

# Organizational learning and innovation practices of elementary schools in Sta Fe district: Basis for management intervention development

Contero, Jesser Q.

*Department of Education-SDO Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines*

Eugenio, Marianne C. 

*Nueva Vizcaya State University, Philippines*



ISSN: 2243-7703  
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

OPEN ACCESS

**Received:** 20 February 2026

**Available Online:** 9 March 2026

**Revised:** 6 March 2026

**DOI:** 10.5861/ijrse.2026.26098

**Accepted:** 8 March 2026

## ***Abstract***

This study assessed the organizational learning and innovation practices of 80 public elementary schools in the Sta. Fe District for the academic year 2025–2026. Organizational learning was examined across four dimensions—intuition, interpretation, integration, and institutionalization—reflecting how knowledge is generated, interpreted, shared, and embedded within schools. Organizational innovation was assessed in six areas, including knowledge acquisition and sharing, collaborative innovation culture, leadership support, curriculum and instructional innovation, structural and operational flexibility, and continuous improvement and evaluation. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design was employed, with respondents selected through stratified sampling and a sample size determined via Slovin’s formula. Data were collected using validated questionnaires on a five-point Likert scale and analyzed using mean scores and Spearman rank correlation at a 0.05 significance level. Findings revealed that organizational learning was highly evident (grand mean = 3.84, Very Good), with intuition scoring highest, while innovation practices were also strong (grand mean = 4.78, Very Good), particularly in collaborative culture and knowledge sharing. A very strong positive relationship ( $\rho = 0.906$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ) was observed between organizational learning and innovation, with integration and institutionalization showing the strongest correlations. Identified gaps included reflective practice, team problem-solving, leadership engagement, data-driven decision-making, and systematic evaluation. The study concludes that fostering integrated and institutionalized learning significantly enhances innovation in teaching and school operations. Recommendations include targeted professional development, leadership engagement, structured innovation mechanisms, and capacity-building initiatives. Future research may explore additional variables such as teacher demographics, professional experience, and organizational culture to further refine theoretical models and interventions supporting sustainable, collaborative, and innovation-driven school practices.

**Keywords:** educational administration intervention, organizational innovation practices, organizational learning practices

## **Organizational learning and innovation practices of elementary schools in Sta Fe district: Basis for management intervention development**

### **1. Introduction**

Across the world, education systems are undergoing profound transformations driven by technological advancements, shifting societal needs, and the urgent call for inclusive and adaptive learning environments. Schools are no longer confined to traditional models of knowledge delivery; instead, they are expected to operate as learning organizations that continuously adapt, innovate, and respond to both local and global challenges. This global redefinition of educational purpose demands that schools foster environments where creativity, collaboration, and strategic learning are part of everyday practice—not only to enhance student learning but also to equip teachers and administrators with the tools necessary for sustained professional and institutional growth.

In rural communities like Sta. Fe District in the Philippines, where educational institutions face constraints in resources, infrastructure, and access to professional development, the imperative for innovation and learning becomes even more pronounced. It is within these contexts that the capacity for organizational learning and innovation becomes a key determinant of school effectiveness. By nurturing a culture that embraces continuous learning and encourages experimentation, schools can overcome systemic limitations and improve teaching, learning, and leadership outcomes. This study explores how such practices are manifested in the district's elementary schools and uses the findings to propose strategic management interventions.

Organizational learning is broadly defined as the process through which institutions create, retain, and transfer knowledge to improve performance and adapt to change (Crossan, Lane, & White, 1999). In schools, this means fostering systems that support reflective practice, collective inquiry, and the embedding of knowledge into institutional norms. Innovation, on the other hand, involves the deliberate introduction and implementation of new ideas and practices that are intended to result in improved outcomes (OECD, 2020). These two processes are inherently connected: learning enables innovation, and innovation feeds back into learning systems. Schools that excel in both are characterized by strong leadership, collaborative culture, flexibility, and mechanisms for continuous evaluation (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2020).

Recent research highlights the critical role of leadership in shaping a culture of innovation and continuous improvement in schools. According to Arar and Nasra (2020), transformational leadership that emphasizes collaboration, trust, and shared vision leads to higher levels of teacher motivation and institutional innovation. Similarly, Kools and Stoll (2020) argue that for schools to become learning organizations, they must establish clear structures for knowledge-sharing, reflection, and responsive change. These insights are particularly relevant in the Philippine setting, where educational reforms—such as the implementation of School-Based Management—prioritize decentralized decision-making and grassroots innovation. Given these developments, assessing the current state of organizational learning and innovation in the elementary schools of Sta. Fe I District is both timely and necessary. The insights gathered from this study will provide a grounded understanding of existing practices, gaps, and potentials. More importantly, they will serve as the foundation for designing data-driven, context-appropriate management interventions aimed at strengthening the district's overall educational capacity.

The research on organizational learning and innovation practices in elementary schools aligns significantly with international, national, and institutional research frameworks aimed at enhancing educational systems and human capital development. At the global level, this study makes a significant contribution to the advancement of Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which seeks to “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.” By examining how schools acquire, share, and apply knowledge, adapt to change, and cultivate a culture of innovation, the study promotes learning environments that strengthen teacher quality, enhance school leadership, and improve the overall effectiveness of educational systems—core

targets of SDG 4.

