

School Leadership Responsiveness and Organizational Learning Culture in Public Elementary Education

Faith Noel D. Reyes^{1*} and Severino T. Morales Jr.^{1,2}

¹*Northeastern College*

^{*}faithnoel1985@gmail.com, ²severinomoralesjr@northeasterncollege.edu.ph

Date Submitted:
February 24, 2026

Date Accepted:
April 19, 2026

Date Published:
July 16, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.21398874

ABSTRACT

This study investigated how school leadership responsiveness shaped organizational learning culture in public elementary education. A cross-sectional predictive-associational design was employed among public elementary school teachers in the Schools Division of Cauayan City, Isabela. Participants were selected through proportionate stratified random sampling, and data were gathered using a validated researcher-developed questionnaire. The instrument demonstrated strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.92 for school leadership responsiveness, 0.94 for organizational learning culture, and 0.95 for the full scale. Partial least squares structural equation modeling was used to assess the measurement and structural models. Results showed that school

leadership responsiveness was generally evident, particularly in accessibility and attentiveness to concerns, although timeliness of action and adaptive decision-making remained weaker areas. Organizational learning culture was also rated positively, with shared learning goals and collective responsibility receiving the strongest evaluations, while evidence-informed improvement and experimentation received lower ratings. The structural model revealed that school leadership responsiveness significantly predicted organizational learning culture, $\beta = 0.646$, $p < .001$, and explained 41.7% of its variance. The model also demonstrated acceptable reliability, convergent validity, discriminant validity, and predictive relevance. The findings indicate that responsive leadership strengthens collective learning when school leaders move beyond listening toward timely action, flexible decision-making, data use, and support for teacher-led innovation.

Keywords: *adaptive decision-making, organizational learning culture, public elementary education, school leadership responsiveness, teacher collaboration, teacher-led innovation*

INTRODUCTION

Public elementary schools depend on leadership that remains attentive to the everyday realities of learners, teachers, families, and communities. A school head is expected not only to administer programs and comply with policies but also to recognize concerns, make sound decisions, and provide support when conditions within the school change. These responsibilities affect how teachers carry out their work, how school personnel respond to difficulties, and how improvement efforts are sustained. Research on successful school leadership has shown that leaders influence learner outcomes mainly by shaping teachers' working conditions, professional motivation, instructional practices, and opportunities for collaboration. Leadership is therefore closely connected with the quality of the environment in which teaching and organizational learning take place (Leithwood et al., 2020).

Leadership responsiveness may be understood as the ability of school heads to recognize legitimate needs, listen to those affected by school decisions, and take appropriate action within a reasonable period. It is reflected

in the way leaders communicate, adjust plans, distribute resources, resolve emerging concerns, and support personnel who face instructional or organizational difficulties. Responsive leaders do not simply react to problems after they have become serious. They maintain open channels of communication, examine available information, consult relevant stakeholders, and choose actions suited to the circumstances of the school. Studies of principal leadership during periods of disruption have shown that responsiveness involves managerial judgment, communication, emotional awareness, and the ability to maintain school processes while addressing the needs of teachers and learners (Dare & Saleem, 2022).

Such responsiveness is especially important because schools are social organizations where people work through shared routines, relationships, and professional expectations. School policies may establish common directions, but their success often depends on how school heads interpret them, explain them to personnel, and adapt their implementation to actual needs. Teachers are more likely to participate meaningfully when they feel that their concerns are heard and that decisions are supported by clear reasons. Learners and parents are also more likely to trust school processes when communication is respectful, timely, and consistent. The Global Education Monitoring Report identified setting expectations, focusing on learning, fostering collaboration, and developing capacity as central dimensions of effective educational leadership. These dimensions require leaders who are willing to listen, learn, and respond rather than rely solely on authority and administrative control (UNESCO, 2024).

Alongside leadership responsiveness, organizational learning culture describes the shared values, practices, and working relationships that encourage members of a school to learn together. In a strong learning culture, professional learning is not limited to formal training sessions. It is visible when teachers discuss instructional concerns, examine learner evidence, exchange useful practices, reflect on unsuccessful strategies, and develop better responses as a group. Knowledge is not treated as the possession of a few individuals but as a resource that can be discussed, tested, refined, and shared. The school gradually develops a collective capacity to improve because learning becomes part of its regular work rather than a separate activity conducted only when required.

Kools and Stoll (2016) described a school as a learning organization through seven connected dimensions. These include developing a shared vision centered on the learning of all students, providing continuous learning opportunities for staff, promoting team learning, encouraging inquiry and innovation, establishing systems for collecting and exchanging knowledge, learning from the external environment, and developing leadership that models learning. These dimensions show that organizational learning involves more than professional development attendance. It requires structures and relationships that allow school personnel to examine their work honestly and make informed changes. A school may conduct many meetings and training activities without developing a learning culture when teachers have little opportunity to question practices, contribute ideas, or use evidence in collective decisions.

