.

It should be noted however that religion negatively predicted the Adventist school reputation (β = -.14). This does not diminish the strength of the model. Since religion was a dichotomous (SDA versus non-SDA) variable in this study, it came out as a negative but significant predictor of the reputation of the school. SDA was used in this study as reference. The negative sign means that being a non-SDA student compared to being an SDA student may negatively affect the school reputation.

It does not mean, however, that there should necessarily be less non-SDAs in Adventist schools. The finding indicates that schools under this study should try to inform and teach non-SDA students what Adventist beliefs are. It would follow that the more the non-SDA students could positively perceive the SDA beliefs and values-which would be the case for SDA students, as this study indicates the better the reputation of the school could be.

Within this model, parenting exerted the greatest influence on Adventist school reputation. The model of Adventist schools' reputation reflects what previous research has indicated about parenting. Parenting was found to be an important ingredient in children's academic success when schools and parents communicatively work together to help students during parenting process (Epstein, 2000; Ward, as cited in Luntungan, 2006; University of Illinois Board of Trustees, 2008; White, 1952).

In addition, when teachers perceive that parents are concerned and interested in their children's progress at school, this opens up the lines of communication (University of Illinois Board of Trustees, 2008) between home and school. Other people say that "there are several reasons-some intuitive, some research-based—to indicate that homes, and especially parents, contribute significantly to all aspects of children's development, including their

success at school" (Kellaghan, Sloane, Alvares, & Bloom, as cited in Luntungan, 2006, p. 34).

Besides parenting, school environment was also next with regard to its prediction of school reputation. Though school environment is sometimes forgotten in terms of its effect on the global view of the perceptions that people have about the intellectual success in school (Marshall, n.d.) this finding affirms that school environment could affect the academic reputation of the school. This finding suggests that schools could look at the overall school cleanliness (BBC News Channel, 2008)—though cleanliness was not the overall concern in the perceptions of the stakeholders under this study, it is not safe to overlook the perception that students under this study expressed with regard to some aspects of school cleanliness.

Places, in the environment of the school, which could help students learn better, is another area that schools under this study may want to consider. Other schools value aspects of school environment (National Network of Partnership Schools, 2000). At the same time, student-teacher relations and staff dedication to student learning-which were also found to be predictors of Adventist school reputation-were other aspects that school may need to put emphasis on. In one of her research reports titled "caring for the children we share" Dr. Epstein (as cited in Naperville Community Unit School District, 2005, Dr. Joyce Epstein Model section) stated,

> The way schools care about children is reflected in the way schools care about the children's families. If educators view children simply as students, they are likely to see the family as separate from the school. That is, the family is expected to do its job and leave the education of children to the schools. If educators view students as children, they are likely to see both the family and the community as partners with the school in children's education and development. Partners recognize their shared interest in and responsibilities for children, and they work together to create better programs and opportunities for students.

The model of school reputation indicates that the above predictors (aspects of school partnership with stakeholders, school climate and some demographic profiles) are determinants of student's academic success and development (DeJong, 1990; Glasser, 2007; Roy, 2007) and may consequently affect the school reputation. Meaning that, the reputation of the school depends on the teaching and learning experiences that teachers and students perceive in the overall of school curriculum—emphasis in school partnership and school climate. This calls for schools to design teaching and learning activities that match the aspects of school partnership and school climate that the school would want to emphasize on.

Based on the findings of this study, the null hypothesis which stated that there is no predictive model of Adventist schools' reputation while considering school climate, school partnership with stakeholders and selected demographic variables as predictor variables, was rejected. In fact, besides determining the predictive model for overall school reputation, predictive models for each of the school reputation subscales were also determined using the school partnership, school climate, and some demographic variables. Five other predictive models for each of the reputation subscales (academic integrity, knowledge about the school, philosophical foundation, program effectiveness, and physical environment) are shown in Tables 3 - 7.

4.4 Other Predictive Models for Adventist School Reputation

Besides the overall predictive model for Adventist school reputation, five other predictive models were found. Each of these models was predicted by variables from school partnership with stakeholders, school climate, or some demographic profiles of the respondents.

4.4.1 Predictive model for Adventist school reputation: Academic integrity

Table 3 presents the significant predictors for school reputation academic integrity. The predictive model for Adventist school reputation—Academic integrity is Academic integrity = 2.41 + .17 (School climate—Student-teacher relations) + .21(Partnership—Parenting) + .19 (School climate—Leadership).

As Table 3 shows, parenting (β = .23), leadership (β = .22), and student-teacher relations (.19) were the predictors of academic integrity of the school. If the effects of the other predictor variables were kept constant, the variable that has the most influence on school reputation (academic integrity) in terms of partnership is parenting (β = .23) followed by leadership (β = .22) in terms of school climate. The variable that provided the best prediction was student-teacher relation (R^2 = .18) in terms of school climate. These predictors accounted for about 26% (adjusted R^2) of the total variance in the school reputation—academic integrity.

