European Journal of Education Studies
ISSN: 2501 - 1111
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

DOI: 10.46827/ejes.v10i1.4657 Volume 10 | Issue 1 | 2023

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AS A FUNCTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING CAPABILITY AND SCHOOL CLIMATE OF TECHNOLOGY AND LIVELIHOOD EDUCATION TEACHERS

Charity Mae C. Ang[i], **Viola P. Buenaventura**
Professional Schools,
University of Mindanao,
Davao City, Philippines

Abstract:
This study was conducted to determine the relationship between quality of work life as a function of organizational learning capability and the school climate of technology and livelihood education teachers. Specifically, it determined if organizational learning capability and school climate significantly influence the quality of work life of the TLE teachers. The study a used quantitative non-experimental, descriptive-correlation research design. This was participated by 128 TLE teachers-respondents from different public secondary schools in municipalities of Magsaysay, Bansalan, Matanao cluster of Davao del Sur. It utilized standardized questionnaires on the quality of work life to measure the dependent variable and organizational learning capability and school climate to measure the independent variables and was validated by the experts. Results showed in the analyses that organizational learning capability has a very high descriptive level; school climate has a high descriptive level; and quality of work life has a very high descriptive level. Organizational learning capability and school climate have a significant correlation to the quality of work life. Stepwise linear regression showed the results in the series of models, increasingly by indicators such as knowledge sharing, academic emphasis, dialogue, and participative decision-making signifies that organizational learning capability best influenced the quality of work life of TLE teachers.

Keywords: organizational learning capability, school climate, quality of work life, TLE teachers, general field education

[i] Correspondence: email charitymae.ang@deped.gov.ph, ang_charity@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

The quality of work life is drawing more importance globally, organizations are facing many issues related to human resources of which, employee's stability is one of the major problems and addressing it, is a topmost priority. Amongst various reasons for employee stability the quality of work life is one among them (Swamy, Nanjundeswaraswamy, & Rashmi, 2015). Quality of work life is a person's life. It covers a person's feelings about every dimension of work including economic rewards and benefits, security, working condition, organizational and interpersonal relations and their intrinsic meaning in a person's life. Therefore, quality of work life is a concern not only to improve life at work, but also life outside work. High quality of work life there should be a positive impact on personal life, an opportunity to be involved in the decision as well as an acceptable level of physical comfort (Bolhari, Rezaeean, Bolhari, Bairamzadeh & Soltan, 2011).

Additionally, research on the quality of work life is considered to be more important at the individual and organization levels. Quality of work life is considered for both the employees and organization and it is involved with job satisfaction, productivity, job involvement, job enrichment etc. The success of any organization is highly dependent on how it motivates and retains its workforce. Today's organizations need to be more flexible so that they are equipped to develop their workforce and enjoy their commitment (Kitratporn & Puncreobutr 2016).

Another variable that captured the interest of the researcher is school climate. It is relevant in building organizational learning capability. The rapid changes and developments triggered by globalization have forced organizations to cope with these developments. Moreover, organizations have become more sensitive to these changes, and they found themselves in global competition. Therefore, organizations are required to make the right decisions and internalize a well-established flow of information systems within their structure in order to survive in this highly uncertain and competitive global environment. In that kind of competitive environment, one of the most valuable competitive advantage tools is organizational learning capability as collective learning behavior has become more important than ever (Cohen, 2006).

It is on the above background that the researcher took an interest to examine if there is a significant relationship between organizational learning capability and quality of work life, school climate and quality of work life. As a TLE teacher, the researcher is even more curious if organizational learning capability and school climate can predict the level of quality of work life of TLE teachers. Although extensive literature on identity orientation exists in relation to a wide variety of topics, research on the relation between a teacher's school climate, organizational learning capability and quality of work life needs to be studied as no study has been conducted on the aforementioned variables, especially in Magsaysay, Bansalan, and Matanao (MABAMA) cluster, Davao del Sur. Hence, making this study a generation of new knowledge that can contribute to the field of education in the context of rural and sub-urban secondary schools.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Organizational Learning Capability

The rapid change and developments triggered by globalization have forced organizations to cope with these developments. Moreover, organizations have become more sensitive to these changes, and they found themselves in global competition. Therefore, organizations are required to make the right decisions and internalize a well-established flow of information systems within their structure in order to survive in this highly uncertain and competitive global environment. In that kind of competitive environment, one of the most valuable competitive advantage tools is knowledge (Aydoğan, Orhan, Naldöken, Beylik, & Aksay, 2011; Celik, 2014).

What is more, to obtain knowledge systematically, collective learning behavior has become more important than ever. The concept of learning has been examined by psychologists and pedagogues, and it has been generally examined in terms of individual learning levels. Later on, scholars from different disciplines, such as business management and economics put emphasis on learning, and they examined the concept of learning from different perspectives, such as behavioral dynamics of individuals in business life. As a result, concepts, such as organizational learning and learning organizations have come into play. Organizational learning refers to an information processing procedure of acquisition, dissemination, interpretation, and storage of knowledge in organizational memory for further use. For advanced organizational learning, it is required to have an advanced organizational learning capability (Farzianpour, Irani, & Foroushani, 2016; Tohidi, Mehdi Jabbari, 2012, Tohidi, 2011).

To add, organizational learning capability is the organizational and managerial characteristics that facilitate the organizational learning process or allow an organization to learn (Onağ, Tepeci, & Başalp, 2014). It is also defined as an intrinsic ability of an organization because of which the organization creates, enriches, and utilizes knowledge to outperform its competitors in terms of its competitiveness and performance. Organizational learning capability implies a complex, multidimensional, and dynamic concept. For instance, according to Jerez-Gómez et al. (2005), the dimensions of OLC are managerial commitment, systems perspective, openness and experimentation, and knowledge transfer and integration. On the contrary, Chiva et al. (2007) offered five dimensions for OLC, namely experimentation, risk-taking, interaction with the external environment, dialogue, and participative decision-making (Akgün, Ince, İmamoglu, Keskin, & Kocoglu, 2013).

With this, organizational learning helps organizations create, transfer and integrate knowledge and experience, as well as learn continuously. The ability to organizational learning is the organizational and management characteristics that facilitate organizational learning process (Tohidi, Seyedaliakbar, & Mandegari, 2012). The ability of organizational learning is defined as all organizational and managerial practices that facilitate the learning process (Chiva, Alegre, & Lapiedra, 2007). In the same line of thought, it is the set of management practices that facilitate the learning process,

or, as a set of mechanisms that increase the ability of an organization to maintain and improve its performance. Innovation is related to the ability of organizational learning (Jerez-Gomez et al., 2005; Tohidi, Seyedaliakbar, & Mandegari, 2012).

To discuss the predictors, *Experimentation*: It is defined as to what extent new ideas or suggestions are tolerated and welcomed sympathetically. The experimentation dimension is the most supported dimension of OLC in the literature. This dimension involves trying new and innovative ideas, being open to change, and encouraging people who work on new ideas. Moreover, it involves new approaches to the solution of existing problems as well.

Risk-taking: It refers to the extent to which uncertainty, ambiguity, and errors are tolerated. Organizations might avoid taking risks if they want to achieve success in the short term because risk-taking may lead to errors. However, benefits derived from errors may lead to ease of problem recognition and diversity in the organization's area of movement (Gomes & Wojahn, 2017).