In addition, the study aligns with SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure) by emphasizing that innovation extends beyond physical infrastructure to include systems, leadership practices, and pedagogical strategies. Recognizing that educational innovation is a systemic process, the research underscores the importance of continuous learning, stakeholder collaboration, and adaptive leadership in creating resilient and forward-looking institutions. Moreover, the study contributes to SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals) by highlighting the role of collaboration among educators, administrators, policymakers, and communities in fostering knowledge sharing and innovation. By promoting strong partnerships and cooperative networks, the study supports the mobilization of resources, expertise, and best practices necessary to achieve sustainable and equitable educational outcomes globally.

At the national level, this study directly responds to the National Research Agenda for Teacher Education (NRATE), particularly its emphasis on research themes that strengthen *teacher quality, educational leadership, curriculum and learning, and innovation* (NRATE, 2019–2023). By foregrounding how schools lead, support, and institutionalize innovation and professional growth, the study aligns with NRATE’s call for evidence-based inquiry into teacher development and quality assurance in basic education (National Research Agenda for Teacher Education, 2019–2023). Additionally, the research resonates with the Department of Education (DepEd) Basic Education Research Agenda, formalized through *DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2016*, which identifies *Governance* as one of its priority themes—focusing on leadership, school management, and organizational processes that enhance educational outcomes (DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2016). Through the generation of empirical data on current leadership practices, innovation strategies, and school processes in public schools, this study supports evidence-based policy formulation and the development of programs that promote instructional leadership, capacity building, and sustainable school improvement.

At the regional and institutional level, this study aligns with the Nueva Vizcaya State University (NVSU) Research Agenda, particularly its priority areas in *Education and Human Development, Governance, and Community Engagement* (Nueva Vizcaya State University, 2020). By generating actionable knowledge that addresses local educational challenges, the study advances the university’s commitment to promoting sustainable development and academic excellence within its communities. It exemplifies applied research that not only documents current practices but also formulates context-responsive management interventions, thereby supporting evidence-based decision-making at the institutional level.

Furthermore, the research is consistent with the College of Teacher Education (CTE) Research Agenda, which prioritizes *Instructional Leadership, School Management, and Teacher Empowerment* (Nueva Vizcaya State University, College of Teacher Education, 2021). By examining organizational dynamics within elementary schools, the study bridges theory and practice, providing empirical data that can inform both pre-service and in-service teacher training programs. The findings support the development of professional learning communities focused on innovation, instructional effectiveness, and sustainability. Ultimately, this research exemplifies the convergence of local action and broader educational goals, demonstrating how focused inquiry within a district can contribute to systemic educational transformation. Furthermore, in the Sta. Fe District, elementary school teachers face a multitude of organizational and instructional challenges that impact their ability to effectively deliver quality education. One of the most pressing concerns is the limited access to sustained professional learning opportunities. While seminars and trainings are periodically conducted, these are often insufficient in promoting deeper, long-term development in pedagogical innovation and reflective practice. This has led to a gap between policy-driven reform initiatives and actual classroom implementation.

Another significant challenge lies in the lack of structured knowledge-sharing mechanisms within and across schools. Peer collaboration, mentoring, and learning action cells are inconsistently practiced, making it difficult for best practices and innovative strategies to be disseminated widely. Teachers often work in isolation, which hinders the formation of a robust learning culture that supports collective improvement. Leadership-related

concerns also emerge, particularly in how school heads support innovation and change. Conservative leadership styles, fear of taking risks, and resistance to new ideas create a culture of compliance rather than creativity. This stifles innovation at the grassroots level, where teachers are the primary agents of change.

Additionally, many schools struggle with rigid organizational structures, such as fixed schedules, centralized decision-making, and limited autonomy in trying new methods. These inflexible systems make it difficult to respond swiftly to the evolving needs of learners, communities, and the broader education sector. These challenges collectively underline the need to examine how schools in the district function as learning organizations and how innovation is nurtured—or inhibited—at the organizational level. The researcher was thus motivated to conduct this study to provide empirical evidence that could guide the development of responsive and sustainable management interventions.

Despite the growing emphasis on educational reforms and innovation in public schools, there remains a noticeable lack of localized empirical studies that explore how organizational learning and innovation practices are actually implemented in the context of elementary education, particularly in rural districts like Sta. Fe. Much of the existing literature focuses on higher education institutions or corporate organizations, leaving a gap in understanding how basic education institutions function as learning organizations. Moreover, limited research has examined the interplay between leadership support, structural flexibility, and knowledge sharing within elementary schools in the Philippine setting. While national policies advocate for school-based management and professional learning communities, little is known about the effectiveness and consistency of these practices on the ground. There is also a scarcity of data-driven insights on how innovation is initiated, sustained, or hindered by organizational culture and leadership at the school level. This lack of contextual evidence presents a barrier to designing interventions that are responsive and grounded in actual practice.

By addressing these gaps, the present study aims to contribute valuable knowledge that can inform policy, enhance school governance, and support the development of strategic management interventions tailored to the unique realities of public elementary schools. The main aim of this investigation is to look into the organizational learning and innovation practices of public elementary schools in Sta. Fe District as perceived by public elementary school teachers during the academic year 2025-2026. Specifically, this investigation answered the following specific questions:

1. What is the perception of the respondents of their organizational learning practices along the dimensions of intuition, interpretation, integration, and institutionalization?
2. What is the perception of the respondents of their organizational innovation practices along the dimensions of knowledge acquisition and sharing, collaborative innovation culture, leadership support for innovation, curriculum and instructional innovation, structural and operational flexibility, and continuous improvement and evaluation?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the dimension of organizational learning to the overall organizational innovation perception of the respondent?
4. Based on the significant findings of the study, what educational management intervention could be developed?

