

Adaptive School Mechanisms on Teachers' Career Resilience and Schools' Organizational Learning for Sustainable School Growth

Basilisa I. Alimagno

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: lisa_jai@yahoo.com

Abstract—The primary aim of this study is to determine the influence of adaptive school mechanisms on teacher's career resilience and schools' organizational learning for sustainable school growth. It evaluates the following research problems: the level of adaptive school mechanism, respondent's assessment on the teacher's career resilience and school organizational learning. Also, the relationship between adaptive school mechanism on teacher's career resilience and schools' organizational learning. The researcher used descriptive research design. This study targeted secondary school teachers as the primary respondents. Based on the roster provided by the Department of Education (DepEd) Division of Laguna Fourteen (14) secondary, categorized as small schools. One hundred eleven (111) teacher respondents were randomly selected. The following were the significant findings of the investigation: The findings showed that the level of adaptive school mechanism experienced by teachers was acceptable. And the level respondent's assessment on the school organizational learning was extremely observable. Furthermore, relationship between adaptive school mechanism and teacher's career resilience was not significant. Lastly, relationship between adaptive school mechanism with schools' organizational learning was significant. On the basis of the foregoing findings, the following conclusion was drawn. As finding indicate no relationship between adaptive school mechanisms and teacher career resilience, the first hypothesis is accepted. The researcher however concludes that a significant relationship between adaptive school mechanisms and school organizational learning was found, leading to the rejection of the second hypothesis. Based on the drawn conclusions resulted to the following recommendations. Teachers should actively engage in professional development programs and collaborative learning communities to continuously enhance their instructional practices and adaptability to changing educational demands. Also, schools should strengthen organizational learning mechanisms by integrating reflective practices, technology-driven teaching strategies, and collaborative professional development opportunities to foster a culture of continuous improvement.

Keywords— Adaptive school, teachers' resilience, organizational learning, leadership, teaching practices.

I. INTRODUCTION

Chen and Lee (2023) stated that the educational landscape is constantly changing, driven by the need to satisfy the requirements of diverse student populations, technological advancements, and increasing societal demands. In this context, adaptable school procedures are crucial for building teacher career resilience and improving organizational learning in schools. Teacher career resilience is critical for maintaining a stable and successful teaching staff. Resilient

teachers are better prepared to deal with the challenges and strains of their profession, which leads to increased job satisfaction and retention rates. Organizational learning, on the other hand, refers to a school's ability to continuously learn, adapt, and improve its processes.

This capacity is essential for schools' continued relevance and effectiveness in fulfilling the needs of their students and communities. Teacher career resilience refers to educators' ability to overcome challenges, adapt to change, and maintain their effectiveness and enthusiasm throughout their careers. This resilience is especially important in an environment where instructors face increasing demands and pressures, such as new curricula, high-stakes testing, and shifting student needs. Teachers who are resilient are more likely to persevere in their professions, remain engaged, and contribute positively to their schools. Adaptive mechanisms promote resilience by providing instructors with the tools, support, and opportunities they need to thrive in a dynamic educational environment. Grounded in sustainability concepts, sustainable learning and education (SLE) represents a novel paradigm for learning and teaching. Sustainable learning, a cutting-edge idea, is not always the same as sustainability education.

The goal of SLE is to develop and promote sustainable approaches to education and instruction. These are meant to give people the skills and mindset they need to succeed in a complicated, demanding, and constantly changing environment while making a constructive contribution to society. By clarifying the concept and goal of SLE, providing a list of sustainability principles that may be used in educational and professional development settings, and recommending an SLE curriculum that is organized as a university course or professional development program, this article adds to the body of knowledge. The authors emphasize the importance of systems, ecological thinking, and self-sufficiency as both a means and an end to sustainable learning and education (Hays and Reinders).

The present study examines the impact of adaptive school mechanisms on teachers' career resilience and the organizational learning of schools for sustainable growth.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Specifically, this study sought to address the following questions:

1. What is the level of adaptive school mechanisms that teachers experience regarding:

1.1 Supportive Leadership and Governance

1.2 Professional Development and Opportunities

1.3 Collaborative Culture

1.4 Data Driven Decision Making

1.5 Resource Allocation, and

1.6 Community Engagement?

2. What is the level of the respondents' assessment of the teachers' career resilience, particularly in terms of:

2.1 Social Competence

2.2 Emotional Competence

2.3 Physical Competence

2.4 Psychological Competence and

2.5 Intellectual Competence?

3. What is the level of respondents' assessment on the school organizational learning in terms of:

3.1 Teacher-Student Relationship

3.2 Classroom Management

3.3 Social Learning

3.4 Emotional Learning

3.5 Professional Development and Collaboration

3.6, Reflective Practices and Feedback, and

3.7 Technology Integration?

4. Is there a significant relationship between adaptive school mechanism and teacher's career resilience?

5. Does the adaptive school mechanisms significantly relate to the teacher's career resilience and schools' organizational learning for sustainable school growth.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive research design to examine the adaptive school mechanisms on teachers' career resilience and schools' organizational learning for sustainable school growth. The study aimed to collect numerical data from a large sample of teachers and school administrators to measure the relationships between the variables: adaptive school mechanisms, teacher career resilience, and organizational learning.

Quantitative research is well-suited for this study as it allows for the use of statistical methods to assess the strength and direction of relationships between variables, providing objective and generalizable findings (Creswell, 2018). Through structured surveys and questionnaires, the study quantified the extent to which specific adaptive mechanisms such as organizational structure, duty structure, authority structure, production structure, aggregation structure, role structure and culture structure contribute to teacher resilience and organizational learning outcomes.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter enumerates the different results and discusses the results yielded from treating the data gathered in this study.