Interaction with the external environment: This dimension involves the scope of relationship with the external environment, which refers to the factors beyond the organization's direct control, such as competitors, social, economic, and governmental systems. *Dialogue*: It can be described as the basic process of developing shared understanding, and it has a very important role in organizational learning. Communication and dialogue among employees, and between employees and managers have a direct influence on learning. In addition, *participative decision-making:* This dimension refers to the level of employees' involvement in decision-making process. Managerial characteristics that facilitate organizational learning have great importance for providing a competitive advantage to organizations (Julien, 2013).

With his predictors, organizational learning capability has a positive influence on organizations' performance. In healthcare organizations an increase in staff learning increases both staff performance and organizational performance, which then increases patient satisfaction as well. Therefore, it is important to examine OLC in healthcare organizations. In this study, it is aimed to determine the level of OLC perception of employees working in private healthcare organizations. In addition, it is also aimed to examine whether this perception level shows variance according to demographic differences (Jurgenfeld & Lins, 2011).

To compare, numerous case studies have devised the constitutional complexity of the organizational learning construct comprehensively. Developing quantitative instruments and empirically testing organizational learning scales may contribute to the study field and help to make more generalizable conclusions easily. For this reason, researchers need to take into consideration the multidimensionality of the organizational learning construct which recognized in various studies (Goh & Richards, 1997; Jerez-Gomez et al., 2005; Tohidi, Seyedaliakbar & Mandegari, 2012).

Organizational learning capability (OLC), as the source of competitive advantage and a key to future organizational success, has been subject of some studies (Chiva et al., 2007; Jerez-Gomez et al., 2005). OLC is defined as the organizational and managerial

characteristics, practices, skills or factors that facilitate the organizational learning processes (e.g., generating, acquiring, disseminating and integrating information/knowledge) or allow an organization to learn (Jerez-Gomez et al., 2005). Many studies conceptualize OLC as a multiple dimensions construct.

Moreover, organizational learning can be labeled as a field of the study of cognitive and social processes of knowledge in organizations that are embedded in organizational and work practices (Boff & Antonello, 2011). In this perspective, knowledge is seen as content and learning is the process by which knowledge is acquired (Easterby-Smith & Lyles, 2003). For Chiva and Alegre (2005) organizational knowledge is mainly in the field of strategic management, and makes use of economic language, whereas organizational learning is dominated by academics in the area of human resources. Organizational learning has been implemented as a field of study among researchers since the 1990s, suggesting the need for maximizing the use of knowledge in organizations efficiently. A generic definition of organizational learning is the way in which organizations learn. It is characterized as an essential component in organizations that operate in turbulent environments, in which knowledge acts as a key resource (Jiménez-Jiménez & Cegarra-Navarro, 2007). Organizations that emphasize learning in this type of environment are able to optimize the competitive experience (Gomes & Wojahn, 2017).

Furthermore, organizational learning is described as one of the factors that precede innovation. Organizational learning, innovation and performance are interrelated factors. Innovation implies novelty and use (Alegre & Chiva, 2008) and may trigger direct results in organizational performance or work with the innovative performance, i.e., in the results arising from innovation. Although these relations have often been studied, there is little empirical evidence to support this perspective in small and medium-sized enterprises. Part of the research on organizational learning has been based on case studies, other non-quantitative descriptive methods and especially in large companies (Gunday, Ulusoy, Kilic, & Alpkan, 2011).

In contrast, the implementation of organizational learning is complicated by the lack of a methodical approach in the literature that includes the measurement of learning capability. There is a minority of empirical research about organizational learning capability (OLC) concept in the literature. Organizational learning capability is a multidimensional construct that measures identifying and measuring the crucial organizational characteristics and practices that promote and facilitate organizational learning (Alegre & Chiva, 2008). Generally, researches that conceptualized organizational learning capability have no consensus about the numbers of dimensions, such as with different contents. Accordingly, understanding organizational learning capability concept and its effects on organizational innovativeness will contribute to the theory and practices in this field of study (Gomes & Wojahn, 2017).

2.2 School Climate

The term school climate has been around for more than a hundred years to explore the idea of school environmental or contextual factors that might have an impact on student learning and academic success. During the past three decades there has been growing research to support the importance of a positive school climate in promoting academic achievement, school safety, dropout prevention, teacher retention, healthy social interactions, and well-being (Cohen & Geier, 2010).

Although school climate has been studied for a long time, researchers have yet to develop a common definition. Most often cited, however, is a definition developed by the National School Climate Center (NSCC) which states that school climate refers to the quality and character of school life. School climate is based on patterns of students', parents' and school personnel's experience of school life and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, teaching and learning practices, and organizational structures. A sustainable, positive school climate fosters youth development and learning necessary for a productive, contributing and satisfying life in a democratic society (Ahmed, 1998).

In agreement, the U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention recommended school climate reform as a scientifically sound strategy that promotes healthy relationships, school connectedness and student engagement. The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) includes school climate as a strategy for dropout prevention, and the U.S. Department of Education recommends school climate reform as an evidence-based strategy to prevent violence. In fact, the U.S. Department of Education is investing in school climate improvement efforts as a fundamentally important school reform strategy (Galimaka, 2012).

Furthermore, the way students, teachers, and parents view their school climate is a strong predictor of social, emotional, and academic outcomes. When the school climate is seen as a positive one, there are fewer behavior problems, increased academic achievement, higher self-esteem, and more commitment to the school. In order to achieve a positive school climate, collaboration among stakeholders, best practice techniques, effective evaluations, and useful resources are needed. Principals/administrators are pivotal to defining, promoting, and sustaining a positive school climate. Research has shown that the leadership of a school principal directly impacts the climate of the school and, in turn, the achievement of its students (Walters, 2012; Smith, Connolly, & Pryseski, 2014).

More so, research also shows that the principal's effect on school climate influences the feelings that teachers have about their work. Despite this research, the connection between a positive school climate and student achievement is often ignored. Studies have shown that a positive school climate is correlated with decreased student absenteeism in middle school and high school and with lower rates of student suspensions in high school (Smith, Connolly, & Pryseski, 2014).

Discipline problems also can contribute to a poor school climate. While schools have a responsibility to protect students from disruptive or dangerous peers, it's

important to understand that students who are being disciplined through out-of-school suspensions can suffer academically (Haynes, Emmons, & Comer, 1993). Students are far more likely to repeat a grade or drop out altogether as a result of suspensions. In addition, high out-of-school suspensions and expulsions can have a negative impact on school-wide performance. Research shows that some schools are able to keep suspensions down and produce higher student outcomes as a result of community partnerships and strong school leadership (Fox, 2010).

According to the National Association of Secondary School Principals, schools should develop discipline policies about removing students from class. Out-of-school suspensions and even in-school suspensions can mean that a student falls further behind in work and is even less motivated to start attending school. Furthermore, a great deal of research shows that student perceptions of school climate affect academic motivation and achievement. Increasingly, research is showing that perceptions of school climate also influence student behavioral and emotional problems. Behavioral problems are characterized by acting-out behaviors such as fighting, lying, and cheating. Unlike behavioral problems, which tend to be external and observable, emotional problems are more difficult to identify because of their internal nature, but include anxiety, sadness, loneliness, hopelessness, and worthlessness (Smith, 2008; Psanos, 2013).

In addition to being directly predictive of their outcomes, student perceptions of the school's climate may offset or counteract the negative impact of risk factors that elevate the probability of behavioral and emotional problems. For instance, research has shown that student perceptions of a high-quality school climate offset the negative effects of difficult temperament, self-criticism, and low levels of self-efficacy. Such findings indicate that although a perceived high-quality school climate is advantageous for all students, it may be particularly beneficial for students at-risk for negative outcomes (Psanos, 2013).