The concept was further examined by Kools et al. (2020), who developed and validated measures for viewing the school as a learning organization. Their work presented organizational learning as a condition that can be observed through staff experiences, school routines, collaborative practices, and leadership behavior. This is important because a learning culture cannot be assessed only through written plans or the number of activities completed. It must also be seen in whether personnel have access to meaningful learning opportunities, whether knowledge is exchanged across the organization, and whether leaders create space for inquiry and professional dialogue. Organizational learning culture is therefore expressed through both formal systems and ordinary interactions among school personnel.

Leadership responsiveness and organizational learning culture are closely connected because leaders influence the conditions under which people are willing and able to learn together. A school head who listens to teachers, responds constructively to instructional concerns, and supports well-considered experimentation signals that professional learning is valued. In contrast, personnel may become reluctant to share difficulties when responses from leadership are delayed, dismissive, inconsistent, or punitive. The quality of leadership response can either strengthen or weaken trust, and trust affects whether teachers speak openly about problems, request

assistance, and participate in collaborative improvement. Evidence from the Teaching and Learning International Survey also showed that teacher collaboration is more common in schools where instructional leadership is strong and where stakeholders are given opportunities to participate in decision-making (OECD, 2016).

Empirical work has also linked the characteristics of a learning organization with favorable staff experiences. Kools et al. (2019) found a positive and significant relationship between schools functioning as learning organizations and both staff job satisfaction and responsiveness to staff needs. This finding suggests that organizational learning is not only concerned with the transfer of knowledge. It is also connected with how personnel experience support, participation, and professional respect within the school. When leadership responses are aligned with staff needs and organizational goals, teachers may be more willing to contribute ideas, learn from colleagues, and assume responsibility for school improvement. When such support is absent, learning activities may be viewed as additional requirements rather than meaningful opportunities for professional growth.

In the Philippine public school system, the professional responsibilities of school heads are formally expressed in the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. The standards identify five domains: leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections. They also emphasize learner-centered leadership, stakeholder relationships, high-quality instruction, a strong school culture, job-embedded professional development, accountability, and inclusivity. These expectations show that the work of a school head extends beyond administrative supervision. It includes creating conditions in which teachers and other personnel can develop their competence, participate in school improvement, and respond collectively to concerns affecting learners (Department of Education, 2020).

The Basic Education Development Plan 2030 also calls for continuing improvement in access, quality, resilience, and education delivery. As a long-term plan, it requires schools to use information, review their practices, address learning needs, and refine programs over time. These demands cannot be met through policy compliance alone. They require school leaders who can translate broad goals into workable school-level actions and organizations that can learn from implementation. A responsive school head may help connect national priorities with the particular needs of teachers, learners, and families, while a strong organizational learning culture may help personnel examine whether planned actions are producing the intended results (Department of Education, 2022).

Although professional standards and development plans provide a clear direction for school leadership, the presence of these policies does not automatically establish responsive practices or a strong learning culture in every school. School heads differ in how they communicate, involve personnel, respond to concerns, and support professional learning. Schools also differ in their routines for reflection, collaboration, knowledge sharing, and the use of evidence. These differences create a need to examine leadership and organizational culture through the experiences of those who take part in the daily work of public elementary education. Understanding how leadership responsiveness is associated with organizational learning culture can provide a grounded basis for leadership development, school improvement planning, and professional learning programs.

This study is intended to examine the responsiveness demonstrated by school leadership and the organizational learning culture experienced within public elementary schools. It seeks to determine whether leadership practices characterized by attentiveness, communication, timely action, participation, and professional support are associated with a culture of shared learning, collaboration, inquiry, knowledge exchange, and continuous improvement. Findings from the study may help clarify how school leaders can respond more effectively to the people they serve while building schools where learning is expected not only from pupils but also from the adults responsible for their education.

Literature Review

Responsive and Learning-Centered School Leadership

Leadership responsiveness becomes meaningful when school heads connect their decisions with the professional and instructional needs of teachers. It requires leaders to remain accessible, recognize problems that affect teaching, provide suitable assistance, and adjust school practices when existing arrangements no longer

serve their purpose. Hallinger and Liu (2016) found that school leadership influenced teacher learning both directly and through school conditions that supported professional growth. Their findings suggest that leadership cannot be separated from the opportunities teachers receive to improve their knowledge and instructional practices. Bellibaş et al. (2020) likewise established that learning-centered leadership supported teacher leadership by strengthening teacher agency. School heads who encouraged professional learning, modeled continuous development, and gave teachers room to exercise judgment helped create conditions where teachers could contribute beyond their classroom duties. These findings clarify that responsive leadership is not limited to answering requests or solving immediate concerns. It also involves understanding teachers' professional needs, removing barriers to their participation, and supporting their capacity to initiate improvements. In public elementary schools, such leadership may be reflected in timely instructional assistance, reasonable resource allocation, open consultation, and decisions that consider the actual conditions faced by teachers and learners.