Table 3: Predictors of School Reputation—Academic Integrity

Predictors	B	*SEB*	β	R^2 Change	*p*-value
Climate: student-teacher relations	.17	.06	.19	.18	.004
Partnership: parenting	.21	.05	.23	.06	< .001
Climate: leadership	.19	.05	.22	.03	.001
Constant = 2.41				Total R^2 = .27 (.26*)	

* Adjusted R^2

In Table 3, the model is modest fit. The adjusted R^2 was between .11 and .30 (Muijs, 2004). The model indicates that the more students and teachers perceive a healthy relationships in the school, perceive that leadership styles and parental involvement in the education are being initiated by the school in teaching and learning, the better the reputation of the school could be—and this is seen through students' and teachers' integrity in their teaching and learning.

4.4.2 Predictive model for Adventist school reputation: Knowledge about the school

Table 4: Predictors of School Reputation: Knowledge About the School

Predictors	B	*SEB*	β	R^2 Change	*p*-value.
Partnership: volunteering	.21	.04	.30	.26	< .001
Climate: staff dedication to students learning	.17	.05	.19	.10	< .001
Partnership: parenting	.16	.05	.18	.03	< .001
Climate: leadership	.13	.05	.16	.02	.006
Religion	-.19	.09	-.09	.01	.041
Constant = 1.93				Total R^2 = .42 (.41*)	

* Adjusted R^2

Table 4 presents significant predictors for school reputation—knowledge about the school. The predictive model for school reputation—knowledge about the school is Knowledge about the school = 1.93 + .21 (Partnership—Volunteering) + .17 (School climate—Staff dedication to students' learning) + .16 (Partnership—Parenting) + .13 (School climate—Leadership) –.19 (Religion). That is, the predictors of knowledge about the school were volunteering (β = .30), staff dedication to students learning (β = .19), parenting (β = .18), leadership (β = .16), and religion (β = -.09).

If the effects of the other predictor variables were kept constant, the variable that has the most influence on the school reputation on knowledge about the school is volunteering (β = .30) in terms of school partnership with other stakeholders. These predictors accounted for about 42% (adjusted R^2) of the total variance in the School Reputation—knowledge about the school. This model is moderate fit since the adjusted R^2 was between .31 and .50 (Muijs, 2004). The model in Table 34 indicates that the more stakeholders perceive that the schools engage them in volunteerism in terms of school activities, the more stakeholders perceive that staff are dedicated to students' learning and parents have part in education of their children, that leadership encourages other stakeholders to participate in education, and the more non-SDA live according to SDA religious standards, the better the reputation of the school could be in the aspect of the knowledge that stakeholders have about the school.

4.4.3 Predictive model for Adventist school reputation: Philosophical foundations

Table 5 presents the significant predictors for school reputation—philosophical foundations. The predictive model for School reputation—philosophical foundation is

Philosophical foundation = 4.41 + .20 (School climate—student teacher relation) -.16 (School climate—staff dedication to students' learning) + .21 (Gender) -.51 (Religion).

Table 5: Predictors of School Reputation: Philosophical Foundations

Predictors	B	*SEB*	β	R^2 Change	*p*-value
Climate: student-teacher relation	.20	.05	.28	.23	<. 001
Religion	-.51	.08	-.30	.11	< .001
Climate: staff dedication to student learning	.16	.05	.23	.03	< .001
Gender	.21	.07	.13	.02	.004
Constant = 4.41				Total R^2 = .38 (.38*)	

* Adjusted R^2

As Table 5 shows, the predictors of philosophical foundation are religion (β = -.30), student-teacher relation (β = .28), staff dedication to student learning (β = .23), and gender (β = .13). These variables accounted for about 38% (adjusted R^2) of the total variance in the school reputation—philosophical foundation. As Table 35 shows, the variable that provided the best prediction was school climate—student-teacher relation (R^2 = .23). This model is one of moderate fit since the adjusted R^2 was between .31 and .50 (Muijs, 2004).

The model, school reputation—philosophical foundation—suggests that the more students and teachers perceive positive relationships between themselves, teachers' dedication to students' learning, and the more non-SDA students perceive Adventist religious beliefs to be practiced in the school, the better the reputation of the school could be. If the effects of the other predictor variables were kept constant, the variable that has the most influence on the school reputation on philosophical foundation is student-teacher relation (β = .28) in terms of school climate.