## **2. Related Literature**

This study is anchored on two distinct yet complementary theoretical foundations: the Organizational Learning Theory of Argyris and Schön (1978, 1996) and the Dynamic Capabilities Theory proposed by Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997). These frameworks are vital in understanding how elementary schools acquire knowledge, promote innovation, and adapt to evolving educational demands.

Organizational Learning Theory posits that organizations learn through a cyclical process of knowledge

acquisition, interpretation, and integration, culminating in institutionalization (Argyris & Schön, 1996). In schools, this theory explains how educators collectively make sense of challenges, share insights, and embed successful practices into institutional norms. The four dimensions of organizational learning—intuition, interpretation, integration, and institutionalization—provide a comprehensive structure for analyzing how knowledge becomes part of organizational culture (Crossan, Lane, & White, 1999). According to Garvin, Edmondson, and Gino (2018), learning organizations are characterized by supportive learning environments, concrete learning processes, and leadership behavior that reinforces learning—conditions highly relevant in the school setting.

In the Philippine context, public elementary schools must continuously evolve to meet both national and global benchmarks. As such, organizational learning becomes a strategic asset. Studies such as that by Nguyen and Tran (2021) highlight the importance of learning cultures in improving institutional performance in Southeast Asian education systems. Similarly, Dimas et al. (2022) emphasize that school systems benefit from organizational learning by increasing teachers' adaptability and promoting collaborative problem-solving in the face of curriculum and policy changes. To complement this perspective, the study draws on the Dynamic Capabilities Theory to examine organizational innovation practices. Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997) defined dynamic capabilities as the firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences to address rapidly changing environments. In education, this means schools must sense, seize, and transform opportunities to innovate their structures, teaching methods, leadership practices, and stakeholder engagement mechanisms.

Recent literature supports the application of this theory in public education. According to Ritala and Richter (2020), dynamic capabilities are crucial in fostering organizational innovation, particularly in environments characterized by uncertainty and change. In schools, this theory translates into the ability to adopt new technologies, develop innovative instructional designs, and engage in flexible operational practices (Akhmetshin et al., 2021). Moreover, leadership support and a culture that encourages experimentation and collaboration are fundamental to sustaining innovation (Salazar & Yang, 2022).

The present study conceptualizes organizational innovation in academic institutions as a dynamic process arising from interconnected dimensions that collectively strengthen institutional effectiveness. Anchored in the works of Amabile and Pratt (2016) as cited by Tallungan et al. (2025), Crossan and Apaydin (2010), and the OECD (2021), organizational innovation is viewed as emanating from five core dimensions: knowledge acquisition and sharing, collaborative innovation culture, leadership support, curriculum and instructional innovation, and structural and operational flexibility. These dimensions operate synergistically, enabling schools to generate, implement, and sustain innovative ideas and practices. Underpinning all dimensions is continuous improvement and evaluation, which ensures that innovation remains reflective, adaptive, and responsive to evolving educational needs and organizational goals. Together, these theories provide a dual lens for examining both the internal learning processes and the external innovation actions of elementary schools in Sta. Fe District. This theoretical integration supports the formulation of an evidence-based educational management intervention grounded in reflective practice and adaptive leadership.

Organizational learning refers to the process by which organizations develop, enhance, and manage knowledge and practices to adapt to changes and improve performance. It is a key factor in ensuring long-term organizational effectiveness, especially in dynamic environments like education. Learning occurs when organizations systematically process experiences, evaluate outcomes, and use the insights gained to inform future actions (Mahmood et al., 2020). In the school context, this includes the continuous professional development of teachers, collaborative reflection, and evidence-based decision-making. According to López-Muñoz et al. (2019), schools that foster organizational learning are more capable of adapting to curriculum reforms, technological advancements, and community demands. The development of a learning organization involves collective engagement, leadership support, and structured feedback mechanisms. Recent research emphasizes that sustainable school improvement is deeply connected to how learning is internalized and institutionalized across the system (Vargas-Mendoza & Marquez, 2022). Hence, organizational learning is not just a strategy but a culture that enables innovation and responsiveness.

Intuition as the first dimension of organizational learning involves the pre-conscious recognition of patterns and possibilities based on individual experience or insight. In the context of schools, this may appear as a teacher's ability to anticipate classroom challenges or instructional outcomes without explicit reasoning. As noted by Haryono and Widhiarso (2020), intuition allows educators to make fast, experience-informed judgments that support adaptive decision-making. Intuitive learning is the first stage in Crossan et al.'s (1999) 4I Framework, where ideas are formed at the individual level before being shared and developed collectively. In recent studies, intuitive capacities among educators have been linked with creativity, early problem detection, and instructional innovation (Sutrisno et al., 2021). Cultivating intuition can be encouraged through reflective practice and experiential learning opportunities. Although difficult to measure, intuition serves as the seed of innovation, particularly in dynamic school environments requiring responsive action.