Level of Adaptive School Mechanism

Table 1 shows the level of adaptive school mechanisms experienced by teachers regarding Supportive Leadership and Governance. It includes the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

The highest mean score ($M = 6.61$, $SD = 0.57$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school head acknowledges and celebrates the achievements of staff and students, promoting a positive culture. This suggests that schools prioritize recognition and appreciation, reinforcing motivation and professional growth among teachers.

On the other hand, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.34$, $SD = 0.69$) pertains to the school head's ability to establish a clear and inspiring vision for the organization. While still rated as "Very Great Extent," this may indicate that some teachers perceive gaps in the clarity or implementation of the school's mission and vision in guiding decision-making. The level of adaptive school mechanisms in Supportive Leadership and Governance attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.43$ ($SD = 0.53$), verbally interpreted as Highly Acceptable.

This means that the school effectively fosters strong leadership and governance by maintaining open communication, promoting teamwork, and ensuring that teachers feel valued and supported. These leadership strategies contribute to a school environment that enhances adaptability and resilience among educators.

TABLE 1. Level of Adaptive School Mechanism Experienced by Teachers, With Respect to Supportive Leadership and Governance

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
The school head establishes a clear, inspiring vision for the organization that aligns with its mission and values, guiding decision-making and actions.	6.34	.69	Very Great Extent
The school head promotes teamwork and collective problem-solving to leverage diverse skills and ideas.	6.35	.61	Very Great Extent
The school head maintains clear, open lines of communication, sharing relevant information and updates with all stakeholders.	6.44	.62	Very Great Extent
The school head actively listens to concerns, feedback, and suggestions from staff and community members, fostering an environment of trust.	6.41	.66	Very Great Extent
The school head acknowledges and celebrates the achievements of staff and students, promoting a positive culture.	6.61	.57	Very Great Extent
Weighted Mean	6.43		
SD	0.53		
Verbal Interpretation	Highly Acceptable		

Governance structure requirements allocate rights and obligations among various participants in an organization and ensure that decision-making follows rules and processes. A governance framework should be capable of describing transparency and an efficient market while being consistent with laws and regulations. It should also have a clear meaning in the division of duty between differences in monitoring, regulation, and authority enforcement. It is anticipated that governance work should be protected to facilitate control over owners' rights.

Table 2 illustrates the level of adaptive school mechanisms experienced by teachers regarding Professional Development and Opportunities.

TABLE 2. Level of Adaptive School Mechanism Experienced by Teachers, With Respect to Professional Development and Opportunities

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
The school head employs current research and best practices, ensuring educators receive the most relevant and effective training.	6.33	.678	Very Great Extent
The school head viewed a lifelong process rather than a one-time event, with ongoing opportunities for learning and growth.	6.45	.62	Very Great Extent
The school head continuously supports and provides coaching, mentoring, and follow-up sessions to reinforce learning and encourage application in practice.	6.51	.65	Very Great Extent
The school head establishes networks where educators can engage in collective inquiry, problem-solving, and sharing best practices.	6.40	.60	Very Great Extent
The school head incorporates various formats such as workshops, seminars, online courses, webinars, conferences, and peer observations to cater to different learning styles.	6.40	.65	Very Great Extent
Weighted Mean SD Verbal Interpretation	6.42 0.53 Highly Acceptable		

The highest mean score ($M = 6.51$, $SD = 0.65$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school head continuously supports and provides coaching, mentoring, and follow-up sessions to reinforce learning and encourage practical application. This suggests that schools prioritize sustained professional development, ensuring that teachers receive continuous guidance and opportunities for improvement.

On the other hand, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.33$, $SD = 0.67$) is associated with the school head's employment of current research and best practices in training programs. While still rated as "Very Great Extent," this may indicate that some teachers perceive gaps in the integration of up-to-date research and methodologies in professional development initiatives.

The level of adaptive school mechanisms in Professional Development and Opportunities attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.42$ ($SD = 0.53$), verbally interpreted as Highly Acceptable.

This means that the school effectively fosters continuous learning and professional growth by providing diverse training formats, encouraging collaboration among educators, and ensuring ongoing mentoring and support. These professional development strategies enhance teachers' skills, adaptability, and effectiveness.

The author identified several instructional leadership practices associated with improved student outcomes, such as setting goals and expectations, providing intellectual stimulation, and providing individualized support. He discovered that effective instructional leadership practices included promoting a clear and shared vision, providing support and resources, and monitoring and evaluating teacher performance.

Table 3 presents the extent of adaptive school mechanisms experienced by teachers regarding Collaborative Culture.

TABLE 3. Level of Adaptive School Mechanism Experienced by Teachers with Respect to Collaborative Culture

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
The school head clearly understands the school's mission, vision, and goals, aligning their efforts toward achieving them.	6.66	.49	Very Great Extent
The school head provides and receives feedback constructively, focusing on growth and improvement.	6.61	.59	Very Great Extent
The school head has a regular assessment of collaborative practices to help refine and enhance the effectiveness of teamwork within the school.	6.25	.71	Very Great Extent
The school head identifies challenges and develops solutions, pooling their expertise and resources to address issues effectively.	6.50	.60	Very Great Extent
The school encourages creativity and innovation in tackling problems, allowing for experimentation and risk-taking.	6.38	.70	Very Great Extent
Weighted Mean SD Verbal Interpretation	6.49 0.49 Highly Acceptable		

The highest mean score ($M = 6.66$, $SD = 0.49$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school head effectively shares a clear understanding of the school's mission, vision, and goals, aligning their efforts toward achieving them. This suggests that school leadership successfully establishes a shared sense of purpose among educators, fostering a unified direction for school improvement.