Moreover, knowing that students' perceptions of school climate are related to their behavioral and emotional problems is important, but understanding the processes or mechanisms that underlie this relationship is critical to developing effective interventions to improve school climate. One of the mechanisms that may explain how school climate affects individual outcomes is school connectedness. School connectedness is defined as student perceptions of belonging and closeness with others at the school. Some researchers consider school connectedness a component of school climate, but others suggest that it is a factor that intervenes between school climate and student outcomes to explain their relationship (Vos, van der Westhuizen, Mentz, & Ellis, 2012).

According to the latter perspective, high-quality school climates cultivate a connection to the school and in this way protect youths from negative outcomes. That is, the quality of school climate impacts student's feelings of connectedness to the school and, in turn, the level of connectedness is directly predictive of how students behave and feel. Empirical research supports this perspective and shows that school connectedness explains or accounts for the school climate effects (Smith, 2008). Nevertheless, given that student perceptions of the school climate may counteract certain risk factors,

understanding how students feel about their school is an important first step in decreasing the probability of negative student outcomes (Fox, 2010).

However, given the numerous components that comprise school climate and the prohibitive nature of assessing the perceptions of each one, research indicates that interventions focused on increasing students' sense of connectedness or belongingness to the school may be an effective means of decreasing behavioral and emotional problems (Statham & Harris, 2010). Consequently, numerous studies document that students in schools with a better school climate have higher achievement and better socio-emotional health. Probably the most comprehensive work in this area is being done by the Search Institute, a nonprofit organization that encourages schools and communities to develop and empower young people. In a review of studies on the impact of support in school, the Search Institute found that a caring school climate is associated with: higher grades, engagement, attendance, expectations and aspirations, a sense of scholastic competence, fewer school suspensions, and on-time progression through grades, higher self-esteem and self-concept, less anxiety, depression and loneliness, and less substance abuse (Vos, van der Westhuizen, Mentz, & Ellis, 2012).

Furthermore, the importance of a positive school climate for students and educators is essential for schools to monitor school climate on a regular basis. Several tools have been developed to assess student, parent, and educator perspectives on school climate. The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments has created an online compendium of research-based school climate measures, including surveys to be completed by students, parents, and educators. Once a school has measured the school climate and identified areas for improvement (e.g., increased supervision in hallways, professional development on cultural diversity), educators need to consider ways to change the school norms, values, and expectations. Integrated and multi-tiered models are often the most effective approaches (Psanos, 2013).

Moreover, improving student behavior and academic performance generally requires changing the school climate and school culture. Change may require moving individuals and organizations along a continuum. This process takes time to accomplish. While making positive changes in school climate motivates staff and students to improve, the district-level school culture must also change if school reforms are to be sustained for long-term improvement. Both school climate and school culture require significant attention when a principal or superintendent is new or when major changes are being implemented in the school system. It is worth noting that educational reform under the No School Left Behind Act is essentially a long-term effort to change school culture (Tableman & Herron, 2004).

A positive school climate is recognized as an important target for school reform and improving behavioral, academic, and mental health outcomes for students. Specifically, schools with positive climates tend to have fewer student discipline problems and aggressive and violent behavior, and fewer high school suspensions (Smith, 2008). Research has also shown associations between school climate and lower

levels of alcohol and drug use, bullying, and harassment (Attar-Schwartz, 2009; Thapa et al., 2013; Gregory et al., 2010).

In addition to reducing students' exposure to risk factors, school climate can promote positive youth development. For example, a favorable school climate has been linked with higher student academic motivation and engagement, as well as elevated psychological well-being. Not surprisingly, schools promoting engaging learning environments tend to have fewer student absences and improvements in academic achievement across grade levels (Fox, 2010).

Institutional integrity refers to the school's capacity to deal with destructive outside forces including community demands are accepted even when they are not consistent with the educational program just to give in to their demands and make the relationship mutual. An example of this is when a few vocal parents can change school policy or the school is open to the whims of the public.

Moreover, *collegial leadership* means the principal lets faculty know what is expected of them and then conducts meaningful evaluations. The school head or the principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist and looks out for the personal welfare of faculty members. Further, the principal goes out of his or her way to show appreciation to teachers.

Resource influence refers to principal's ability to lobby for the needs of the school. *Teacher affiliation* is observed through positive interactions, feelings, and trust among colleagues. More so, *academic emphasis* happens when students are cooperative during classroom instruction. Students respect others who get good grades. Students try hard to improve on previous work. Students neglect to complete homework and students seek extra work so they can get good grades.

A positive school climate also has benefits for teachers and education support professionals. Research shows that when educators feel supported by their administration, they report higher levels of commitment and more collegiality. Likewise, schools where educators openly communicate with one another, feel supported by their peers and administration, and establish strong student-educator relationships tend to have better student academic and behavioral outcomes. School climate efforts also have the potential of increasing job satisfaction and teacher retention, which is a major concern given the high rate of turnover in the field of education (Cohen and Geier, 2010; Walters, 2012; Smith, Connolly, & Pryseski, 2014).

2.3 Quality of Work Life

The role of the human resource department in quality of work life (QWL) efforts varies widely. In some organizations, top management appoints an executive to ensure that QWL and productivity efforts occur throughout the organization. In most cases, these executives have a small staff and must rely on the human resource department for help with employee training, communications, attitude survey feedback, and similar assistance. In other organizations, the department is responsible for initiating and

directing the firm's QWL and productivity efforts. Perhaps the most crucial role of the department is winning the support of key managers (Omugo, Onuoha, & Akhigbe, 2016). Historically, quality of work life is reputed to have originated from an international labor relations conference in New York. While there seems to be no agreed-upon definition of quality of work life, it has been used as a construct which relates to the well-being of employees. Some say that Mills (1978) may have first coined the term 'quality of work life' and he suggested that QWL had moved into the permanent vocabulary of both unions and management. From a business perspective, quality of work life (QWL) is important since there is evidence demonstrating that the nature of the work environment is related to satisfaction of employees and work-related behaviors (Elamparuthi & Jumbulingam, 2014).

Management support, particularly top management support, appears to be an almost universal prerequisite for successful QWL programs. By substantiating employee satisfaction and bottom-line benefits, which range from lower absenteeism and turnover to higher productivity and fewer accidents, the department can help convince doubting managers (Srivastava & Kanpur, 2014). The policies and practices of the department also influence motivation and satisfaction indirectly. Rigorous enforced safety and health programs, for example, can give employees and supervisors a greater sense of safety from accidents and industrial health hazards. The motivation and satisfaction of employees act as feedback on the organization's QWL and on the department's day-to-day activities (Sinha, 2012).

Quality of work life is the existence of a certain set of organizational conditions or practices. This definition frequently argues that a high quality of work life exists when democratic management practices are used, employee's jobs are enriched, employees are treated with dignity and safe working conditions exist. In recent years the phrase "Quality of life" has been used with increasing frequency to describe certain environmental and humanistic values neglected by industrial productivity and economic growth. Within business organizations attention has been focused on the quality of human experience in the workplace (Swamy, Nanjundeswaraswamy, & Rashmi, 2015; Bolhari, Rezaeean, Bolhari, Bairamzadeh & Soltan, 2011).