Interpretation as the second dimension of organizational learning refers to the process of articulating and explaining new insights or experiences to others within the organization. In schools, this involves collaborative dialogue, professional learning communities, and feedback sessions, where teachers give meaning to events or practices. According to Gómez et al. (2019), interpretation is crucial in ensuring that individual learning is shared and becomes part of collective understanding. It enables staff to align perceptions, negotiate meanings, and build shared mental models essential for coordinated actions. Interpretation is often facilitated through structured activities like peer coaching, lesson study, and departmental meetings (Nguyen & Hwang, 2020). Furthermore, interpreting experiences enhances accountability and fosters a culture of openness and trust. When supported by leadership, this process strengthens the internal knowledge network and ensures that learning is not fragmented but unified across teams.

Integration as the third dimension of organizational learning refers to the development of shared understanding and coordinated action among members of the organization. In educational settings, it is when insights from individual and group learning are incorporated into school-wide practices and strategies. Integration is crucial for coherence in instructional approaches, school policies, and curricular innovations. As stated by Fernandes et al. (2021), successful integration of learning outcomes strengthens collaboration and ensures sustainability of reforms. It also fosters a sense of ownership and collective responsibility, which are essential for organizational resilience. Strategies such as co-planning, team teaching, and school improvement planning are instrumental in facilitating integration. Recent studies show that integration enhances school performance when it is supported by open communication channels and distributed leadership (Chandra & Wahyudi, 2022). Hence, integration marks the transition from fragmented learning to systemic application of knowledge and skills.

Institutionalization as the fourth and final dimension of organizational learning involves embedding learned practices into the structures, routines, and policies of an organization. In schools, this means that innovations and improvements become formalized and sustained through regulations, guidelines, and professional norms. According to Martins et al. (2020), institutionalization ensures that learning transcends individual roles and becomes a permanent part of the organizational fabric. For example, when a school formalizes peer mentoring, reflective dialogue, or data-driven instruction, it signals that such practices are valued and expected. Institutionalization also involves allocating resources and creating support systems to uphold new initiatives (Ali & Hassan, 2021). Without this dimension, organizational learning remains temporary and vulnerable to change in leadership or personnel. By embedding successful learning practices into policy and routine, schools build long-term capacity for adaptation and excellence.

On the other hand, organizational innovation refers to the intentional implementation of new ideas, processes, products, or practices within an organization to improve effectiveness, adaptability, and competitiveness. In the educational context, innovation is essential to responding to technological changes, pedagogical shifts, and evolving learner needs (Nguyen et al., 2020). Innovation extends beyond the adoption of tools; it includes rethinking organizational structures, leadership models, and collaborative culture. According to Wang and Ahmed (2021), schools that actively foster innovation tend to demonstrate higher teacher motivation, student engagement, and institutional responsiveness. These innovations often involve the integration of knowledge management,

leadership, and strategic planning to produce sustainable results. Effective organizational innovation requires systems that support experimentation, risk-taking, and iterative learning (Sivalingam & Booth, 2023). When innovation becomes part of the school culture, it contributes to a cycle of reflection, action, and transformation. Thus, organizational innovation is not just about novel practices, but about creating a climate where such practices are nurtured and institutionalized.

Knowledge acquisition and sharing form the backbone of organizational innovation. In educational institutions, acquiring relevant pedagogical, technological, and managerial knowledge is crucial to adapting to contemporary challenges. Sharing this knowledge across teachers and departments facilitates collective learning and cross-functional collaboration. According to Kang and Lee (2021), schools that institutionalize knowledge-sharing mechanisms—such as mentoring, communities of practice, and digital repositories—are better positioned to innovate. When educators are encouraged to document and disseminate best practices, schools benefit from reduced redundancy and increased coherence in instructional methods. Effective knowledge sharing requires trust, open communication, and leadership support. Additionally, advancements in digital technology enable easier dissemination of resources and ideas across platforms (Rahman et al., 2020). Ultimately, when schools treat knowledge as a shared asset rather than an individual possession, they build a strong foundation for innovation and continual improvement.

A collaborative innovation culture refers to an organizational environment that promotes teamwork, open dialogue, and collective problem-solving in the pursuit of innovative solutions. In schools, this culture enables teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders to contribute ideas without fear of criticism, fostering creativity and ownership (Tan & Ng, 2019). When collaboration is deeply embedded, innovation is no longer dependent on a few individuals but becomes a shared responsibility. Schools with a strong innovation culture create formal and informal structures—such as innovation teams, brainstorming workshops, or reflective learning circles—to support ongoing dialogue and experimentation (Putra & Harahap, 2021). Collaboration encourages multiple perspectives, increasing the relevance and acceptance of innovations. Research has shown that teacher collaboration is positively correlated with student achievement, as it leads to aligned instruction and cohesive improvement efforts. Thus, nurturing a collaborative innovation culture is pivotal to sustaining innovation within educational organizations.

Leadership plays a pivotal role in initiating, guiding, and sustaining innovation within schools. Leaders who support innovation cultivate a vision that embraces change, allocate resources effectively, and empower staff to take initiative. As noted by Da'as et al. (2022), transformational leadership fosters psychological safety and motivation, which are critical conditions for innovation. Supportive leaders create space for experimentation, provide feedback, and celebrate both success and failure as part of the learning process. They also act as role models by engaging in continuous professional learning and encouraging others to do the same. Furthermore, school leaders who involve teachers in decision-making processes increase the likelihood of innovation being effectively implemented and sustained (Kowalski & Lasley, 2020). When leadership is consistent, inclusive, and future-oriented, it creates an enabling environment where innovation is not only possible but inevitable.