Conversely, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.25$, $SD = 0.71$) is associated with regularly assessing collaborative practices to refine and enhance teamwork effectiveness. While still rated as "Very Great Extent," this may suggest that some teachers perceive a need for more frequent or structured evaluations of collaborative efforts to ensure their continuous improvement. The overall level of adaptive school mechanisms in Collaborative Culture attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.49$ ($SD = 0.49$), verbally interpreted as Highly Acceptable.

This means that the school effectively promotes a collaborative culture by fostering teamwork, constructive feedback, problem-solving, and innovation. However, ensuring regular assessment of collaborative practices may further strengthen teamwork and shared decision-making.

Table 4 presents the level of adaptive school mechanisms experienced by teachers with respect to Data-Driven Decision-Making.

The highest mean score ($M = 6.48$, $SD = 0.61$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school head prioritizes student learning and achievement, using data to inform practices that enhance educational outcomes. This shows that data-driven strategies are effectively implemented to improve instructional practices and student success.

On the other hand, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.30$, $SD = 0.65$) is associated with collaboration among teams to analyze data, share insights, and collectively make decisions. While still rated as "Very Great Extent," this may indicate that some teachers see opportunities for stronger teamwork in data

analysis and decision-making processes. The overall level of adaptive school mechanisms in Data-Driven Decision-Making attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.40$ ($SD = 0.55$), verbally interpreted as Highly Acceptable.

TABLE 4. Level of Adaptive School Mechanism Experienced by Teachers, With Respect to Data Driven Decision Making

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
The school head prioritizes student learning and achievement, using data to inform practices that enhance educational outcomes.	6.48	.61	Very Great Extent
The school head used to identify individual student needs, allowing for differentiated instruction and targeted interventions.	6.40	.63	Very Great Extent
The school head shares data and insights with stakeholders to ensure that everyone is informed and engaged in the decision-making process.	6.42	.65	Very Great Extent
The school head maintains transparent communication about data findings and decisions fosters trust and collaboration among staff.	6.38	.71	Very Great Extent
The school head collaborate with the teams and analyze data together, share insights, and collectively make decisions based on their findings	6.30	.65	Very Great Extent
Weighted Mean SD Verbal Interpretation	6.40 0.55 Highly Acceptable		

This means that the school effectively utilizes data to guide instructional decisions, communicate findings transparently, and prioritize student achievement. Strengthening collaborative data analysis among educators may further enhance the efficiency and inclusivity of data-driven practices.

Level of Adaptive School Mechanism Experienced by Teachers with Respect to Resource Allocation

Table 5 shows the level of adaptive school mechanisms experienced by teachers concerning Resource Allocation.

The highest mean score ($M = 6.90$, $SD = 0.44$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school head ensures that decisions are made with a clear understanding of how resources will impact student achievement and organizational effectiveness. This means that school leaders prioritize resource distribution based on its direct influence on student learning and institutional success.

The lowest mean score ($M = 6.6698$, $SD = 0.45800$) is associated with regular data reviews to identify areas where resources can be reallocated for maximum impact. While still rated as "Very Great Extent," this may suggest that some teachers perceive room for improvement in the frequency or depth of resource reassessment to optimize utilization.

The overall level of adaptive school mechanisms in Resource Allocation attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.79$ ($SD = 0.39$), verbally interpreted as Highly Acceptable.

The school effectively manages resource allocation by aligning investments with strategic goals, ensuring fairness, and making data-informed decisions. However, enhancing periodic reviews and reassessing resource distribution may further optimize its impact on student learning.

TABLE 5. Level of Adaptive School Mechanism Experienced by Teachers with Respect to Resource Allocation

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
The school head allocates resources based on the organization's strategic goals and priorities, ensuring that investments support the overall mission.	6.7786	.53916	Very Great Extent
The school head ensures that decisions are made with a clear understanding of how resources will impact student achievement and organizational effectiveness.	6.9016	.44668	Very Great Extent
The school head regularly reviews data that helps identify areas where resources can be reallocated for maximum impact.	6.6698	.45800	Very Great Extent
The school head distributes resources equitably, addressing the varying needs of different student populations, schools, or departments to promote fairness.	6.8183	.51664	Very Great Extent
The school head allocates resources based on the organization's strategic goals and priorities, ensuring that investments support the overall mission.	6.7817	.46809	Very Great Extent
Weighted Mean SD Verbal Interpretation	6.79 0.39 Highly Acceptable		

Table 6 presents the level of adaptive school mechanisms experienced by teachers concerning Community Engagement.

The highest mean score ($M = 6.63$, $SD = 0.58$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that the school head engages in partnerships that benefit both the school and the community. This suggests that schools actively collaborate with external organizations to create mutually beneficial relationships that enhance student learning and community development.

Conversely, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.43$, $SD = 0.74$) is associated with designing sustainability initiatives that foster long-term relationships between schools and communities rather than short-term projects.

TABLE 6. Level Of Adaptive School Mechanism Experienced by Teachers with Respect to Community Engagement

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
The school head engages in partnerships that provide benefits to both the school and the community	6.63	0.58	Very Great Extent
The school head engages in community initiatives that are designed to support student learning and development, addressing local needs and enhancing educational opportunities.	6.49	0.67	Very Great Extent
The school head has clear and open lines of communication established between schools and community members, facilitating the sharing of ideas, concerns, and successes.	6.59	0.57	Very Great Extent
The school head design for sustainability, fostering long-lasting relationships between schools and communities rather than short-term projects.	6.43	0.74	Very Great Extent
The school head includes recognizing and celebrating the diversity within the community, promoting inclusivity and understanding.	6.54	0.62	Very Great Extent
Weighted Mean SD Verbal Interpretation	6.54 0.53 Highly Acceptable		

While still rated as "Very Great Extent," this may indicate that some teachers see opportunities to improve the longevity and consistency of school-community partnerships.

The overall level of adaptive school mechanisms in Community Engagement attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.54$ ($SD = 0.53$), verbally interpreted as Highly Acceptable.