Relational Trust and Participatory School Governance

The willingness of teachers to express concerns, propose alternatives, and participate in school decisions is shaped by the quality of their relationship with school leadership. Teachers may withhold useful information when they expect their views to be ignored, misunderstood, or used against them. Relational trust therefore supports leadership responsiveness because it allows school heads to receive honest information about instructional concerns and organizational difficulties. Yin and Zheng (2018) found that leadership practices and faculty trust contributed to the development of professional learning communities. Their work indicates that formal opportunities for collaboration may have limited value when trust is weak. Vanblaeire and Devos (2016) also reported that school leadership was associated with teachers' perceptions of professional learning community characteristics, showing that principals influence how shared responsibility, reflective dialogue, and collective learning are experienced within the school. Participation must consequently extend beyond attendance in meetings or compliance with assigned tasks. Teachers need genuine opportunities to explain their concerns, contribute to decisions, and understand how their recommendations were considered. A responsive school leader does not need to approve every suggestion, but should provide clear reasons for decisions and maintain respectful communication. Through such practices, participatory governance can strengthen professional trust and encourage teachers to regard school improvement as a shared responsibility rather than an administrative requirement.

Collaborative Professional Learning and Knowledge Sharing

Organizational learning culture develops when professional knowledge moves across classrooms, grade levels, committees, and leadership groups instead of remaining with individual teachers. Collaboration provides a means for teachers to compare learner difficulties, review assessment evidence, discuss instructional strategies, and refine practices through professional feedback. Vangrieken et al. (2017), in a systematic review of 40 empirical studies, identified supportive leadership, trust, respect, and constructive group dynamics as important conditions for successful teacher communities. Their review also showed that collaboration differs according to how groups are organized, who initiates them, and how much influence teachers have over their goals and activities. Admiraal et al. (2021) examined schools seeking to function as professional learning communities and emphasized that teacher development requires coordinated school-level support rather than isolated training activities. Professional learning becomes more firmly embedded when schools provide time, structures, shared objectives, and opportunities for teachers to examine their own practice. This distinction is important because frequent meetings do not necessarily signify a strong organizational learning culture. Meetings may remain procedural when teachers merely receive instructions or submit reports. Meaningful knowledge sharing occurs when teachers can question existing methods, learn from unsuccessful efforts, and use collective understanding to improve instruction. School leaders play a central role by protecting time for collaboration and ensuring that professional dialogue remains focused, respectful, and useful.

Organizational Learning for School Improvement and Change

A school demonstrates organizational learning when it can identify weaknesses, study their causes, develop appropriate responses, and use the results to guide later decisions. This process involves more than adopting a new program because improvement depends on whether the organization can learn from implementation. Seashore Louis and Lee (2016) found that teachers' capacity for organizational learning was shaped by school culture and working conditions, particularly those that supported shared responsibility, reflective practice, and collective engagement. Their findings underline the value of an environment where teachers can examine established routines without being treated as resistant or incompetent. Meyer et al. (2023) further found that principals could support teacher collaboration and organizational change by establishing clear goals, involving teachers in decision-making, guiding teacher teams, and sustaining their motivation during improvement efforts. The study also showed that change becomes more difficult when leadership lacks direction, communication is unclear, or teachers have little ownership of proposed innovations. Responsive leadership therefore contributes to organizational learning by helping the school interpret problems and act upon evidence rather than merely complete prescribed activities. For public elementary schools, this may include reviewing learner performance, examining implementation difficulties, adapting interventions, and recording lessons that can inform succeeding plans. Through this cycle, organizational experience is converted into knowledge that supports more deliberate and sustainable school improvement.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a cross-sectional predictive-associational design using latent-variable modeling. This design was selected because the inquiry examined whether school leadership responsiveness was associated with and could statistically predict organizational learning culture without manipulating the working conditions of the participants. Data were collected at one point in time, while both variables were treated as multidimensional constructs represented by several observable indicators. Rather than limiting the analysis to a simple correlation between total scores, the design allowed the researcher to assess the quality of the measurement model and estimate the predictive contribution of school leadership responsiveness to organizational learning culture. This approach was appropriate because leadership responsiveness and organizational learning culture could not be measured directly through a single question or indicator.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in selected public elementary schools under the Schools Division of Cauayan City, Isabela. The locale included schools operating under the administrative and instructional policies of the Department of Education. Public elementary schools within the division differed in enrollment size, staffing conditions, available resources, and community characteristics, allowing the study to capture varied experiences of school leadership and organizational learning. Gaggabutan Elementary School served as the institutional base of the researcher, but the gathering of data was not limited to one school. The inclusion of several public elementary schools provided a broader representation of leadership practices and learning conditions within the division.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants were public elementary school teachers who had worked under their current school leadership long enough to observe communication practices, responses to workplace concerns, instructional support, collaborative arrangements, and school-based professional learning. Teachers who were newly assigned, on extended leave, or serving only in temporary or short-term capacities during the collection period were excluded because they might not have had sufficient exposure to the organizational practices being examined. A proportionate stratified random sampling technique was applied. Each participating school was treated as a

sampling stratum, and the allocation of participants was based on the relative number of eligible teachers in each school. Names were selected through a computer-generated random procedure from the official lists supplied by the participating schools. Sample adequacy was checked through an a priori statistical power analysis based on the number of paths entering the dependent construct, the anticipated effect size, and the selected level of statistical significance.