Curriculum and instructional innovation involve the adoption of new teaching strategies, content delivery methods, and learning materials to improve student engagement and learning outcomes. In the digital age, such innovations often incorporate technology, differentiated instruction, and student-centered pedagogies (Zhou et al., 2019). Schools that support instructional innovation encourage teachers to redesign lessons to reflect real-world challenges, critical thinking, and collaborative learning. According to Ahmed et al. (2020), effective curriculum innovation involves aligning instructional strategies with student needs, societal trends, and global competencies. Professional development programs, access to updated resources, and collaborative curriculum planning are instrumental in supporting teachers' innovation efforts. Moreover, integrating technology—such as flipped classrooms or learning management systems—enhances accessibility and interactivity in learning. Therefore, fostering curriculum and instructional innovation is essential for keeping pace with educational transformations and ensuring relevant and high-quality learning experiences.

Structural and operational flexibility refers to the ability of an organization to adapt its frameworks, processes, and routines in response to internal or external changes. In educational settings, this includes flexible scheduling, modular curricula, and adaptable teaching assignments. Flexible structures allow schools to respond effectively to emerging challenges, such as sudden shifts to remote learning or changing student demographics (Singh & Manju, 2021). Operational flexibility, meanwhile, allows teachers and administrators to deviate from rigid protocols to test new strategies or interventions. According to Cho et al. (2022), schools with decentralized decision-making and streamlined workflows are better equipped to innovate. Flexibility also enhances teacher autonomy, allowing for customization of instruction to suit diverse learner needs. Ultimately, structural and operational flexibility enables schools to remain resilient, responsive, and innovative, especially in times of uncertainty or reform.

Continuous improvement and evaluation refer to the cyclical process of assessing organizational performance and making evidence-based refinements. In the school context, this involves using assessment data, stakeholder feedback, and reflective practices to guide instructional and administrative improvements (Ramos et al., 2018). Schools that embed evaluation mechanisms—such as action research, monitoring systems, and performance audits—are more likely to sustain and scale innovations. Continuous improvement is not a one-time initiative but an ongoing effort that requires commitment, collaboration, and data literacy. According to Lopez and Vega (2021), the most innovative schools are those that regularly measure their progress and adapt strategies accordingly. These schools cultivate a mindset of learning from failures and leveraging insights to refine future practices. Thus, a commitment to continuous improvement ensures that innovation is dynamic, data-informed, and aligned with evolving goals. The assumption underpinning this study is that organizational learning and organizational innovation are interrelated and potentially correlated. Organizational learning equips schools with the knowledge, skills, and reflective capacity to adapt and evolve, while organizational innovation translates these learning outcomes into tangible improvements in practices, systems, and outcomes. As learning processes enhance knowledge acquisition, collaboration, and adaptability, they foster an environment conducive to innovation.

### **3. Methodology**

This study employed a quantitative research design using the descriptive-correlational method to systematically collect and analyze numerical data. This design enabled the researcher to quantify variables and determine relationships, patterns, and trends related to organizational learning and innovation within the school setting (Leedy & Ormrod, 2015). The descriptive-correlational approach was appropriate because it examined naturally occurring relationships among variables without manipulating them (American Psychological Association, 2020). Specifically, the study investigated how organizational learning behaviors—such as knowledge sharing, collaborative practices, continuous improvement, and openness to innovation—were associated with the implementation of innovative practices in elementary schools. It explored whether schools that demonstrated strong learning-oriented cultures, reflective practices, collective inquiry, and leadership support for experimentation also exhibited higher levels of innovation in teaching methods, curriculum adaptation, and school operations. Standardized and validated instruments were used to measure the key variables, ensuring reliability and objectivity in data collection. The study also considered the socio-cultural and institutional context of Sta. Fe District to determine which aspects of organizational learning most significantly contributed to fostering innovation. The findings generated empirical evidence to support evidence-based management interventions, leadership development initiatives, policy formulation, and professional training programs aimed at strengthening adaptive and innovation-driven educational environments.

The research was conducted in the Department of Education–Sta. Fe District, located in the southernmost part of Nueva Vizcaya. The district serves as a strategic educational hub characterized by rich cultural heritage, rugged terrain, and a diverse population, including indigenous groups such as the Kalanguya and Ifugao. Public elementary schools in Sta. Fe operate in geographically isolated and resource-constrained settings, requiring high levels of adaptability and resilience. In response to these challenges, schools have developed innovative strategies such as multi-grade teaching, locally produced learning modules, and community-assisted classroom improvements. Organizational learning practices are evident through Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, school-

based in-service trainings (INSET), and cluster meetings where teachers collaboratively reflect on instructional challenges and share insights. These practices align with the four dimensions of organizational learning: intuition, interpretation, integration, and institutionalization. Innovation is further reflected in curriculum contextualization, enhanced modular learning, home-based learning support systems, and community partnerships. Leadership support, stakeholder engagement, and flexible organizational structures contribute to sustaining innovation despite limited technological and financial resources. The district's unique balance of cultural tradition and educational transformation provides a rich context for examining the relationship between organizational learning and innovation practices.