Moreover, quality of work life refers to the level of satisfaction, motivation, involvement and commitment individuals experience with respect to their lives at work. Quality of work life is the degree to which individuals are able to satisfy their important personal needs while employed by the firm. Companies interested in enhancing employees' quality of work life generally try to instill in employees' feelings of security, equity, pride, internal democracy, ownership, autonomy, responsibility and flexibility (Talebi, PakdelBonab, Zemestani & Aghdami, 2012). They try to treat employees in a fair and supportive manner, open communication channels at all levels, offer employees opportunities to participate in decisions affecting them and empower them to carry on with their assignments. It has also been associated with organizational changes aimed at increasing the levels of job widening and job enrichment (Kheradmand, Valilou & Lotfi, 2010; Elamparuthi & Jumbulingam, 2014).

Some authors define the quality of work life as the physical, mental and emotional well-being of employees at work. Although most organizations today consider that the quality of work life is extremely important, most often organizational strategies do not reflect it. This can affect employees' professional satisfaction and encourage withdrawal behaviors (absenteeism and or resignation). Therefore, improving conditions at work can lead to greater performance, driven by the individuals' loyalty, as well as to a better quality of life in society (Kheradmand, Valilou & Lotfi, 2010).

To note, scholars and practitioners regained an interest in the study of QWL and this concept has become of renewed concern and increased importance to the organization and its human resources both in terms of employee job satisfaction and in terms of the ultimate performance of the organization. People began to know more about quality of work life when the United Auto Workers and General Motors introduced a QWL program for work reform (Beer et al., 1985; May, Lau and Johnson, 1999). The list of QWL factors and literature review is not meant to be exhaustive of all possible theories or variables rather the emphasis in this study is placed on testing the relative frequency with which various QWL factors emerge while analyzing employees' versions of high-quality working-life experiences (Hannif, Burgess & Connell, 2008).

More so, QWL is also found to affect employees' work responses in terms of organizational identification, job satisfaction, job involvement, job effort, job performance, intention to quit, organizational turnover and personal alienation. QWL is said to differ from job satisfaction but QWL is thought to lead to job satisfaction. QWL refers to the impact of the workplace on satisfaction in work life (job satisfaction), satisfaction in non-work life domains, and satisfaction with overall life. Some researchers see QWL as a hierarchy of concepts that include non-work domains such as life satisfaction, job satisfaction and more work-specific facets of job satisfaction including such things as pay, co-workers, and supervisor. Although QWL originated over three decades ago, the interest in the construct has not waned entirely (Elamparuthi & Jumbulingam, 2014).

Crucially, the idea is that of attaining higher levels of involvement and thereby motivation by improving the attractiveness of the work itself rather than through improving the terms and conditions of work. Quality of life phenomena explored in early studies included job satisfaction (measured by employee turnover, absenteeism or attitude surveys), organizational climate and the learning of new tasks (Akedere, 2006). One of the main capabilities of organizations is to provide an environment favorable to talent development, known in the literature as an environment that supports quality of work life. The quality of work life expresses a philosophy, a set of principles that highlight the fact that people represent the most important resource in an organization and deserve to be treated with dignity and respect (Chelte, 1983; Haniff, Burgess, & Connell, 2008).

However, many firms have questioned their viability in increasingly competitive world markets. These dual concerns have created a growing interest in the possibilities of redesigning the nature of work. Many current organizational experiments seek to

improve both productivity for the organization and the quality of working life for its members. Quality can be assessed by factors like performance, reliability, aesthetics, and complying with customer requirements. Quality refers to freedom from wastage, freedom from trouble and freedom from failure (Mejbel, Almsafir, Siron & Alnaser, 2013).

2.4 Correlation between Measures

The school climate influences the quality of work life: fairness (perceived organizational justice), supervision, organizational decisions, professionalism, education, professional feedback, promotion opportunities, correct wages, positive relationships, autonomy and professional recognition. The most important indicators used in the operationalization of the 'quality of work life' concept. Working conditions refer to the physical environment supposed to facilitate professional activity and not affect the employee's health. Health status has a significant influence on work performance and motivation, and can lead to job loss, decreased productivity and increased staff turnover. Therefore, the employer and the social policies provide some protective measures: free health monitoring services, reduction of the working time duration, and alternating with mandatory rest periods, among others (Srivastava and Kanpur, 2014).

Organizations are also developing as communities of practice, which build common values and cultures that emphasize social relationships (Wenger, 1998). This is a shift away from viewing the workplace in technical or systems terms, to one that understands organizations as cultures in which people, their needs and desires, and their interpersonal relationships, play a central role. That is why conflicts may arise if an employee realizes that her co-workers do not share her values. For example, an employee who values hard work may resent co-workers who are lazy or unproductive without being reprimanded (Spector, Bauer and Fox, 2010).

Organizational learning capability is the organizational and managerial characteristics that facilitate the organizational learning process or allow an organization to learn as a whole (Onağ, Tepeci, Başalp, 2014). It is also defined as an intrinsic ability of an organization because of which the organization creates, enriches, and utilizes knowledge to outperform its competitors in terms of its competitiveness and performance. Organizational learning capability implies a complex, multidimensional, and dynamic concept. For instance, according to Jerez-Gómez et al. (2005), the dimensions of OLC are managerial commitment, systems perspective, openness and experimentation, and knowledge transfer and integration.

Grounded on the above literature, the variables of the study are: organizational learning capability, school climate and quality of work life. The readings and relevant studies are useful to the presentation of the study. These are the strong, organized, structured, and supporting findings, theories and principles for the claim of the concept in which this study is presented. These literatures are helpful in determining the significant relationship between organizational learning capability and quality of work life, and school climate and quality of work life. This will also be a basis for the presentation, results and findings of the study.

3. Material and Methods

This study used a non-experimental, descriptive-correlation research design. Non-experimental research, defined as any kind of quantitative or qualitative research that is not an experiment, is the predominant kind of research design used in the social sciences (Reio, 2016). In non-experimental research, researchers gather data without making changes or introducing treatments. In this study, the variables were not manipulated and the setting was not controlled. Descriptive-correlation research design describes and interprets what is, and reveals conditions and relationships that exist and do not exist (Calderon, 2006; Calmorin, 2007; Gehle, 2013). This is also correlational in collecting the primary data. The interest of the study is to investigate the relationship between organizational learning capability and quality of work life, and the relationship between school climate and quality of work life (Calmorin, 2017).

The descriptive research design was used to determine the different levels of organizational learning capability, school climate and quality of work life among TLE teachers in Matanao, Bansalan, Magsaysay, Davao del Sur.

This study used regression analysis to predict the dependent variable by the independent variables. Predictive analysis is a statistical method that utilizes algorithms and machine learning to identify trends in data and predict future behaviors. Because predictive analysis goes beyond sorting and describing data, it relies heavily on complex models designed to make inferences about the data it encounters. These models utilize algorithms and machine learning to analyze past and present data in order to provide future trends. Predictive analysis is the attempt to predict what could happen. To do this, we need to dig into data and pull out the pieces that can help answer that question. You may have heard of the term data mining to describe such analysis (Gibbs, 2016).

This study was conducted in public secondary schools in Davao del Sur. It is part of Region XI in the Philippines. Davao del Sur is located on the southeastern portion of Mindanao. It consists of five provinces, namely: Davao de Oro, Davao del Norte, Davao del Sur, Davao Oriental, and Davao Occidental. The region encloses the Davao Gulf and its regional center is Davao City. The respondents of the study were the secondary Technology and Livelihood Education teachers of Matanao, Bansalan and Magsaysay, Davao del Sur. To include everyone in this study, a universal sampling was used. A total of 128 TLE teachers participated in this study. The respondents of the study were public school teachers with regular teaching positions with at least one year of teaching experience. However, the voluntary participation of the respondents was emphasized to them. The study did not include the school heads and non-teaching staff. This study was conducted from May to July of School Year 2020-2021.