In summary, the school demonstrates strong engagement with the community through partnerships, open communication, and inclusive practices. Strengthening sustainability efforts to ensure long-term collaboration may further enhance community involvement and educational support.

Level of Respondent's Assessment on the Teacher's Career Resilience

Table 7 presents the respondents' assessment of teachers' career resilience concerning Social Competence, including the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

The highest mean score ($M = 5.98$, $SD = 0.52$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that they can effectively build relationships with colleagues to support their professional growth. This suggests that collaborative relationships play a crucial role in career resilience by fostering a supportive work environment.

On the other hand, the lowest mean score ($M = 5.36$, $SD = 1.15$) is associated with relying on colleagues for support during career challenges. While still rated as "Great Extent," this may indicate that some teachers perceive limitations in accessing peer support during professional difficulties.

TABLE 7. Level of Respondent's Assessment on the Teacher's Career Resilience, Particularly in Terms of Social Competence

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
I can effectively build relationships with colleagues to support my professional growth.	5.98	0.52	Great Extent
My social skills help me adapt to changes in the work environment.	5.85	0.46	Great Extent
I rely on my colleagues for support when I face career challenges.	5.36	1.15	Great Extent
I actively seek out social interactions that enhance my career resilience.	5.48	.95	Great Extent
Social connections in the workplace help me cope with work stress.	5.76	1.08	Great Extent
Weighted Mean	5.69		
SD	0.62		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

The overall level of teacher career resilience in Social Competence attained a weighted mean score of $M = 5.69$ ($SD = 0.62$), verbally interpreted as Acceptable.

The findings show that while teachers demonstrate strong social competence in building relationships and adapting to changes, fostering more structured peer support systems may further enhance their resilience in challenging situations.

Table 8 shows the respondents' assessment of teachers' career resilience concerning Emotional Competence, including the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

The highest mean score ($M = 5.96$, $SD = 0.67$) suggests that teachers strongly agree that they maintain a positive mindset when facing emotional stress at work. This indicates

that optimism and emotional regulation are critical factors in sustaining resilience.

TABLE 8. Level of Respondent's Assessment On The Teacher's Career Resilience, Particularly In Terms Of Emotional Competence

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
I can regulate my emotions effectively in stressful situations at work.	5.84	.54	Great Extent
My emotional intelligence helps me stay calm under pressure.	5.63	1.11	Great Extent
I cope well with emotional challenges related to my job.	5.74	.97	Great Extent
I find it easy to recover emotionally from setbacks at work.	5.75	.59	Great Extent
I am able to keep a positive mindset when facing emotional stress at work.	5.96	.67	Great Extent
Weighted Mean	5.79		
SD	0.64		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

Conversely, the lowest mean score ($M = 5.66$, $SD = 1.14$) is associated with staying calm under pressure due to emotional intelligence. While still rated as "Great Extent," the relatively higher standard deviation suggests that some teachers may find it more challenging to remain composed in high-stress situations.

The overall level of teacher career resilience in Emotional Competence attained a weighted mean score of $M = 5.79$ ($SD = 0.64$), verbally interpreted as Acceptable. The findings show that teachers generally exhibit strong emotional competence, but additional training in stress management and emotional regulation strategies could further enhance their resilience in demanding work environments.

Table 9 shows the respondents' assessment of teachers' career resilience concerning Physical Competence.

The highest mean score ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 0.67$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that they practice self-care to maintain their physical health and reduce work-related stress. This suggests that self-care plays a significant role in maintaining career resilience.

On the other hand, the lowest mean score ($M = 5.60$, $SD = 0.74$) is associated with ensuring regular physical activity to manage stress effectively. While still rated as "Great Extent," this result may suggest that some teachers experience challenges in integrating consistent physical activity into their routines.

TABLE 9. Level of Respondent's Assessment On The Teacher's Career Resilience, Particularly In Terms Of Physical Competence

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
My physical health helps me maintain my energy throughout the school day.	5.84	.66	Great Extent
I ensure regular physical activity, which helps me manage stress effectively.	5.60	.74	Great Extent
I rarely experience burnout due to my commitment to maintaining good physical health.	5.65	.89	Great Extent
My physical endurance allows me to meet the demands of my teaching role.	5.90	.71	Great Extent
I practice self-care to maintain my physical health, which reduces work-related stress.	6.00	.67	Very Great Extent
Weighted Mean	5.80		
SD	0.51		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

The overall level of teacher career resilience in Physical Competence attained a weighted mean score of $M = 5.80$ ($SD = 0.51$), verbally interpreted as Acceptable. This shows that teachers recognize the importance of self-care and physical well-being in maintaining resilience, but encouraging more structured wellness programs may further support their overall physical endurance and stress management.

Table 10 shows the respondents' assessment of teachers' career resilience concerning Psychological Competence.

TABLE 10. Level of Respondent's Assessment on the Teacher's Career Resilience, Particularly in Terms of Psychological Competence

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
I can adapt psychologically to changing work environments.	5.88	.48	Great Extent
My mental strength helps me overcome career setbacks effectively.	5.84	.62	Great Extent
I feel prepared to face psychological challenges in my teaching career.	5.80	.76	Great Extent
I maintain a positive psychological outlook, even during difficult times.	6.12	.77	Very Great Extent
I am psychologically equipped to handle stressful situations at school.	5.90	.73	Great Extent
Weighted Mean	5.91		
SD	0.51		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

The highest mean score ($M = 6.12$, $SD = 0.77$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that they maintain a positive psychological outlook even during difficult times. This highlights the importance of a growth mindset and psychological adaptability in career resilience.