The respondents of the study consisted of 80 permanent public elementary school teachers, representing 83.33% of the total 96 teaching personnel in the complete elementary schools of Sta. Fe District. The sample size was determined using Slovin's Formula to ensure statistical representativeness and feasibility. School heads were excluded from the study. Stratified sampling was first employed, with each school serving as a separate stratum to account for differences in size, location, and organizational context. Within each stratum, simple random sampling was conducted to ensure that every teacher had an equal chance of selection. This multi-stage sampling approach minimized selection bias and enhanced the reliability and generalizability of the findings. Ethical standards were strictly observed, including informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and the right to withdraw without consequences. Approval was secured from the District Supervisor, the Schools Division Office of Nueva Vizcaya, and the appropriate research ethics committee.

Two validated research instruments were utilized in this study. The Organizational Learning Practices Questionnaire, developed by Quimson et al. (2025), consisted of 32 items measuring four dimensions: intuition, interpretation, integration, and institutionalization. It demonstrated strong internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95. The Organizational Innovation Practices Questionnaire, developed by Tallungan et al. (2025), included 36 items assessing six dimensions: knowledge acquisition and sharing, collaborative innovation culture, leadership support for innovation, curriculum and instructional innovation, structural and operational flexibility, and continuous improvement and evaluation. This instrument also showed high reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95. Both instruments utilized a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always), with corresponding descriptive interpretations from Poor to Excellent based on computed means.

The data gathering procedure followed a systematic and ethical process. After obtaining formal approval, the researcher coordinated with school heads to schedule data collection without disrupting school operations. An orientation was conducted to explain the study's objectives, procedures, and ethical safeguards. Participants were given printed questionnaires and allowed three to five working days to complete them. The researcher ensured uniform instructions and remained available for clarification. Completed questionnaires were retrieved personally, and responses were encoded in a secure, password-protected database accessible only to the researcher and thesis adviser. Confidentiality was strictly maintained, and only aggregated data were reported.

For statistical treatment, the mean was used to describe the extent of organizational learning and innovation practices as perceived by the respondents. Spearman Rank Correlation was employed to determine the significant relationship between organizational learning and organizational innovation practices. These statistical tools enabled the researcher to generate reliable and meaningful findings that could inform evidence-based management interventions in the elementary schools of Sta. Fe District.

#### **4. Results and Discussion**

The primary focus of this research was to assess the organizational learning and innovation practices of public elementary schools in the Sta. Fe District for the academic year 2025–2026. Organizational learning was examined across four core dimensions: intuition, interpretation, integration, and institutionalization, reflecting how knowledge was generated, interpreted, shared, and embedded within the organization. In parallel, organizational innovation practices were assessed in terms of six critical areas: knowledge acquisition and sharing, collaborative

innovation culture, leadership support for innovation, curriculum and instructional innovation, structural and operational flexibility, and continuous improvement and evaluation.

The study adopted a quantitative research design using a descriptive-correlational approach. The respondents were public elementary school teachers selected through stratified sampling, with the sample size determined via Slovin's formula to ensure statistical representativeness. Data collection was facilitated through a validated and reliable questionnaires, measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Never" (1) to "Always" (5). Statistical tools such as mean and Spearman Rank correlation coefficient were used for data analysis. The hypothesis was tested at a 0.05 level of significance to determine the presence of statistically significant relationships.

The study aimed to achieve the following objectives. First, it sought to determine the perception of the respondents regarding their organizational learning practices along the dimensions of intuition, interpretation, integration, and institutionalization. Second, it aimed to assess the perception of the respondents regarding their organizational innovation practices in terms of knowledge acquisition and sharing, collaborative innovation culture, leadership support for innovation, curriculum and instructional innovation, structural and operational flexibility, and continuous improvement and evaluation. Third, the study intended to examine the significant relationship between the dimensions of organizational learning and the overall organizational innovation practices as perceived by the respondents. Finally, it aimed to develop an educational management intervention based on the significant findings of the study. The following are the significant results of the study:

1. The data reveal a grand mean of 3.84, described as Very Good, indicating that respondents generally perceive their organizational learning practices as highly evident and consistently manifested. Among the dimensions, Intuition scored highest (3.94), reflecting strong individual learning and experiential insight. Interpretation followed (3.88), showing effective articulation and shared understanding within teams. Institutionalization (3.80) highlighted the embedding of knowledge into organizational systems, while Integration (3.75) indicated slightly lower but still strong coordination across units. Overall, findings suggest a strong learning-oriented culture with opportunities to further enhance collective integration, ensuring sustained and maximized organizational learning.

2. The findings show a grand mean of 4.78, described as Very Good, indicating that organizational innovation practices are highly evident and consistently applied. Collaborative Innovation Culture scored highest (3.94), reflecting strong teamwork and shared problem-solving. Knowledge Acquisition and Sharing (3.93) highlights continuous, collective learning, while Curriculum and Instructional Innovation (3.89) show commitment to enhancing teaching practices. Leadership Support for Innovation (3.73) and Continuous Improvement and Evaluation (3.65) are evident but offer room for strengthening. Structural and Operational Flexibility (3.49) indicates some rigidity. Overall, the results reveal a strong, systemic approach to innovation with opportunities for further enhancement.