Research Instrument

Data were obtained through a researcher-developed questionnaire composed of two multi-item scales. The first scale measured school leadership responsiveness through indicators concerning accessibility, attentiveness to concerns, timeliness of action, adaptive decision-making, communication of responses, and provision of professional support. The second scale measured organizational learning culture through indicators related to shared learning goals, reflective dialogue, collaborative inquiry, knowledge exchange, evidence-informed improvement, experimentation, and collective responsibility. Responses were recorded using a five-point agreement scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The initial pool of statements was examined by a panel of specialists in educational leadership, research methodology, elementary education, and measurement and evaluation. The experts assessed the clarity, relevance, alignment, and suitability of each statement. Item-level content validity indices ranged from 0.83 to 1.00, while the scale-level content validity index based on average agreement reached 0.94. Statements that received unclear comments or lower ratings were revised, combined, or removed before pilot administration. A language review was also completed to ensure that the wording was understandable to public elementary school teachers and did not contain double-barreled, leading, or unnecessarily technical statements.

The revised questionnaire was pilot-tested among public elementary school teachers from a nearby school division who were not included in the main investigation. The pilot administration examined the clarity of directions, average completion time, item response variation, and internal consistency of the scales. The school leadership responsiveness scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.92, while the organizational learning culture scale produced an alpha coefficient of 0.94. The complete instrument yielded an overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.95. These coefficients indicated strong internal consistency. Corrected item-total correlations were also inspected, and all retained items exceeded the acceptable minimum criterion. The finalized questionnaire was prepared after the comments of the pilot participants and the statistical results had been reviewed.

Data Gathering

Permission to conduct the study was secured from the appropriate officials of the Schools Division of Cauayan City and from the school heads of the identified public elementary schools. After approval had been obtained, the researcher coordinated with designated school personnel regarding the distribution schedule and the availability of eligible participants. The purpose of the research, the voluntary nature of participation, the expected completion time, and the procedures for protecting the participants' responses were explained before the questionnaires were released.

The survey forms were distributed either in printed format or through a restricted electronic form, depending on the arrangement approved by each school. Participants completed the questionnaire individually and were instructed not to place their names, employee numbers, or other direct identifiers on the instrument. Printed questionnaires were returned in sealed envelopes, while electronic responses were collected through an account accessible only to the researcher. Follow-up communication was limited to general reminders and did not identify teachers who had or had not responded. Completed forms were checked for missing sections, uniform response patterns, and evident response irregularities before the data were encoded. The dataset was then reviewed against the original questionnaires to reduce encoding errors.

Data Analysis

The analysis was carried out through partial least squares structural equation modeling because the study aimed to examine prediction while accounting for measurement error in the two constructs. Before model estimation, the dataset was screened for incomplete responses, out-of-range entries, extreme observations, and suspiciously repetitive answer patterns. Missing values were examined according to their frequency and distribution. Cases with substantial missing information were excluded, while isolated missing responses were handled using an appropriate imputation procedure when the pattern was considered random.

The measurement model was assessed before testing the structural relationship. Indicator reliability was examined through outer loadings. Internal consistency was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, rho_A, and composite reliability. Convergent validity was determined through the average variance extracted, while discriminant validity was checked using the heterotrait-monotrait ratio. Collinearity was assessed through variance inflation factors to confirm that the estimated paths were not distorted by overlapping indicators. Indicators that performed weakly were reviewed carefully and were not automatically removed unless their exclusion improved construct validity without weakening the conceptual coverage of the scale.

After the measurement requirements had been satisfied, the structural model was examined. The standardized path coefficient from school leadership responsiveness to organizational learning culture was estimated to determine the direction and strength of the predictive relationship. Statistical significance was tested through bias-corrected bootstrapping with 10,000 resamples and a significance level of 0.05. The coefficient of determination was used to establish the proportion of variance in organizational learning culture explained by school leadership responsiveness. Effect size was examined through f^2 , while predictive relevance was assessed through the Stone-Geisser Q^2 value generated through blindfolding. The model's out-of-sample predictive capacity was further checked through PLSpredict. Descriptive statistics, including the mean, standard deviation, median, and interquartile range, were also reported to describe the distribution of responses for each study dimension.

Ethical Consideration

The study followed the ethical principles of voluntary participation, informed consent, privacy, confidentiality, and responsible data management. Participants received an informed consent statement that explained the purpose of the research, the procedures involved, the expected use of the findings, and their right to decline or discontinue participation without penalty. Participation was not connected with performance appraisal, promotion, teaching assignment, or any administrative decision. No school head was allowed to require teachers to participate or to inspect their individual answers.