There were three sets of adapted questionnaires used in this research. For Independent Variables, the first part of the questionnaire deals with organizational learning capability. The instrument was adapted and modified from the study of Onag et al. (2014). There are seven indicators for this variable, namely: knowledge sharing; dialogue; participative decision-making; managerial commitment; experimentation and

openness; knowledge transfer; and risk-taking. The second set of instruments employed was to measure school climate with the following indicators: institutional integrity; collegial leadership; resource influence; teacher affiliation; and academic emphasis (Psanos, 2013).

For the dependent variable, the third set of adapted questionnaires used was to assess the quality of work life of TLE teachers. The questionnaire was adapted and modified from the study of Swamy et al. (2015) with nine indicators. These are: work environment, organization culture and climate, relation and cooperation, training and development, compensation and reward, facilities, job satisfaction and job security, the autonomy of work, and adequacy of resources.

Survey questionnaires were adapted and validated by experts and had undergone reliability tests by piloting them and employed Cronbach's alpha in determining the reliability level. The Cronbach's alpha for organizational learning capability is 0.959 which means excellent, school climate is 0.949 or excellent, and quality of work life is 0.951 or excellent.

In gathering the needed data, it followed a procedure. First, the researcher sent a letter of permission to the Department of Education Schools Division Superintendent. The researcher also sent a letter addressed to the different school heads for the researcher to conduct the study to the teachers in their respective schools. After the approval of letters, an electronic copy of the informed consent form and the google form of survey questionnaires can be accessed through a link that was sent to the respondents as an alternative process in gathering the data to avoid face-to-face survey. This is consistent to the health protocol standard set by the IATF because of Covid-19 pandemic. The consent form can be found in the first section of the survey's online forms. The respondents will be asked to agree to the consent form before participating in the survey.

The researcher gives sufficient time to the respondents to answer the questions. The accomplished results were checked and tallied. After the checking and tallying of results, data were analyzed and interpreted by the researcher with the help of experts guided by the objectives of the study.

For a more comprehensive interpretation and analysis of the data, the following statistical tools were utilized. Mean was employed to determine the level of organizational learning capability, school climate and quality of work life of TLE teachers. Panneerslvam (2008) defined mean as the ratio between the sum of the observations and the number of observations. Pearson Product Moment Correlation (Pearson r) was employed to determine if the relationship among organizational learning capability, school climate and quality of work life of TLE teachers are really significant. Pearson r correlation is the most widely used correlation statistic to measure the degree of the relationship between linearly related variables. Pearson r correlation is used to measure the degree of relationship between the two, Hatch, et al., (1982). Regression Analysis was employed to prove if organizational learning capability and school climate can predict the quality of work life. Regression analysis also allows us to compare the effects of variables measured on different scales such as the effect of price changes and

the number of promotional activities. Regression analysis can also help to make predictions. Regression analysis is a way of fitting a "best" line through a series of observations. By "best" line we mean that it is fitted in such a way that it minimizes the sum of squared differences between the observations and the line itself, Sarstedt, M., and Mooi, E. (2014).

4. Results and Discussion

The results and discussions of the data gathered are based on the objectives of the study. Data were obtained from the respondents, and tables were arranged in the following subheadings: level of organizational learning capability, level of school climate, level of quality of work life, correlation matrix and linear regression analysis results.

In Table 1, the level of organizational learning capability has a weighted mean of 4.22 with a standard deviation of 0.49 and an interpretation of very high. The results show that managerial commitment has the highest mean value of 4.38 or very high. Meanwhile, the managerial commitment is followed by a dialogue with a mean value of 4.32 described as very high, then knowledge transfer, 4.28 or very high and the indicator with the lowest mean of 4.08 or high is risk-taking. Generally, the organizational learning capability of TLE teachers is manifested at all times.

Table 1: Perceived level of organizational learning capability

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Level
Knowledge sharing	4.17	0.587	High
Dialogue	4.32	0.599	Very high
Participative decision-making	4.13	0.607	High
Managerial commitment	4.38	0.509	Very high
Experimental and openness	4.16	0.568	High
Knowledge transfer	4.28	0.591	Very high
Risk-taking	4.08	0.601	High
Overall	**4.22**	**0.492**	**Very high**

The overall level of organizational learning capability is due to the very high rating from the responses which are mostly very high levels. The indicator with the highest-level mean rating is *managerial commitment*. The other indicators: dialogue and knowledge transfer have also had very high ratings which were the product of the very high scores rated by the teacher-respondents in the specific items such as *policies are significantly influenced by the view of employees, errors and failures are always discussed and analyzed in this firm, on all levels*, and *new work processes that may be useful to the organization as a whole*. This implies that organizational learning capability is manifested at all times among TLE teachers.

The study of Ozan Onağa, Tepecib, and Başalp (2014) on organizational learning capability highlight the organizational and managerial characteristics that facilitate the organizational learning process or allow an organization to learn. They also defined

organizational learning as the intrinsic ability of an organization because which the organization creates, enriches, and utilizes knowledge to outperform its competitors in terms of its competitiveness and performance. Organizational learning capability implies a complex, multidimensional, and dynamic concept.

Moreover, the study of Jurgenfeld and Lins (2011) confirmed that organizational learning capability has a positive influence on organizations' performance. In healthcare organizations, an increase in staff learning increases both staff performance and organizational performance, which then increases patient satisfaction as well. Therefore, it is important to examine OLC in healthcare organizations. In this study, it is aimed to determine the level of OLC perception of employees working in private healthcare organizations.

As seen in Table 2, the level of teacher affiliation has the highest mean value of 4.41 or very high, followed by collegial leadership, 4.30 or very high, then academic emphasis, 4.08 or high, resource influence got a mean value of 3.99 or high, institutional integrity has a mean value of 3.62 or high. The level of school climate has an overall mean value of 4.08 or is interpreted as high with an overall standard deviation of 0.40.

Table 2: Extent of school climate

Indicators	**Mean**	**SD**	**Descriptive Level**
Institutional integrity	3.62	0.588	High
Collegial leadership	4.30	0.706	Very high
Resource influence	3.99	0.562	High
Teacher affiliation	4.41	0.528	Very high
Academic emphasis	4.08	0.565	High
Overall	**4.08**	**0.402**	**High**

The *high* level of school climate of TLE teachers is attributed to the high ratings given to indicators such as; *institutional integrity, resource influence*, and *academic emphasis*. Meanwhile, *collegial leadership* and *teacher affiliation* were rated very high by the teachers. This finding validates the idea of Galimaka (2008) who stated that school climate reform is a scientifically sound strategy that promotes healthy relationships, school connectedness and student engagement. The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) includes school climate as a strategy for dropout prevention, and the U.S. Department of Education recommends school climate reform as an evidence-based strategy to prevent violence. In fact, the U.S. Department of Education is investing in school climate improvement efforts as a fundamentally important school reform strategy.

Furthermore, the result is also supported by the study by Smith, Connolly, and Pryseski in 2014 that explains school climate as a way students, teachers, and parents view their school climate as a strong predictor of social, emotional, and academic outcomes. When the school climate is seen as a positive one, there are fewer behavior problems, increased academic achievement, higher self-esteem, and more commitment to the school. In order to achieve a positive school climate, collaboration among stakeholders, best practice techniques, effective evaluations, and useful resources are

needed. Principals/administrators are pivotal to defining, promoting, and sustaining a positive school climate. Research has shown that the leadership of a school principal directly impacts the climate of the school and, in turn, the achievement of its students.