3. The analysis revealed a very strong positive relationship between organizational learning and innovation, with an overall Spearman rho of 0.906, significant at  $p = 0.001$ . This indicates that higher levels of organizational learning are closely linked to greater innovation practices, emphasizing the role of learning in sustaining educational innovation. Among the dimensions, Integration showed the strongest correlation (0.802), followed by Institutionalization (0.739), Interpretation (0.638), and Intuition (0.493). These results suggest that synthesizing knowledge across teams and embedding learning into structures most strongly enhance innovation, while experiential learning also contributes moderately, confirming the critical influence of organizational learning on innovation outcomes.

4. The lowest mean scores in organizational learning and innovation highlighted priority areas for the proposed training design. For learning, gaps included strengthening reflective practice, experiential learning, collaborative problem-solving, coordinated application of new methods, and leadership in sustaining improvements. For innovation, areas needing attention were data-driven decision-making, team teaching and co-planning, innovation-supportive leadership, regular updating of instructional materials, shared decision-making, and systematic

evaluation of initiatives. These identified gaps informed the development of course content and topics aimed at enhancing teachers' capacities in both organizational learning and innovation, ensuring practical, sustainable, and collaborative improvements in teaching and school practices.

## 5. Conclusions

- The study established that organizational learning is highly evident, with teachers demonstrating strong individual learning, experiential insight, and effective knowledge sharing within teams. Knowledge is substantially embedded in organizational systems, and cross-unit coordination, while slightly less pronounced, reflects a culture that supports continuous learning, professional growth, and reflective practice.
- Innovation practices were systematically applied, with strengths in collaborative culture, knowledge acquisition and sharing, and curriculum and instructional innovation. Leadership support, continuous improvement mechanisms, and organizational flexibility, although present, indicate potential areas for further enhancement to optimize innovation outcomes.
- A strong positive relationship was observed between organizational learning and innovation. Integration and institutionalization of knowledge were particularly influential, highlighting that embedding and synthesizing learning across structures directly supports sustainable innovation.
- Gaps were identified in reflective practice, experiential learning, collaborative problem-solving, leadership engagement, data-driven decision-making, team planning, and systematic evaluation. Targeted capacity-building initiatives addressing these areas can strengthen teacher competencies and foster sustainable, collaborative, and innovation-driven school practices.

## *Recommendations*

- School administrators and policymakers should implement professional development programs that strengthen reflective practice, experiential learning, and cross-team knowledge integration to further cultivate a learning-oriented culture and enhance collective capacity.
- Schools should establish structured mechanisms to support leadership engagement, continuous improvement, and operational flexibility, ensuring that innovation initiatives—such as collaborative projects, curriculum enhancement, and instructional innovations—are effectively sustained and scaled.
- Educational leaders should design strategies that explicitly link organizational learning to innovation, emphasizing knowledge integration and institutionalization to maximize the impact of teacher-driven initiatives and foster sustainable improvements in teaching and learning practices.
- Targeted interventions should focus on collaborative problem-solving, data-informed decision-making, team planning, and systematic evaluation of programs to strengthen teacher competencies and ensure evidence-based, innovation-driven school practices.
- Future researchers are encouraged to replicate the study in other districts or educational levels to validate the findings, examine contextual differences, and extend understanding of organizational learning and innovation in diverse school settings.
- Future studies may consider incorporating additional variables that could influence organizational learning and innovation practices, such as teachers' demographic profiles, professional experience, leadership styles, organizational culture, school climate, emotional intelligence, teaching efficacy, or job satisfaction. Including these factors may provide a more comprehensive understanding of the elements affecting these practices and support the development of robust theoretical models and targeted intervention programs.