Conversely, the lowest mean score ($M = 5.80$, $SD = 0.76$) is associated with feeling prepared to face psychological challenges in their teaching career. While still rated as "Great Extent," the slightly lower rating suggests that some teachers may feel less confident in managing unpredictable career-related stressors.

The overall level of teacher career resilience in Psychological Competence attained a weighted mean score of $M = 5.91$ ($SD = 0.51$), verbally interpreted as Acceptable.

The findings show that teachers exhibit strong psychological competence, particularly in maintaining a positive mindset, but further professional development in psychological resilience strategies may reinforce their capacity to manage workplace stress effectively.

Level of Respondent's Assessment on the Teacher's Career Resilience

Table 11 shows the respondents' assessment of teachers' career resilience concerning Intellectual Competence, including the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

The highest mean score ($M = 6.38$, $SD = 0.55$) indicates that teachers strongly agree they are provided opportunities to expand their expertise in their subject areas. This suggests that professional development initiatives significantly contribute to intellectual resilience. Conversely, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.09$, $SD = 0.75$) is associated with schools encouraging intellectual curiosity and critical thinking in teachers.

TABLE 11. Level of Respondent's Assessment on the Teacher's Career Resilience, Particularly in Terms of Intellectual Competence

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Teachers continuously seek new knowledge to improve their instructional strategies.	6.25	.61	Very Great Extent
The school encourages intellectual curiosity and critical thinking in its teachers.	6.09	.75	Very Great Extent
Teachers are provided with opportunities to expand their expertise in their subject areas.	6.38	.55	Very Great Extent
Intellectual growth is fostered through professional development programs that challenge teachers' thinking.	6.27	.45	Very Great Extent
Teachers are encouraged to engage in research and apply new knowledge in their classrooms.	6.17	.71	Very Great Extent
Weighted Mean	6.23		
SD	0.44		
Verbal Interpretation	Highly Acceptable		

While still rated as "Very Great Extent," this suggests that some teachers may feel that critical thinking opportunities could be further strengthened.

The overall level of teacher career resilience in Intellectual Competence attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.23$ ($SD = 0.44$), verbally interpreted as Highly Acceptable.

This shows that teachers demonstrate strong intellectual competence, with professional development and opportunities for expertise expansion being key contributors. Strengthening critical thinking initiatives may further enhance their intellectual resilience.

Level of Respondent's Assessment on the School Organizational Learning in Terms of Teacher-Student Relationship

Table 12 shows the respondents' assessment of school organizational learning concerning Teacher-Student Relationship, including the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

The highest mean score ($M = 6.48$, $SD = 0.58$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that strong teacher-student relationships improve the overall learning experience. This highlights the importance of positive relationships in fostering an effective learning environment.

Conversely, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.09$, $SD = 0.41$) is associated with teachers using rapport to create a stress-free classroom. While still rated as "Very Evident," this suggests that some teachers may encounter challenges in fully establishing a completely stress-free environment.

TABLE 12. Level of Respondent's Assessment on the School Organizational Learning in Terms of Teacher-Student Relationship

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
I foster positive relationships with students that enhance the learning environment.	6.34	.51	Very Evident
My interactions with students improve my teaching methods.	6.37	.52	Very Evident
I learn from my students' feedback to improve my instruction.	6.32	.63	Very Evident
My rapport with students helps me create a stress-free classroom.	6.09	.41	Very Evident
Strong teacher-student relationships	6.48	.58	Very

improve the overall learning experience.			Evident
Weighted Mean	6.32		
SD	0.48		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely Observable		

The overall level of school organizational learning in Teacher-Student Relationship attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.32$ ($SD = 0.48$), verbally interpreted as Extremely Observable.

This shows that teacher-student relationships are well-developed, significantly enhancing the learning environment. Additional strategies to further minimize classroom stress may provide even greater benefits.

Table 13 shows the respondents' assessment of school organizational learning concerning Classroom Management, including the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

TABLE 13. Level of Respondent's Assessment on the School Organizational Learning in Terms of Classroom Management

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
I can manage my classroom effectively, minimizing disruptions.	6.00	.47	Very Evident
I use diverse strategies to maintain a productive learning environment.	6.15	.59	Very Evident
My classroom management skills help students stay focused on learning.	5.95	.57	Very Evident
I feel confident managing a variety of classroom behaviors.	5.92	.65	Very Evident
I have developed effective routines to maintain discipline in the classroom.	6.01	.52	Very Evident
Weighted Mean	6.01		
SD	0.43		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely Observable		

The highest mean score ($M = 6.15$, $SD = 0.59$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that they use diverse strategies to maintain a productive learning environment. This suggests that teachers actively implement various techniques to support effective learning.

Conversely, the lowest mean score ($M = 5.92$, $SD = 0.65$) is associated with teachers' confidence in managing a variety of classroom behaviors. While still rated as "Very Evident," this suggests that some teachers may benefit from additional training in handling diverse behavioral challenges.

The overall level of school organizational learning in Classroom Management attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.01$ ($SD = 0.43$), verbally interpreted as Extremely Observable.

This means that classroom management is effective, with teachers utilizing various strategies to create a conducive learning environment. Enhancing behavioral management training could further improve classroom dynamics.

Table 14 shows the respondents' assessment of school organizational learning concerning Social Learning.

The highest mean score ($M = 6.45$, $SD = 0.56$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that they encourage students to learn from each other through group activities. This highlights the effectiveness of collaborative learning in student engagement.

TABLE 14. Level of Respondent's Assessment on the School Organizational Learning in Terms of Social Learning

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
I encourage collaboration among students to enhance social learning.	6.32	.52	Very Evident
I design activities that promote social learning and interaction.	6.23	.50	Very Evident
Social learning is a central part of my teaching approach.	5.85	.73	Very Evident
My classroom environment fosters social interaction and peer learning.	6.20	.52	Very Evident
I encourage students to learn from each other through group activities.	6.45	.56	Very Evident
Weighted Mean	6.22		
SD	0.44		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely Observable		

On the other hand, the lowest mean score ($M = 5.85$, $SD = 0.73$) is associated with teachers incorporating social learning as a central part of their teaching approach. While still rated as "Very Evident," the slightly lower rating suggests that some teachers may require further training or resources to fully integrate social learning into their pedagogy.