The questionnaire did not request names or other direct personal identifiers. Codes were assigned only for data organization and could not be traced to individual participants. Electronic files were stored in a password-protected device, while printed materials were kept in a secured cabinet accessible only to the researcher. Results were presented in aggregate form to prevent the identification of any teacher or participating school. The collected information was used solely for the stated research purpose and was retained only for the period required by the institution or target journal. Any records scheduled for disposal were securely deleted or physically destroyed. The researcher also disclosed the institutional affiliation and took measures to prevent positional authority from influencing participation, responses, data interpretation, or the reporting of findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Level of School Leadership Responsiveness

Dimension	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation	Rank
Accessibility	3.78	0.67	Agree	1
Attentiveness to concerns	3.71	0.70	Agree	2
Communication of responses	3.62	0.71	Agree	3
Provision of professional support	3.55	0.74	Agree	4
Adaptive decision-making	3.39	0.73	Moderately Agree	5
Timeliness of action	3.36	0.76	Moderately Agree	6
Overall	3.57	0.62	Agree	

Scale: 4.21 to 5.00, Strongly Agree; 3.41 to 4.20, Agree; 2.61 to 3.40, Moderately Agree; 1.81 to 2.60, Disagree; 1.00 to 1.80, Strongly Disagree.

Table 1 shows that school leadership responsiveness obtained an overall mean of 3.57 and a standard deviation of 0.62, interpreted as Agree. The result indicates that teachers generally experienced their school leaders as responsive, although the pattern was not uniformly strong across all dimensions. Accessibility received the highest mean of 3.78, followed by attentiveness to concerns with a mean of 3.71. These findings suggest that teachers were generally able to approach their school leaders and communicate matters requiring administrative or instructional attention. Communication of responses obtained a mean of 3.62, while the provision of professional support received a mean of 3.55. Although both were rated Agree, their lower placement compared with accessibility and attentiveness suggests that being available to teachers did not always result in equally strong follow-through or sustained professional assistance. School leaders appeared willing to receive concerns, but the support provided after these concerns had been raised varied according to the issue and the available school resources.

The most evident concerns appeared in adaptive decision-making and timeliness of action, which received means of 3.39 and 3.36, respectively. Both were interpreted as Moderately Agree. This pattern suggests that some teachers experienced delays before concerns were acted upon or found that existing procedures were not readily adjusted when school conditions changed. The finding points to a gap between leaders' openness to concerns and their capacity to deliver timely, flexible, and visible responses. This result carries practical significance because leadership responsiveness requires more than approachability. Teachers may initially feel heard, but their confidence can weaken when action is delayed or when decisions remain unchanged despite evidence that an adjustment is needed. Reinius et al. (2024) found that teachers' willingness to contribute to school development was influenced by the organizational support they received and by whether school structures provided genuine opportunities for participation. Their work also showed that teachers required different forms of support, including protected collaborative time and adjustments to organizational arrangements. The present result supports the view that responsiveness must be completed through appropriate action rather than ending with consultation.

Table 2. Level of Organizational Learning Culture

Dimension	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation	Rank
Shared learning goals	3.69	0.65	Agree	1
Collective responsibility	3.58	0.68	Agree	2
Collaborative inquiry	3.53	0.70	Agree	3
Reflective dialogue	3.47	0.72	Agree	4
Knowledge exchange	3.45	0.74	Agree	5
Evidence-informed improvement	3.31	0.78	Moderately Agree	6
Experimentation and innovation	3.18	0.81	Moderately Agree	7
Overall	3.46	0.64	Agree	

Table 2 indicates that organizational learning culture obtained an overall mean of 3.46 and a standard deviation of 0.64, interpreted as Agree. The result suggests that the participating public elementary schools possessed several characteristics of learning-oriented organizations, but some practices had not yet become stable parts of daily school operations.

Shared learning goals received the highest mean of 3.69. This indicates that teachers generally understood the learning priorities pursued by their schools. Collective responsibility followed with a mean of 3.58, suggesting that teachers commonly viewed learner development and school improvement as responsibilities shared among personnel rather than duties assigned solely to school leaders or individual classroom teachers.

Collaborative inquiry, reflective dialogue, and knowledge exchange were all rated Agree, although their means ranged only from 3.45 to 3.53. These findings indicate that teachers discussed instructional matters and shared professional knowledge, but the frequency and depth of these activities may have differed across schools. Collaboration may have been present through meetings, learning action cells, grade-level planning, and informal consultations, yet not all collaborative activities necessarily involved a careful review of practice or evidence.

Nguyen et al. (2021) found that a collaborative school culture encouraged teachers' participation in integrated professional learning and contributed to collective innovativeness. Their analysis across 48 countries showed that collaboration was especially valuable when teachers were given professional autonomy and were able to connect formal development activities with workplace learning. The present findings generally agree with this conclusion, although the moderate level of experimentation suggests that collaboration did not always progress toward the testing of new practices.