4.4.4 Predictive model for Adventist school reputation: Program effectiveness

Table 6: Predictors of School Reputation: Program Effectiveness

Predictors	B	*SEB*	β	R^2 Change	*p*-value
Climate: students-teacher relation	.23	.49	.26	.34	< .001
Partnership: collaboration with community	.17	.04	.23	.11	< .001
Partnership: learning at home	.12	.05	.16	.03	.009
Climate: leadership	.12	.04	.14	.01	.009
Partnership: parenting	.11	.05	.12	.01	.035
Constant = 1. 40				Total R^2 = .50 (.49*)	

Table 6 presents the significant predictors for school reputation-program effectiveness. The predictive model for school reputation-program effectiveness is Program effectiveness = 1.40 + .23 (School climate–student-teacher relation) + .17 (Partnership–collaboration with community) + .12 (Partnership–learning at home) + .12 (School climate-leadership) + .11 (Partnership-parenting). That is, the predictors of school reputation-program effectiveness are student-teacher relation (β = .26), collaboration with community (β = .23), learning at home (β = .16), leadership (β = .14), and parenting (β = .12).

As Table 6 shows, the variable that has the most influence on the school reputation in terms of program effectiveness is student-teacher relation (β = .26). This variable also provided the best prediction (R^2 = .34). As Table 36 shows, these predictors accounted for about 49% of the total variance in the school reputation—philosophical foundation. The model is moderate fit (Muijs, 2004). The model of Adventist school reputation in terms of program effectiveness indicates that the more the stakeholders perceive that positive student-teacher relations, collaboration with community and parents in terms of learning at school or at home, and leadership styles that

positively support teaching and learning are practiced in the school, the better the school reputation could be.

4.4.5 Predictive model for Adventist school reputation: Physical environment

In Table 7, the variable that provided the best prediction for school reputation in the area of school climate was school environment (R^2 = .41 and β = .37). If the effect of other predictor variables were kept constant, school environment could have the most influence on the school's reputation especially with regard to school physical environment. The variables school climate school environment (β = .37), school climate-order and discipline (β = .19), partnership-parenting (β = .19), and partnership-collaboration with community (β = .19) accounted for about 51% of the total variance in the school reputation-physical environment. This model is one of moderate fit, with an adjusted R^2 of .5 (Muijs, 2004).

The prediction of Adventist school reputation in terms of physical environment shows that the more stakeholders perceive that schools under this study make the school environment conducive to teaching and learning, that parenting is initiated at home and in school, that students in these schools are taught to be ordered and disciplined, and the school collaborate with the community, the better the reputation of the Adventist school could be. The Administrators of the schools under this study may need to try this.

Table 7: Predictors of School Reputation: Physical Environment

Predictors	B	*SEB*	β	R^2 Change	*p*-value
Climate: school environment	.44	.07	.37	.41	< .001
Partnership: parenting	.23	.06	.19	.06	< .001
Climate: order and discipline	.21	.05	.19	.03	< .001
Partnership: collaboration with community	.14	.05	.14	.01	.009
Constant = 1.56				Total R^2 = 51 (.50*)	

* Adjusted R^2

In summary, the perceptions of the stakeholders on both the overall Adventist school reputation model and other sub-models of Adventist school reputation indicate that the reputation of the school depends on many aspects of school partnership with stakeholders, school climate and demographic profiles of the stakeholders. All the models of school reputation suggest to schools under this study that synergistically connect all areas of school partnership with stakeholders and school climate while planning and designing teaching and learning activities in the overall school curriculum may be an indicator for school reputation.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study provides empirical evidence that the reputation of Adventist secondary schools is not merely a byproduct of historical standing or doctrinal statements, but an active outcome of daily relational, pedagogical, and collaborative practices. Explaining 55% of the variance in overall school reputation, the findings establish that positive student–teacher relationships, dedicated teaching staff, conducive learning environments, and robust parenting partnerships form the core pillars of institutional credibility. Additionally, the study highlights a critical demographic nuance: non-SDA students hold comparatively lower perceptions of school reputation and philosophical foundations, pointing to the need for intentional cultural and philosophical orientation in diverse faith-based campuses.

Implications of the Study

1. Theoretical Implications: The findings extend ecological systems and school climate theories (Wang & Degol, 2016) into the domain of faith-based institutional reputation, demonstrating that internal relational climate mediates how external stakeholders evaluate an institution's philosophical and academic value.
2. Administrative and Resource Allocation Implications: Because relational climate variables (r = .63–.67) and family partnerships (β = .25) predict reputation far more strongly than isolated disciplinary enforcement (r = .23–.51), school boards and principals face diminishing reputational returns when budgets are disproportionately directed toward punitive control rather than faculty development and community engagement.
3. Enrollment and Retention Implications: In competitive educational markets where parents rely heavily on student feedback and peer perceptions when selecting schools (Kleinberg et al., 2024), unaddressed perceptual gaps among non-SDA students represent a tangible retention risk that directly impacts enrollment sustainability.