The overall level of school organizational learning in Social Learning attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.22$ ($SD = 0.44$), verbally interpreted as Extremely Observable. This means that teachers actively encourage social learning, but further support in integrating social learning as a core teaching approach may enhance student engagement and collaboration.

Table 15 shows the respondents' assessment of school organizational learning concerning Emotional Learning.

The highest mean score ($M = 6.30$, $SD = 0.55$) indicates that teachers strongly agree to promote emotional awareness among students to foster positive relationships. This suggests that teachers recognize the value of emotional intelligence in student development.

TABLE 15. Level of Respondent's Assessment on the School Organizational Learning in Terms of Emotional Learning

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
I help students develop emotional intelligence as part of my teaching practice.	6.24	.50	Very Evident
Emotional learning plays a key role in how I structure my classroom.	6.09	.54	Very Evident
I create an emotionally supportive environment where students feel safe to express themselves.	6.22	.65	Very Evident
I promote emotional awareness among my students to foster positive relationships.	6.30	.55	Very Evident
Emotional learning is an integral part of my students' overall development.	6.24	.50	Very Evident
Weighted Mean	6.11		
SD	0.59		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely Observable		

Conversely, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.09$, $SD = 0.54$) is associated with structuring classrooms around emotional learning. While still rated as "Very Evident," some teachers may need further guidance in fully embedding emotional learning within their classroom structure.

The overall level of school organizational learning in Emotional Learning attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.11$ ($SD = 0.59$), verbally interpreted as Extremely

Observable. This means that emotional learning is well-integrated into teaching practices, but additional strategies to further embed emotional intelligence within classroom structures could enhance student well-being and school resilience.

Research on emotional intelligence (EI) and the associated field of social and emotional learning, or SEL, has already shown that socio-emotional competence and abilities are the cornerstone of positive relationships.

TABLE 16. Level of respondent's assessment on the school organizational learning in terms of Professional Development and Collaboration

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
The school provides opportunities for teachers to engage in professional development activities regularly.	6.34	.47	Very Evident
Teachers are encouraged to collaborate and share knowledge with their colleagues.	6.45	.49	Very Evident
Professional development programs in this school are aligned with teachers' instructional needs.	6.27	.50	Very Evident
There are regular meetings where teachers can discuss and reflect on classroom practices collaboratively.	6.27	.62	Very Evident
Teachers are given opportunities to participate in external training programs that enhance their professional skills.	6.38	.48	Very Evident
Weighted Mean SD Verbal Interpretation	6.34 0.40 Extremely Observable		

Table 16 shows the respondents' evaluation of school organizational learning related to Professional Development and Collaboration.

The highest mean score ($M = 6.45$, $SD = 0.49$) suggests that teachers strongly agree that they are encouraged to collaborate and share knowledge with their colleagues. This emphasizes a strong culture of teamwork and professional exchange among teachers.

On the other hand, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.27$, $SD = 0.507$) is associated with the alignment of professional development programs with teachers' instructional needs. While still rated as "Very Evident," this suggests that some teachers may feel that professional development activities could be more tailored to their specific teaching needs.

The overall level of school organizational learning in Professional Development and Collaboration attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.34$ ($SD = 0.40$), verbally interpreted as Extremely Observable.

The findings show that the school provides substantial opportunities for professional development and collaboration. The alignment of professional development programs with teachers' specific instructional needs can be enhanced to further improve.

This collaborative environment also promotes a culture of shared learning, which contributes to the school's overall improvement and organizational learning.

Table 17 shows the respondents' assessment of school organizational learning concerning Reflective Practices and Feedback.

TABLE 17. Level of Respondent's Assessment On The School Organizational Learning In Terms Of Reflective Practices And Feedback

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
Teachers regularly engage in reflective practices to evaluate their teaching effectiveness.	6.06	.52	Very Evident
The school encourages teachers to reflect on their professional growth and set goals for improvement.	6.30	.51	Very Evident
Teachers are provided with constructive feedback that helps them improve their instructional practices.	6.12	.58	Very Evident
Peer feedback is encouraged and valued as part of the reflective practice in this school.	6.05	.60	Very Evident
Reflection on teaching practices is integrated into professional development sessions.	6.09	.54	Very Evident
Weighted Mean SD Verbal Interpretation	6.12 0.41 Extremely Observable		

The highest mean score ($M = 6.30$, $SD = 0.51$) suggests that teachers strongly agree that the school encourages them to reflect on their professional growth and set goals for improvement. This highlights a strong commitment to teacher self-improvement and continuous learning.

Conversely, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.05$, $SD = 0.60$) is associated with peer feedback being encouraged and valued as part of the reflective practice. While still rated as "Very Evident," this suggests that peer feedback practices could be further strengthened.

The overall level of school organizational learning in Reflective Practices and Feedback attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.12$ ($SD = 0.41$), verbally interpreted as Extremely Observable.

This means that teachers actively engage in reflective practices, and feedback mechanisms are well-implemented. Strengthening peer feedback and making it a more integral part of the reflective process may further enhance professional growth.

Table 18 shows the respondents' assessment of school organizational learning concerning Technology Integration.