Evidence-informed improvement obtained a mean of 3.31, while experimentation and innovation received the lowest mean of 3.18. Both were interpreted as Moderately Agree. These results reveal the central organizational problem identified by the study. Schools appeared to have shared goals and collaborative relationships, but they were less consistent in using learner evidence to revise programs and in creating conditions where teachers could test new approaches without fear of criticism or failure.

The low result for evidence-informed improvement may indicate that assessment results, intervention records, attendance data, and classroom observations were collected but were not always examined deeply enough to influence succeeding decisions. Data may have been used for reporting and compliance more often than for diagnosing causes, evaluating strategies, or revising school routines. Van den Boom-Muilenburg et al. (2023) found that sustaining data-use professional learning communities was difficult because their core practices had to be incorporated into ordinary organizational routines. They also found that sustainability depended on the combined work of formal and informal leaders who organized meetings, participated actively, and maintained attention to both the process and substance of collaborative data use.

The low rating for experimentation and innovation further indicates that teachers may have had limited time, resources, autonomy, or administrative assurance for trying unfamiliar strategies. A school may value improvement in principle while still relying heavily on established practices. This condition can restrict organizational learning because new knowledge is developed not only through discussion but also through carefully planned trials, feedback, and revision. The finding suggests that public elementary schools need clearer processes for small-scale experimentation, documentation of lessons learned, and recognition of professionally justified innovations.

Table 3. *Outer Loadings of the Measurement Indicators*

Construct and indicator	Outer Loading	Indicator Reliability	Decision
School Leadership Responsiveness			
Accessibility	0.82	0.672	Retained
Attentiveness to concerns	0.86	0.740	Retained
Timeliness of action	0.74	0.548	Retained
Adaptive decision-making	0.77	0.593	Retained
Communication of responses	0.83	0.689	Retained

Construct and indicator	Outer Loading	Indicator Reliability	Decision
Provision of professional support	0.85	0.723	Retained
Organizational Learning Culture			
Shared learning goals	0.81	0.656	Retained
Reflective dialogue	0.79	0.624	Retained
Collaborative inquiry	0.84	0.706	Retained
Knowledge exchange	0.78	0.608	Retained
Evidence-informed improvement	0.73	0.533	Retained
Experimentation and innovation	0.71	0.504	Retained
Collective responsibility	0.86	0.740	Retained

The outer loadings ranged from 0.71 to 0.86. All indicators met the minimum loading requirement and were retained in the model. Attentiveness to concerns had the highest loading for school leadership responsiveness at 0.86, while collective responsibility had the highest loading for organizational learning culture, also at 0.86. These results show that the indicators represented their assigned constructs adequately.

Timeliness of action and experimentation and innovation produced the lowest loadings within their respective constructs. Their loadings remained acceptable, but their weaker values corresponded with the descriptive findings. The two indicators represented genuine parts of the constructs, although teachers' experiences in these areas were more varied than their experiences with accessibility, shared goals, and collective responsibility.

Table 4. *Construct Reliability and Convergent Validity*

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted	Decision
School leadership responsiveness	0.897	0.905	0.921	0.661	Reliable and valid
Organizational learning culture	0.899	0.907	0.921	0.624	Reliable and valid

Both constructs demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha values were 0.897 for school leadership responsiveness and 0.899 for organizational learning culture. The rho_A and composite reliability coefficients also exceeded 0.70. These results indicate that the indicators within each construct measured a sufficiently consistent underlying concept.

The average variance extracted values were 0.661 for school leadership responsiveness and 0.624 for organizational learning culture. Each construct therefore explained more than half of the variance in its indicators. The findings established convergent validity and supported the use of the measurement model in the structural analysis. Hair and Alamer (2022) explained that PLS-SEM evaluation should establish indicator reliability, internal consistency, and convergent validity before conclusions are drawn from the relationships among latent constructs.

Table 5. *Discriminant Validity and Collinearity Assessment*

Criterion	School Leadership Responsiveness	Organizational Learning Culture
School leadership responsiveness	0.813	
Organizational learning culture	0.646	0.790
HTMT ratio		0.793
Structural VIF		1.000

Note. Bold diagonal values are the square roots of the average variance extracted.

The square root of the average variance extracted for school leadership responsiveness was 0.813, while the corresponding value for organizational learning culture was 0.790. Both diagonal values were greater than the correlation between the two constructs, which was 0.646. The heterotrait-monotrait ratio was 0.793, indicating that the constructs remained empirically distinct despite their meaningful association.

The structural variance inflation factor was 1.000 because the model contained one principal predictor. The result indicated that collinearity did not affect the estimation of the structural path. School leadership responsiveness and organizational learning culture were therefore related but were not interchangeable concepts. Leadership responsiveness referred to how school leaders attended and reacted to organizational needs, while organizational learning culture described the broader patterns through which school personnel learned, shared knowledge, and improved practices.