As shown in Table 3 the level of quality of work life of the teachers with an overall weighted mean score of 4.26 and a standard deviation of 0.43 has an interpretation of very high. For specific items' results, the highest mean job satisfaction and job security have a mean value of 4.49 or very high, organization culture and climate, training and development, compensation and rewards, and autonomy of work, with mean values rating of 4.45, 4.43, 4.26, and 4.20 and a descriptive interpretation of very high. Followed by other indicators with results revealed mean values of 4.09, 4.14, 4.16, and 4.17 for the work environment, facilities, relation and co-operation, and adequacy of resources. All four aforementioned items got a descriptive interpretation of high.

Table 3: Level of quality of work life

Indicators	**Mean**	**SD**	**Descriptive Level**
Work environment	4.09	0.555	High
Organization culture and climate	4.45	0.490	Very high
Relation and co-operation	4.16	0.530	High
Training and development	4.43	0.518	Very high
Compensation and rewards	4.26	0.619	Very high
Facilities	4.14	0.546	High
Job satisfaction and job security	4.49	0.487	Very high
Autonomy of work	4.20	0.502	Very high
Adequacy of resources	4.17	0.637	High
Overall	**4.26**	**0.431**	**Very high**

The *very high* level of quality of work life among TLE teachers is due to the very high rating given by the respondents. Public-school teachers have also very high levels of organization culture and climate, training and development, compensation and rewards, job satisfaction and job security, and autonomy of work. These results are congruent with the views of Sinha (2012) and Srivastava and Kanpur (2014) who explain that management support appears to be an almost universal prerequisite for successful QWL programs. By substantiating employee satisfaction and bottom-line benefits, which range from lower absenteeism and turnover to higher productivity and fewer accidents, the department can help convince doubting managers. The policies and practices of the department also influence motivation and satisfaction indirectly. Rigorous enforced safety and health programs, for example, can give employees and supervisors a greater sense of safety from accidents and industrial health hazards. The motivation and satisfaction of employees act as feedback on the organization's QWL and on the department's day-to-day activities.

Pearson r correlation coefficient was run to determine a significant relationship between organizational learning capability and the quality of work life of teachers. Results showed in Table 4 that there was a significant relationship between OLC and QWL. This is evident in the correlation coefficient of 0.000 at $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance.

This leads the researcher to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between OLC and QWL of teachers. This result implies that the higher the OLC the higher also is the QWL among TLE teachers. Moreover, this relationship is seen to be significantly high since all the indicators of OLC and OWL are significantly related.

Table 4: Correlation organizational learning capability and quality of work life

Quality of Work Life	**Organizational Learning Capability**							
	KS	**DI**	**PDM**	**MC**	**EO**	**KT**	**RT**	**Overall**
Work environment	.635**	.625**	.632**	.673**	.612**	.523**	.545**	.714**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Organization culture and climate	.720**	.783**	.612**	.634**	.586**	.636**	.436**	.743**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Relation and co-operation	.688**	.679**	.624**	.605**	.619**	.565**	.518**	.725**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Training and development	.518**	.482**	.487**	.417**	.437**	.423**	.401**	.535**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Compensation and rewards	.606**	.557**	.607**	.532**	.553**	.489**	.379**	.627**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Facilities	.577**	.472**	.523**	.479**	.456**	.453**	.370**	.561**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Job satisfaction and job security	.589**	.585**	.525**	.491**	.530**	.543**	.406**	.619**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Autonomy of work	.576**	.583**	.573**	.546**	.566**	.488**	.515**	.649**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Adequacy of resources	.590**	.621**	.565**	.523**	.601**	.568**	.445**	.660**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Overall	.768**	.751**	.721**	.685**	.695**	.655**	.560**	.815**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

** p<0.01 * p<0.05

As presented in Table 5, the result of the test of the relationship between school climate and quality of work life. Reflected in the hypothesis, the relationship was tested at a 0.05 level of significance. The correlation coefficient of .000 at $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance means a rejection of the null hypothesis. It means that there is a significant relationship between school climate and the quality of work life of TLE teachers. This shows that the TLE teachers' school climate is correlated with their quality of work life.

Table 5: Correlation matrix of school climate and quality of work life

Quality of Work Life	**School Climate**					
	Institutional integrity	**Collegial leadership**	**Resource influence**	**Teacher affiliation**	**Academic emphasis**	**Overall**
Work environment	.206*	.736**	.596**	.591**	.451**	.767**
	.020	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Organization culture and climate	.126	.622**	.427**	.632**	.498**	.681**
	.155ns	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Relation and co-operation	.125	.694**	.533**	.670**	.543**	.758**
	.161ns	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

Training and development	.171	.373**	.276**	.311**	.243**	.408**
	.054ns	.000	.002	.000	.006	.000
Compensation and rewards	.206*	.480**	.380**	.361**	.295**	.512**
	.020	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000
Facilities	.119	.447**	.444**	.364**	.303**	.497**
	.181ns	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000
Job satisfaction and job security	.131	.432**	.403**	.556**	.415**	.565**
	.142ns	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Autonomy of work	.265**	.529**	.411**	.430**	.397**	.602**
	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Adequacy of resources	.096	.548**	.496**	.452**	.356**	.578**
	.281ns	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Overall	.201*	.680**	.557**	.606**	.485**	.749**
	.023	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

** p<0.01 * p<0.05

Taking into consideration that some indicators of organizational learning capability and school climate showed a significant relationship with a *p*-value of .000 with .000, linear regression was employed to confirm the result.

The test of the relationship between organizational learning capability and quality of work life revealed a significant relationship. This implies that TLE teachers' organizational learning capability is correlated with their quality of work life. In other words, the increase of TLE teachers' attitude, knowledge and behavior in organizational learning capability would also likely increase their quality of work life. This finding conforms to the results of the study of Spector, Bauer and Fox in 2010. They revealed that organizational learning capability is a shift away from viewing the workplace in technical or systems terms, to one that understands organizations as cultures in which people, their needs and desires, and their interpersonal relationships, play a central role. That is why conflicts may arise if an employee realizes that co-workers do not share the same values. For example, an employee who values hard work may resent co-workers who are lazy or unproductive without being reprimanded.

Furthermore, there is a significant relationship between school climate and the quality of work life of TLE teachers. This shows that the TLE teachers' school climate is correlated with their quality of work life. As revealed in the study of Srivastava and Kanpur in 2014, the quality of work life can influence school climate: fairness, supervision, organizational decisions, professionalism, education, professional feedback, promotion opportunities, correct wages, positive relationships, autonomy and professional recognition. The most important indicators used in the operationalization of the 'quality of work life' concept.

In Table 6 stepwise linear regression was used to show the combined variables that best influence the overall quality of work life as regards knowledge sharing one of the indicators of organizational learning capability, academic emphasis, one of the indicators of school climate, dialogue, and participative decision-making as indicators of organizational learning capability.

Model 1 results revealed that knowledge sharing has a significant positive relationship with quality of work life (B=.564, p<0.01). Knowledge sharing accounts for 58.6% of the variance in quality of work life, F=181.074, p<0.01.

Model 2 results revealed that knowledge sharing and academic emphasis have a significant positive relationship with quality of work life (B=.639, p<0.01). Knowledge sharing and academic emphasis accounts for 63.9% of the variance in quality of work life, F=113.397, p<0.01.

Model 3 results revealed that knowledge sharing, academic emphasis, and dialogue have a significant positive relationship with quality of work life (B=.670, p<0.01). Knowledge sharing, academic emphasis, and dialogue accounts for 67% of the variance in quality of work life, F=86.848, p<0.01.