## 6. References

- Ahmed, M., Arshad, M., & Mahmood, R. (2020). Rethinking instructional strategies for 21st-century learners: Curriculum innovation in schools. *Journal of Educational Innovation*, 15(1), 55–68.
- Akhmetshin, E. M., Vasin, S. A., & Pavlyuk, A. V. (2021). Development of educational institutions based on dynamic capabilities: A conceptual model. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7010012>
- Ali, M., & Hassan, R. (2021). Organizational routines and institutionalized learning: Lessons for educational reform. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(5), 779–796.
- Arar, K., & Nasra, M. A. (2020). Leadership for learning and teacher motivation in Arab schools in Israel: The mediating role of trust and collaboration. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(3), 503–520. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218813191>
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method, and practice*. Addison-Wesley.
- Bernardo, A. B. I., & Mendoza, N. B. (2021). Resilience and collective efficacy of teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic: Contributions of self-efficacy and social support. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30, 77–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00542-7>
- Chandra, L., & Wahyudi, T. (2022). Strengthening school systems through integrated learning practices. *Journal of Educational Change and Practice*, 13(1), 77–90.
- Cho, H., Shin, S., & Lee, J. (2022). Structural flexibility and innovation in education: A study of adaptive school management. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 58(4), 745–771.
- Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 522–537. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202135>
- Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 522–537. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202135>
- Da'as, R. A., Qutaiba, I., & Sammour, R. (2022). Principal leadership and school innovation: The mediating role of teacher empowerment. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(6), 937–956.
- Department of Education. (2016). *DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2016: Adoption of the Basic Education Research Agenda*. [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/DO\\_s2016\\_039.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/DO_s2016_039.pdf) Department of Education
- Dimas, I. D., Alves, R. A., Lourenço, P. R., & Rebelo, T. (2022). Organizational learning culture and teachers' innovative behavior: A mediated model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 109, 103556. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103556>
- Fernandes, J., Rocha, H., & Matos, F. (2021). Integration of organizational learning in education: A strategic approach. *Educational Planning*, 29(3), 56–70.
- Garvin, D. A., Edmondson, A. C., & Gino, F. (2018). Is yours a learning organization? *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2008/03/is-yours-a-learning-organization>
- Gómez, S., Luna, M., & Pérez, R. (2019). Collaborative interpretation as a driver of teacher professional development. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 7(2), 119–138.
- Haryono, A., & Widhiarso, W. (2020). Enhancing intuitive decision-making in teachers: Implications for school improvement. *Asian Journal of Education*, 10(1), 85–97.
- Kang, D., & Lee, H. (2021). Knowledge sharing as a catalyst for educational innovation. *Journal of Organizational Learning in Education*, 12(2), 88–103.
- Kools, M., & Stoll, L. (2020). The school as a learning organisation: A review revisited. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 31(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2019.1623453>
- Kowalski, T. J., & Lasley, T. J. (2020). School leadership and innovation: A conceptual model for transformation. *Educational Leadership Review*, 21(1), 45–62.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Lopez, J. M., & Vega, A. R. (2021). Sustaining school improvement through continuous evaluation: An empirical study. *International Journal of Educational Planning & Administration*, 11(3), 189–204.
- López-Muñoz, J. F., Pérez-Fuentes, M. C., Molero Jurado, M. M., & Gázquez Linares, J. J. (2019). Organizational learning in educational institutions: Development, challenges and perspectives. *Educational Sciences*, 9(3), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9030215>
- Mahmood, R., Arshad, M., & Ahmed, M. (2020). The impact of organizational learning on performance through innovation in educational settings. *Journal of Educational Research*, 23(4), 50–65.
- Martins, C., de Oliveira, R., & Pereira, L. (2020). Institutionalizing learning in schools: Pathways for sustainability. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(9), 1401–1415.
- National Research Agenda for Teacher Education. (2019–2023). *National Research Agenda for Teacher Education 2019–2023*. (NRATE).
- Nguyen, H. T., & Tran, Q. H. (2021). Enhancing school performance through organizational learning and leadership. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 22(3), 451–463. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-021-09683-w>
- Nguyen, L. M., Pham, A. D., & Bui, T. H. (2020). Organizational innovation in education: A model for schools in transformation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 40(4), 569–583.
- Nguyen, T. D., & Hwang, Y. S. (2020). From individual learning to shared understanding: Enhancing teachers' interpretive practices. *Educational Practice and Theory*, 42(1), 66–78.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Back to the future of education: Four OECD scenarios for schooling*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/178ef527-en>
- Putra, M. R., & Harahap, Y. S. (2021). The role of collaboration in driving innovation in public schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(16), 88–96.
- Quimson, L. L., Tallungan, J. R. R., & Vadil, C. F. (2025, May 8). *Development and validation of organizational innovation practices questionnaire for Asian academic setting*. Social Science Research Network
- Rahman, M. A., Karim, R., & Islam, M. S. (2020). Digital knowledge sharing platforms in education: Impact on innovation and performance. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 48(3), 289–305.
- Ramos, M. T., Almonte, J. R., & Santos, P. A. (2018). Continuous school improvement: Evaluative practices and leadership roles. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 97(2), 123–138.
- Ritala, P., & Richter, A. (2020). Dynamic capabilities in innovation management: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 24(2), 2050012. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919620500124>
- Salazar, M. G., & Yang, Y. (2022). School innovation and principal leadership: The dynamic capabilities approach. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221121632>
- Singh, A., & Manju, R. (2021). Organizational flexibility and performance: An analysis of public school systems. *Indian Journal of Educational Management*, 25(1), 34–49.
- Sivalingam, P., & Booth, A. (2023). Innovation management in education: Trends and challenges. *Educational Innovation Research Review*, 9(1), 12–29.
- Sutrisno, H., Nugroho, S. E., & Mulyani, S. (2021). Teachers' intuition and decision-making in the face of educational reforms. *Journal of Educational Psychology and Innovation*, 4(2), 112–125.
- Tallungan, J. R. R., Quimson, L. L., & Vadil, C. F. (2025, April 18). *Design, development, and validation of an organizational learning questionnaire for Philippine schools*. Social Science Research Network
- Tan, C. Y., & Ng, P. T. (2019). Creating a culture of innovation in schools: Insights from Singapore. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 18(2), 123–138.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z)
-

[0266\(199708\)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1440/1/012018)

- Vargas-Mendoza, J. E., & Marquez, F. M. (2022). Building learning organizations: The role of leadership and collaboration in educational institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 36(5), 785–800.
- Wahyuni, T. S., & Purwanto, K. K. (2020). Students' conceptual understanding on acid-base titration and its relationship with drawing skills on a titration curve. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1440(1), 012018. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1440/1/012018>
- Wang, C. L., & Ahmed, P. K. (2021). Organizational innovation capability: A review of literature and future research agenda. *Management Decision*, 59(10), 2417–2435.
- Zhou, M., Chen, Y., & Wang, H. (2019). Reinventing curriculum design through innovation: A Chinese school experience. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 51(5), 659–675.