Table 6. *Predictive Effect of School Leadership Responsiveness on Organizational Learning Culture*

Structural path	β	Standard Error	t-value	p-value	95% Confidence Interval	Decision
School leadership responsiveness → Organizational learning culture	0.646	0.045	14.36	< .001	[0.555, 0.728]	Significant
Structural model criterion	Result	Interpretation				
R ²	0.417	Moderate explanatory power				
Adjusted R ²	0.413	Moderate explanatory power				
f ²	0.715	Large effect				
Q ²	0.251	Predictive relevance established				
SRMR	0.061	Acceptable model discrepancy				

The structural model revealed that school leadership responsiveness had a significant positive effect on organizational learning culture, $\beta = 0.646$, $t = 14.36$, $p < .001$. The bias-corrected confidence interval ranged from 0.555 to 0.728 and did not include zero. The result supported the proposed relationship between the constructs.

The positive coefficient means that stronger leadership responsiveness was associated with a stronger organizational learning culture. Schools where leaders were more accessible, attentive, communicative, supportive, timely, and adaptive tended to report better shared learning goals, reflective conversations, knowledge exchange, collaborative inquiry, collective responsibility, evidence use, and experimentation.

School leadership responsiveness explained 41.7 percent of the variance in organizational learning culture. The remaining 58.3 percent was associated with factors not included in the model. These may include teacher trust, workload, professional autonomy, staffing stability, time for collaboration, material resources, institutional policies, and prior experiences with school improvement. Thus, leadership responsiveness was a substantial predictor, but it was not the only condition shaping organizational learning.

The effect size of 0.715 showed that removing school leadership responsiveness from the model would substantially reduce its ability to explain organizational learning culture. This was the strongest statistical result of the study. It establishes that the manner in which school leaders respond to teachers and organizational concerns was not a minor administrative matter. It was closely connected with the school's capacity to learn collectively.

The finding agrees with García Torres (2019), who established positive relationships among distributed leadership, professional collaboration, and teachers' work experiences. Her findings showed that leadership practices and professional collaboration were mutually connected and that teacher participation in leadership processes contributed to stronger school working conditions. The present study extends this reasoning by showing that responsive leadership was associated with a broader culture of shared learning and organizational improvement.

The strength of the relationship should not be interpreted as proof that leadership responsiveness alone caused organizational learning culture. The cross-sectional design measured the variables during the same period

and did not establish temporal order. It is also possible that schools with stronger learning cultures encouraged school leaders to become more attentive and participatory. The result nevertheless provides strong predictive evidence that leadership responsiveness is a central condition associated with organizational learning in public elementary schools.

The structural finding becomes more meaningful when considered beside the descriptive results. Leadership responsiveness had a strong overall effect, but its weakest areas were timeliness and adaptive decision-making. Organizational learning culture was rated positively overall, but evidence use and experimentation remained underdeveloped. Together, these findings suggest that the positive relationship may become stronger when leaders move beyond listening and communication toward faster action, flexible decision-making, protected experimentation, and systematic use of school evidence.

Table 7. *PLSpredict Results for Organizational Learning Culture*

Target indicator	Q ² predict	PLS-SEM RMSE	Linear Model RMSE	Lower Prediction Error
Shared learning goals	0.286	0.589	0.603	PLS-SEM
Reflective dialogue	0.241	0.648	0.662	PLS-SEM
Collaborative inquiry	0.267	0.620	0.635	PLS-SEM
Knowledge exchange	0.205	0.671	0.682	PLS-SEM
Evidence-informed improvement	0.146	0.724	0.719	Linear model
Experimentation and innovation	0.118	0.763	0.754	Linear model
Collective responsibility	0.274	0.612	0.626	PLS-SEM

All Q²predict values were greater than zero, ranging from 0.118 to 0.286. The results indicate that the PLS-SEM model predicted each indicator of organizational learning culture more accurately than a basic mean-value benchmark. The model therefore possessed out-of-sample predictive relevance.

The PLS-SEM model produced lower root mean square error values than the linear model for five of the seven indicators. These included shared learning goals, reflective dialogue, collaborative inquiry, knowledge exchange, and collective responsibility. The linear model performed slightly better for evidence-informed improvement and experimentation and innovation. Based on the overall pattern, the model demonstrated medium out-of-sample predictive power.

The weaker prediction of evidence-informed improvement and experimentation was consistent with their lower descriptive means and outer loadings. These practices may have depended on conditions beyond leadership responsiveness, such as access to reliable data, teacher research competence, technological support, available time, resource sufficiency, and tolerance for unsuccessful trials. Leadership responsiveness contributed to these areas, but it did not fully account for their development.

Shmueli et al. (2019) explained that a model should not be judged solely by the amount of variance it explains within the collected sample. Its ability to predict observations outside the estimation sample must also be examined. The PLSpredict findings provide added support for the model because leadership responsiveness predicted most organizational learning indicators more effectively than the comparison model.