Model 4 results that knowledge sharing, academic emphasis, dialogue, and participative decision-making have a significant positive relationship with quality of work life (B=.683, p<0.01). Knowledge sharing, academic emphasis, dialogue and participative decision-making accounts for 68.3% of the variance in quality of work life, F=69.355, p<0.01.

Table 6: Stepwise linear regression results showing the combined variables that best influence the overall quality of work life

Regressors	**B**	**S.E.**	**B**	**T**	**Sig.**	**ΔR^2**
(Constant)	1.911	.177		10.820	.000	0.586
Knowledge sharing	.564	.042	.768	13.456	.000	
***F*=181.074, *p*<0.01**						
(Constant)	1.398	.202		6.924	.000	0.639
Knowledge sharing	.501	.042	.682	11.996	.000	
Academic emphasis	.191	.043	.250	4.399	.000	0.639
***F*=113.397, *p*<0.01**						
(Constant)	1.268	.197		6.447	.000	0.670
Knowledge sharing	.318	.065	.433	4.884	.000	
Academic emphasis	.167	.042	.220	3.992	.000	
Dialogue	.228	.064	.318	3.555	.001	0.670
***F*=86.848, *p*<0.01**						
(Constant)	1.219	.194		6.292	.000	0.683
knowledge sharing	.241	.071	.328	3.395	.001	
Academic emphasis	.156	.041	.205	3.778	.000	
Dialogue	.186	.065	.258	2.841	.005	
Participative decision-making	.146	.059	.205	2.474	.015	0.683
***F*=69.355, *p*<0.01**						

All the indicators are predictors of quality of work life because its *p*-value is less than α .05. This implies that organizational learning capability significantly influenced the TLE teachers' conceptions of quality of work life.

Using the linear regression analysis, results showed that organizational learning capability has a significant influence on the quality of work life. Thus, it can be stated that organizational learning capability does influence the conceptions quality of work life of

TLE teachers. More so, Elamparuthi and Jumbulingam, (2014) cited that the quality of work life affects employees' work responses in terms of organizational identification, job satisfaction, job involvement, job effort, job performance, intention to quit, organizational turnover and personal alienation. Quality of work life refers to the impacts of job satisfaction, satisfaction in non-work life domains, and satisfaction with overall life.

5. Recommendations

Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, several recommendations are offered. Since there is a very high level of organizational learning capability, it is suggested that public school teachers may maintain this level or even improve for better organizational learning capability. As to their school climate, they need to strengthen institutional integrity which refers to the school's capacity to deal with destructive outside forces. This may be improved through the conduct of surveys on which services of the school need to be evaluated for improvement, discussions, and constant communication with stakeholders and between and among teachers also need to be evaluated or checked to increase institutional integrity. Furthermore, the quality of work life is already very high. The current practice may be sustained. However, it was found that the work environment has the lowest rating. The work environment can be made better by improving the quality of work life among TLE teachers. School heads and administrators can attend trainings and contemporary trends in leadership on improving the work environment of teachers.

On the other hand, attention and well-coordinated efforts may be extended to the indicators that revealed low results in terms of mean scores. More variables can be adopted to get a more comprehensive view of the organizational learning capability that can be explored with the quality of work life of TLE teachers. The span of the study can be increased to other major cities and provinces to get a more holistic view of the population. Future study is recommended in a different context to gain more array of helpful information to alleviate the quality of work life of the teachers and a study toward examining other variables that can possibly mediate the relationship between organizational learning capability and school climate which will be significant to the research community may be taken into consideration.

6. Conclusion

As can be gleaned from the findings of the study, conclusions are drawn in this section. Results showed that the level of organizational learning capability among TLE teachers is very high, the level of their school climate is high and the level of quality of work life is very high. There are significant relationships between organizational learning capability and quality of work life, school climate and quality of work life. In addition, organizational learning capability significantly influences the TLE teachers' quality of work life.

The findings of the study affirmed the motivational theories of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg's Two-factor Theory, and McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y. The higher the organizational learning capability the higher also is the quality of work life among TLE teachers.

This study supported the propositions of Gymbrah and Hanson 2017 on the influence of organizational learning on the quality of work of employees and Walton (1973) on the quality of work life and organizational climate of schools. When school heads provide a better working environment and opportunities for the teachers to contribute to organizational well-being, these can lead to a better quality of work life.

Acknowledgements
We would like to thank the Department of Education specifically the Division of Davao del Sur for the approval of our request to conduct a survey for data collection.

Conflict of Interest Statement
The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Author(s)
Charity Mae C. Ang is a Teacher - II of Tacul Agricultural High School. She is a candidate for the degree of Master of Arts in Education (Technology and Livelihood Education).
Dr. Viola P. Buenaventura is a College Professor 1 and the Discipline Chair for Social Sciences of the Department of Arts and Sciences of UM Digos College, Philippines.

References

Ahmed, P. K. (1998). Culture and climate for innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 1*(1), 30-43. https://doi.org/10.1108/14601069810199131

Akdere, M. (2006). Improving quality of work-life: Implications for human resources. The Business Review, Cambridge, 6 (1), 173-177.

Akgün, A. E., Ince, H., Imamoglu, S. Z., Keskin, H., & Kocoglu, İ. (2014). The mediator role of learning capability and business innovativeness between total quality management and financial performance. *International Journal of Production Research*, *52*(3), 888-901.

Alegre, J., & Chiva, R. (2008). Assessing the impact of organizational learning capability on product innovation performance: An empirical test. Technovation, 28(6), 315–326.

Alegre, J., & Chiva, R. (2013). Linking entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance: The role of organizational learning capability and innovation performance. *Journal of Small Business Management, 51*(4), 491-507. https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12005

Attar-Schwartz, S. (2009). Peer sexual harassment victimization at school: The roles of student characteristics, cultural affiliation, and school factors. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 79(3), 407-420. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016553

Aydoğan E, Orhan F, Naldöken Ü, Beylik U, Aksay K. (2011). Organizational learning capacity in medical institutions: example of a public hospital. *Cumhuriyet Univ JEAS, 12*(2), 191-213.

Beer, Michael, Bert Spector, Paul Lawrence, D. Q. Mills, and Richard Walton (1985). Human Resource Management: A General Manager's Perspective: Text and Cases. New York: Free Press.

Boff, L. H., & Antonello, C. S. (2011). Descaminhos: aprendizagem e conhecimento organizacional versus organizac¸ões que aprendem e gestão do conhecimento. In: Antonello, C. S. & Godoy, A.S. (Org.), Aprendizagem organizacional no Brasil. Porto Alegre: Bookman.

Bolhari, A., Rezaeean, A., Bolhari, J., Bairamzadeh., and Amir Arzi Soltan (2011). The Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Demographic Characteristics of Information Technology Staffs. *International Conference on Computer Communication and Management, 5*, 374-378.

Calderon J. (2006). Methods of research and thesis writing (2nd Ed.) National Bookstore.

Calmorin L., P. & Calmorin M. A. (2007). Research Methods and Thesis Writing. Rex Book Store, Inc.

Çelik V. (2014). The effects of organizational learning capacity and innovativeness on financial performance. *Balikesir Univ J Social Sci Inst, 17*(31), 193-212

Chelte, A. F. (1983). *Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Quality of Work Life*. U.M.I. Dissertation Information Service.

Chiva, R., & Alegre, J. (2005). Organizational learning and organizational knowledge: Towards the integration of two approaches. *Management Learning, 36*(1), 49–68.