Table 18. Level of Respondent's Assessment on the School Organizational Learning in Terms of Technology Integration

STATEMENTS	MEAN	SD	REMARKS
The school provides adequate technology resources to support teaching and learning.	6.30	.58	Very Evident
Teachers receive ongoing training on how to effectively integrate technology into their lessons.	6.06	.57	Very Evident
Technology is used to enhance student engagement and participation in the classroom.	6.34	.59	Very Evident
The school promotes the use of digital tools to facilitate collaborative learning among students.	6.35	.64	Very Evident
Teachers are encouraged to explore new technologies and implement them in their instructional practices.	6.36	.63	Very Evident
Weighted Mean SD Verbal Interpretation	6.28 0.51 Extremely Observable		

The highest mean score ($M = 6.36$, $SD = 0.63$) indicates that teachers strongly agree that they are encouraged to explore new technologies and implement them in their instructional practices. This suggests that there is a strong emphasis on technological innovation in teaching.

On the other hand, the lowest mean score ($M = 6.06$, $SD = 0.57$) is associated with teachers receiving ongoing training on how to integrate technology effectively into their lessons. While still rated as "Very Evident," this suggests that some teachers may require more continuous support and hands-on training in technology integration.

The overall level of school organizational learning in Technology Integration attained a weighted mean score of $M = 6.28$ ($SD = 0.51$), verbally interpreted as Extremely Observable.

The findings mean that the school highly supports technology integration, encouraging teachers to explore new tools. Ongoing and targeted training on effective technology use in instruction can be enhanced to improve further.

Significant Relationship Between Adaptive School Mechanism and Teacher's Career Resilience

The results of the Pearson correlation coefficients measure the strength and direction of the relationship between adaptive school mechanisms and teacher's career resilience. A positive correlation indicates that teachers' career resilience improves as schools strengthen their adaptive mechanisms. Conversely, a negative correlation suggests that an increase in adaptive school mechanisms may correspond with a decrease in resilience.

Correlations were computed across five dimensions of career resilience—Social Competence (SC), Emotional Competence (EC), Physical Competence (PC), Psychological Competence (PC2), and Intellectual Competence (IC)—using data from 111 respondents. A correlation coefficient of 1 signifies a perfect positive correlation, while -1 represents a perfect negative correlation.

TABLE 19. Significant Relationship Between Adaptive School Mechanism and Teacher's Career Resilience

		SC	EC	PC	PC2	IC
SLAG	Pearson Correlation	-.035	-.043	-.035	.032	.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.713	.654	.716	.742	.700
	N	111	111	111	111	111
PDAO	Pearson Correlation	.050	-.143	-.009	-.078	.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.605	.133	.921	.417	.700
	N	111	111	111	111	111
CC	Pearson Correlation	.037	-.086	-.018	-.015	.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.700	.368	.852	.874	.570
	N	111	111	111	111	111
DDDM	Pearson Correlation	-.027	-.152	-.107	-.067	.018
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.777	.111	.264	.486	.852
	N	111	111	111	111	111
CE	Pearson Correlation	-.118	-.151	-.109	-.080	.040
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.216	.113	.257	.404	.674
	N	111	111	111	111	111

The correlation coefficients range from -0.15 to 0.05, indicating a weak to negligible relationship between adaptive school mechanisms and teachers' career resilience. The

highest correlation was observed between Professional Development and Organizational Adaptability (PDAO) and Social Competence (SC) ($r = 0.05$, $p = 0.60$), although it is not statistically significant. This suggests that while professional development efforts may slightly contribute to teachers' ability to build relationships, the effect is minimal. Similarly, Community Engagement (CE) and Emotional Competence (EC) ($r = -0.15$, $p = 0.11$) show the strongest negative correlation, indicating that as community engagement efforts increase, emotional competence may slightly decline—though this result lacks statistical significance.

On the other hand, the lowest correlation was found between PDAO and Physical Competence (PC) ($r = -0.009$, $p = 0.92$), indicating virtually no relationship. This suggests that professional development and organizational adaptability have no measurable impact on teachers' physical resilience. Likewise, Data-Driven Decision Making (DDDM) and Psychological Competence (PC2) ($r = -0.07$, $p = 0.49$) show a weak negative correlation, suggesting minimal influence of data-based strategies on psychological adaptability.

The significance values (p-values) for all correlations exceed 0.05, meaning none of the relationships are significant. This implies that adaptive school mechanisms, as measured in this study, do not have a meaningful or reliable impact on teachers' career resilience.

Significant Relationship Between Adaptive School Mechanism with Schools' Organizational Learning

TABLE 20. Significant Relationship Between Adaptive School Mechanism With Schools' Organizational Learning

		TSR	CM	SL	EL	PDAC	RPAF	TI
SLAG	Pearson Correlation	.102	-.087	-.069	.070	-.201	.051	-.097
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.286	.362	.469	.466	.034	.592	.311
	N	111	111	111	111	111	111	111
PDAO	Pearson Correlation	.033	-.165	-.115	-.016	-.230	.028	-.109
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.732	.083	.229	.867	.015	.769	.254
	N	111	111	111	111	111	111	111
CC	Pearson Correlation	-.015	-.167	-.151	-.085	-.212	-.007	-.128
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.874	.080	.114	.378	.026	.941	.180
	N	111	111	111	111	111	111	111
DDDM	Pearson Correlation	.017	-.260	-.174	.034	-.232	.085	-.167
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.860	.006	.068	.725	.014	.376	.080
	N	111	111	111	111	111	111	111
CE	Pearson Correlation	.075	-.297	-.142	.088	-.172	.063	-.113
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.432	.002	.137	.358	.072	.510	.238
	N	111	111	111	111	111	111	111

The results of the Pearson correlation coefficients measure the strength and direction of the relationship between adaptive school mechanisms and school organizational learning. A positive correlation indicates that as schools enhance their adaptive mechanisms, organizational learning also improves. Conversely, a negative correlation suggests that an increase in adaptive mechanisms may correspond with a decrease in organizational learning. Correlations were computed across seven dimensions of organizational learning—Teacher-Student Relationship (TSR), Classroom Management (CM), Social Learning (SL), Emotional Learning (EL), Professional Development and Collaboration (PDAC), Reflective Practices and Feedback (RPAF), and Technology Integration (TI) using data from 111 respondents. A correlation coefficient 1

represents a perfect positive correlation, while -1 represents a perfect negative correlation.