Recommendations

Based on the statistical findings, the following actionable recommendations are proposed for Adventist school administrators, teachers, and denominational education directors:

1. Prioritize Relational Pedagogy and Faculty Support: Principals should allocate professional development funds toward strengthening student–teacher rapport, mentoring, and instructional dedication, as student–teacher relations alone account for 45% of the variance in overall school reputation.
2. Institutionalize Structured Family–School Partnerships: Schools should move beyond passive parent–teacher conferences by implementing structured parenting workshops, transparent home-learning communications, and parent volunteering initiatives ($\beta = .30$ for institutional knowledge) to strengthen stakeholder trust.
3. Develop Intentional Orientation Programs for Non-SDA Students and Families: To address the negative predictive effect of non-SDA status on philosophical and overall reputation ($\beta = -.14$ to $-.30$), administrators should design welcoming, transparent orientation sessions that clearly explain Adventist educational philosophy, holistic values, and inclusive campus practices without coercion.
4. Invest in Conducive Physical and Instructional Environments: School leaders should maintain clean, safe, and well-equipped learning spaces while linking facility upkeep to community collaboration, thereby reinforcing visible perceptions of program effectiveness and physical quality.
5. Adopt Data-Driven Climate Audits: Denominational education departments should integrate validated school climate and stakeholder perception surveys into annual quality assurance reviews to monitor relational health and proactively safeguard school reputation.

References

Allen, K., Kern, M. L., Vella-Brodrick, D., Hattie, J., & Waters, L. (2018). What schools need to know about fostering school belonging: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, *30*(1), 1–34.

Baumsteiger, R., Hoffmann, J. D., Seibyl, J., Rose, B., & Brackett, M. A. (2023). A systematic review of secondary school climate assessments. *Educational Psychology Review*, *35*(2), Article 47.

Cardenal, M.-E., Díaz-Santana, O.-D., & González-Betancor, S.-M. (2023). Teacher-student relationship and teaching styles in primary education: A model of analysis. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, *8*(3), 165–183.

Charlton, C. T., Moulton, S., Sabey, C. V., & West, R. (2021). A systematic review of the effects of schoolwide intervention programs on student and teacher perceptions of school climate. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *23*(3), 185–200.

Daily, S. M., Mann, M. J., Lilly, C. L., Dyer, A. M., Smith, M. L., & Kristjansson, A. L. (2020). School climate as an intervention to reduce academic failure and educate the whole child: A longitudinal study. *Journal of School Health*, *90*(3), 182–193.

Demirtas-Zorbaz, S., Akin-Arikan, C., & Terzi, R. (2021). Does school climate that includes students' views deliver academic achievement? A multilevel meta-analysis. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *32*(4), 543–563.

Derevianko, O. (2019). Reputation stability vs anti-crisis sustainability: Under what circumstances will innovations, media activities and CSR be in higher demand? *Oeconomia Copernicana*, *10*(3), 511–536.

Deslandes, R. (2020a). *School-family-community collaborations: Retrospective on what has been done and what has been learned: Vol. 1. School-family relations*. Routledge.

Deslandes, R. (2020b). *School-family-community collaborations: Retrospective on what has been done and what has been learned: Vol. 2. School-community relations*. Routledge.

Downes, M. (2017). University scandal, reputation and governance. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *13*(1), Article 8.

General Conference Education Department. (2026a). *Mission and scope*. Adventist Education. adventist.education

Kleinberg, J., Oren, S., Ryu, E., & Tardos, É. (2024). *Modeling reputation-based behavioral biases in school choice*. arXiv.

Knight, G. R. (2005). Why have Adventist education? *The Journal of Adventist Education*, *67*(5), 6–9.

Mahajan, P. (2021). *Selection of an engineering institution: Students' perceptions of choice characteristics and suitability under the COVID-19 pandemic*. arXiv. doi.org

Marraccini, M. E., Fang, Y., Levine, S. P., Chin, A. J., & Pittleman, C. (2020). Measuring student

perceptions of school climate: A systematic review and ecological content analysis. *School Mental Health*, *12*(2), 195–221.

North American Division Office of Education. (2004). *Philosophy of Seventh-day Adventist education*. Journey to Excellence.

Robertson, S., Nguyen, T., & Salehi, N. (2022). Not another school resource map: Meeting underserved families' information needs requires trusting relationships and personalized care. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, *6*(CSCW2), Article 371, 1–23.

Wang, M.-T., & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review*, *28*(2), 315–352.

White, E. G. (1952). *Education*. Pacific Press Publishing Association.