CONCLUSION

School leadership responsiveness was a significant and substantial predictor of organizational learning culture in public elementary education. Teachers generally viewed their school leaders as accessible, attentive, communicative, and supportive, although delays in action and limited flexibility in decision-making remained evident. Organizational learning culture was also present, particularly through shared goals, collective responsibility, and collaborative inquiry, but evidence-informed improvement and experimentation were less

consistently practiced. These findings indicate that schools learn more effectively when leaders respond not only by listening to concerns but also by acting promptly, adjusting decisions when necessary, and creating opportunities for teachers to test, evaluate, and refine instructional practices. It is therefore recommended that school leaders establish clear response-monitoring systems, provide regular feedback on concerns raised by teachers, strengthen school-based data analysis, protect time for professional collaboration, and support small-scale teacher-led innovations. Leadership development programs should also include training in adaptive decision-making, evidence use, collaborative problem-solving, and organizational learning. Future studies may examine additional factors such as trust, teacher autonomy, workload, resource availability, and professional learning structures to provide a broader explanation of how organizational learning culture develops in public elementary schools.

References

- Admiraal, W., Schenke, W., De Jong, L., Emmelot, Y., & Sligte, H. (2021). Schools as professional learning communities: What can schools do to support professional development of their teachers? *Professional Development in Education*, 47(4), 684–698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2019.1665573>
- Bellibaş, M. Ş., Gümüş, S., & Kılınç, A. Ç. (2020). Principals supporting teacher leadership: The effects of learning-centred leadership on teacher leadership practices with the mediating role of teacher agency. *European Journal of Education*, 55(2), 200–216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12387>
- Dare, P. S., & Saleem, A. (2022). Principal leadership role in response to the pandemic impact on school process. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 943442. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.943442>
- Department of Education. (2020, September 7). *National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads* (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/09/07/september-7-2020-do-024-s-2020-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-school-heads/>
- Department of Education. (2022, May 30). *Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030* (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2022). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2022/05/30/may-30-2022-do-024-s-2022-adoption-of-the-basic-education-development-plan-2030/>
- García Torres, D. (2019). Distributed leadership, professional collaboration, and teachers' job satisfaction in U.S. schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 79, 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.12.001>
- Hair, J., & Alamer, A. (2022). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) in second language and education research: Guidelines using an applied example. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 1(3), Article 100027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2022.100027>
- Hallinger, P., & Liu, S. (2016). Leadership and teacher learning in urban and rural schools in China: Meeting the dual challenges of equity and effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 51, 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2016.10.001>
- Kools, M., Gouëdard, P., George, B., Steijn, B., Bekkers, V., & Stoll, L. (2019). The relationship between the school as a learning organisation and staff outcomes: A case study of Wales. *European Journal of Education*, 54(3), 426–442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12355>
- Kools, M., & Stoll, L. (2016). *What makes a school a learning organisation?* (OECD Education Working Papers No. 137). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jlwm62b3bvh-en>
- Kools, M., Stoll, L., George, B., Steijn, B., Bekkers, V., & Gouëdard, P. (2020). The school as a learning organisation: The concept and its measurement. *European Journal of Education*, 55(1), 24–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12383>
- 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>
- Meyer, A., Hartung-Beck, V., Gronostaj, A., Krüger, S., & Richter, D. (2023). How can principal leadership practices promote teacher collaboration and organizational change? A longitudinal multiple case study of three school improvement initiatives. *Journal of Educational Change*, 24(3), 425–455. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-022-09451-9>
- Nguyen, D., Pietsch, M., & Gümüş, S. (2021). Collective teacher innovativeness in 48 countries: Effects of teacher autonomy, collaborative culture, and professional learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 106, Article 103463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103463>

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2016). *School leadership for learning: Insights from TALIS 2013*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264258341-en>
- Reinius, H., Hakkarainen, K., Juuti, K., & Korhonen, T. (2024). Teachers' perceived opportunity to contribute to school culture transformation. *Journal of Educational Change*, 25(2), 369–391. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-023-09496-4>
- Seashore Louis, K., & Lee, M. (2016). Teachers' capacity for organizational learning: The effects of school culture and context. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 27(4), 534–556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2016.1189437>
- Shmueli, G., Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J.-H., Ting, H., Vaithilingam, S., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). Predictive model assessment in PLS-SEM: Guidelines for using PLSpredict. *European Journal of Marketing*, 53(11), 2322–2347. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0189>
- UNESCO. (2024). *Global education monitoring report 2024/5: Leadership in education: Lead for learning*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391406>
- Vanblaere, B., & Devos, G. (2016). Relating school leadership to perceived professional learning community characteristics: A multilevel analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 57, 26–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.03.003>
- van den Boom-Muilenburg, S. N., Poortman, C. L., Schildkamp, K., de Vries, S., & van Veen, K. (2023). Sustaining data use professional learning communities in schools: The role of leadership practices. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 78, Article 101273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2023.101273>
- Vangrieken, K., Meredith, C., Packer, T., & Kyndt, E. (2017). Teacher communities as a context for professional development: A systematic review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 61, 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.10.001>
- Yin, H., & Zheng, X. (2018). Facilitating professional learning communities in China: Do leadership practices and faculty trust matter? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 76, 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.09.002>