The correlation coefficients range from -0.297 to 0.102, indicating a weak to moderate relationship between adaptive school mechanisms and school organizational learning. The strongest significant negative correlation was observed between Community Engagement (CE) and Classroom Management (CM) ($r = -0.297$, $p = 0.002$), suggesting that increased community engagement may pose challenges in maintaining classroom management effectiveness. Similarly, Data-Driven Decision Making (DDDM) and Classroom Management (CM) ($r = -0.260$, $p = 0.006$) show a moderate negative correlation, implying that while data-driven approaches contribute to overall school performance, they may not always align with effective classroom management strategies.

On the other hand, the lowest correlation ($r = -0.007$, $p = 0.941$) was found between Community Collaboration (CC) and Reflective Practices and Feedback (RPAF), indicating an almost negligible relationship. This suggests that community collaboration efforts have little to no direct effect on how teachers engage in reflective practices within the school setting.

These results suggest that while adaptive school mechanisms, such as leadership governance and data-driven decision-making, are crucial for institutional development, they may inadvertently reduce collaboration among teachers. This could be due to increased administrative responsibilities, policy constraints, or a shift in focus from peer collaboration to compliance-driven activities.

The significance values (p-values) for these correlations indicate that the relationships are statistically significant, particularly in areas involving classroom management, professional collaboration, and decision-making processes. This implies that while adaptive school mechanisms contribute to structural improvements, they may also introduce challenges in key areas of school organizational learning, such as teacher collaboration, classroom management, and community engagement. Schools that implement balanced policies focusing on both administrative efficiency and collaborative learning may foster a more effective learning environment.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the foregoing findings, the following conclusion was drawn.

The results show no significant relationship between adaptive school mechanisms and teacher career resilience, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This indicates that while adaptive mechanisms improve school-wide learning systems, they may not directly impact teachers' social, emotional, physical, psychological, or intellectual resilience. Other personal, environmental, or external factors could substantially influence shaping teachers' career resilience more than the mechanisms implemented at the school level.

The researcher, however, concludes that a significant relationship between adaptive school mechanisms and school organizational learning was found, leading to the rejection of

the second hypothesis. The results indicate a significant relationship between these variables, emphasizing the role of supportive leadership and governance, professional development and opportunities, collaborative culture, data-driven decision-making, resource allocation, and community engagement in enhancing organizational learning within schools. These mechanisms contribute to stronger teacher-student relationships, effective classroom management, social and emotional learning, professional collaboration, reflective practices, and technology integration, which are essential for fostering a dynamic and continuously improving learning environment.

The drawn conclusions resulted in the following recommendations:

1. Teachers need to actively participate in professional development programs and collaborative learning communities to consistently improve their instructional practices and adaptability to evolving educational demands.
2. Schools must enhance organizational learning mechanisms by incorporating reflective practices, technology-driven teaching strategies, and collaborative professional development opportunities to promote a culture of continuous improvement.
3. School administrators can implement data-driven decision-making processes and allocate resources effectively to support both teacher career resilience and overall school adaptability, ensuring sustainable and impactful educational reforms

REFERENCE

- [1]. Chen, J., & Lee, J. C.-K. (2023). Reimagining Teacher Resilience for Flourishing. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-023-00810-5>
- [2]. Cherry (2024) How Social Learning Theory Works <https://www.verywellmind.com/social-learning-theory-2795074>
- [3]. Cilliers (2021) Reflecting on Social Learning Tools to Enhance the Teaching-Learning Experience of Generation Z Learners <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/educ.2020.606533/full?>
- [4]. Collie, Martin and Frydenberg (2017) Importance of social and emotional competence for teachers, for very young children and for at-risk students: latest research <https://blog.aare.edu.au/importance-of-social-and-emotional-competence-for-teachers-for-very-young-children-and-for-at-risk-students-latest-research/>
- [5]. Hallam, Smith and Wilcox (2015) Trust and Collaboration in PLC Teams: Teacher Relationships, Principal Support, and Collaborative Benefits <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0192636515602330>
- [6]. Hargreaves and O'Connor (2017) Cultures of professional collaboration: their origins and opponents <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/jpcc-02-2017-0004/full/html>
- [7]. Harris (2018) School leadership practices, challenges and opportunities in Spain from key agents' perspective <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23311886.2022.2126604#abstract>
- [8]. Kendal et al. (2018) Social Learning Strategies: Bridge-Building between Fields [https://www.cell.com/trends/cognitive-sciences/abstract/S1364-6613\(18\)30094-9?iid=ee9db067e1524784a7a80c7c9a5459fef&fl=4&nid=244+276893704&cn=ZmxleGlibGVfcmVjcw%3D%3D&uid=265463749&t=1&refsrc=email](https://www.cell.com/trends/cognitive-sciences/abstract/S1364-6613(18)30094-9?iid=ee9db067e1524784a7a80c7c9a5459fef&fl=4&nid=244+276893704&cn=ZmxleGlibGVfcmVjcw%3D%3D&uid=265463749&t=1&refsrc=email)
- [9]. Khan and Alamri (2017) Technology integration in education https://journals.lww.com/ijmr/fulltext/2017/02010/technology_integration_in_education.1.aspx



- [10]. Kilag, O. K. T., & Sasan, J. M. (2023). Unpacking the role of instructional leadership in teacher professional development. *Advanced Qualitative Research*, 1(1), 63–73