Chiva, R., Alegre, J., & Lapiedra, R. (2007). Measuring organisational learning capability among the workforce. *International Journal of Manpower, 28*(3/4), 224-242. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720710755227

Cohen, J. (2006). Social, emotional, ethical, and academic education: Creating a climate for learning, participation in democracy, and well-being. Harvard Educational Review, 76(2), 201-237. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.76.2.j44854x1524644vn

Cohen, J. & Geier, V.K. (2010). School Climate Research Summary: January 2010. New York, N.Y. Retrieved on February 21, 2018 from: www.schoolclimate.org/climate/research.php

Easterby-Smith, M., & Lyles, M. (2003). Re-reading Organizational Learning: Selective memory, forgetting, and adaptation. Academy of Management Perspectives, 17(2), 51–55. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2003.10025192

Elamparuthi, S.J (2014). Significance of Quality of Work Life in Small Scale Industries, Employees in Cuddalore, European Journal of Commerce and Management Research 3(1), 26-31.

Farzianpour, F., Irani, A., & Foroushani, A. R. (2016). Determine the level of organizational learning capability in teaching hospitals in Bandar Abbas City – Iran. *Health, 08*(01), 24-31. https://doi.org/10.4236/health.2016.81004

Fox, R. S. (2010). School climate improvement: A challenge to the school administrator. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa International, 408 N. Union Street, P.O. Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402-0789. 800-766-1156.

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2010). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85*(1), 199–220. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02032.x

Galimaka, D. B. (2012). Organisational climate, organisational learning, innovation and academic achievement in government-aided primary schools in Kampala District. Makerere University Institutional Repository. http://makir.mak.ac.ug/handle/10570/2529

Gibbs, M. (2016). *Predictive Analysis: Definition & Examples*. Retrieved from https://study.com/academy/lesson/predictive-analysis-definition-examples.html.

Goh, S., & Richards, G. (1997). Benchmarking the learning capability of organization. European Management Journal, 15(5), 575-583. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0263-2373(97)00036-4

Gomes, G., & Wojahn, R. M. (2017). Organizational learning capability, innovation and performance: study in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMES). Revista de Administração, 52(2), 163-175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rausp.2016.12.003

Gregory, A., Cornell, D., Fan, X., Sheras, P., Shih, T., & Huang, F. (2010). Authoritative school discipline: High school practices associated with lower bullying and victimization. Journal of Educational Psychology, 102(2), 483-496. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018562

Gyambrah, M. & Hanson, P. (2017) Influence of Organizational Learning on the Quality of Work of Employees in Selected Ghanai an Organization. IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science Volume 22, Issues 8, Ver III, pp. 39-47.

Gunday, G., Ulusoy, G., Kilic, K., & Alpkan, L. (2011). Effects of innovation types on firm performance. *International Journal of Production Economics, 133*(2), 662–676. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2011.05.014.

Hannif, Z., Burgess, J., & Connell, J. (2008). Call centres and the quality of work life: Towards a research agenda. *Journal of Industrial Relations, 50*(2), 271-284. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022185607087902

Hatch, J. P., Hearne, E. M., & Clark, G. M. (1982). A method of testing for serial correlation in univariate repeated-measures analysis of variance. *Behavior Research Methods & Instrumentation, 14*(5), 497-498. https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03203324

Haynes, N. M., Emmons, C., & Comer, J. P. (1993). *Elementary and middle school climate survey*. New Haven, CT. Yale University Child Study Center.

Jerez-Gómez, P., Céspedes-Lorente, J., & Valle-Cabrera, R. (2005). Organizational learning capability: A proposal of measurement. *Journal of Business Research, 58*(6), 715-725. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.11.002

Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Cegarra-Navarro, J. G. (2007). The performance effect of organizational learning and market orientation. Industrial Marketing Management, 36(6), 694–708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2006.02.008

Julien, P. A. (2013). Introdução: uma definição da PME. In: Julien P. A. (Org.). O estado da arte da pequena e média empresa: fundamentos e desafios. Florianópolis: Ed.

Jurgenfeld, V., & Lins, H. N. (2011). A projeção asiática da indústria têxtil e vestuarista catarinense nos anos 2000: estudo sobre três experiências no Vale do Itajaí DOI:10.5007/2175-8085.2010v13n2p11. Textos de Economia, 13(2), 11–34. https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-8085.2010v13n2p11

Kheradmand, E., Valilou, M., & Lotfi, A. (2010) The relation between Quality of work life and Job Performance. Middle–East Journal of Scientific Research 6(4), 317-323.

Kitratporn, P., & Puncreobutr, V. (2016). Transformational Leadership and Organizational Climate of Educational Institutions Along Thai-Cambodian Borders. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences.* https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2016.v7n3s1p470

May, B., Lau, R. & Johnson, S. K. (1999) A longitudinal study of quality of work life and business performance. South Dakota Business Review, 58(2), 1–7.

Mejbel, A., Almsafir, M., Siron, R., and Ahmad Alnaser, A. (2013). The Drivers of Quality of Working Life (QWL): A Critical Review. Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 7(10), 398-405.

Omugo, O. H., Onuoha, B. C. and Akhigbe, J. O. (2016). Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment in Public sector Organizations in Rivers State. *International Journal of Novel Research in Humanities and Social Sciences, 3*(3), 35-44.

Onağ, A. O., Tepeci, M., & Başalp, A. A. (2014). Organizational learning capability and its impact on firm innovativeness. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 150,* 708-717. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.029

Osgood, B., Siripuram, A., & Wu, W. (2012). Discrete Sampling and Interpolation: Universal Sampling Sets for Discrete Bandlimited Spaces. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 58*(7), 4176–4200. https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2012.2193871

Psanos, B. (2013). *Teacher perceptions of school climate based on positive behavior intervention and supports (PBIS) and Olweus bullying prevention program (OBPP) implementation.* Middle Tennessee State University. Retrieved from https://jewlscholar.mtsu.edu/bitstream/handle/mtsu/3582/Psanos_mtsu_0170N_10161.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Panneerselvam, R. (2008). *Research Method*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Limited

Reio, T. G. (2016). Nonexperimental research: Strengths, weaknesses and issues of precision. European Journal of Training and Development, 40(8/9), 676-690. https://doi.org/10.1108/ejtd-07-2015-0058

Sarstedt, M., & Mooi, E. (2014). Regression Analysis. Springer Texts in Business and Economics, 193–233. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-53965-7_7

Sinha, C. (2012). Factors affecting quality of work life: empirical evidence from Indian Organizations. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, 1*(11), 31-40.

Smith, K. M. (2008). The impact of district and school climate on student achievement. *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-ewch-0e52

Smith, T., Connolly, F. and Pryseski, C. (2014). Positive School Climate: What It Looks Like and How It Happens. Nurturing Positive School Climate for Student Learning and Professional Growth. Baltimore Education Research Consortium.

Srivastava, S., & Kanpur, R. (2014). A study on quality of work life: Key elements & it's implications. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 16(3), 54-59. https://doi.org/10.9790/487x-16315459

Statham, J., A. Harris, et al. (2010). Strengthening Family Wellbeing and Community Cohesion through the Role of Schools and Extended Services. Schools and Communities.

Swamy, D., Nanjundeswaraswamy, T., Rashmi, S. (2015). Quality of Work Life: Scale Development and Validation. International Journal of Caring Sciences. 8(2), 281-300.

Tableman, B., & Herron, A. (2004). School climate and learning. Best Practices Briefs, 31, 1-10. https://www.outrech.msu.edu

Talebi, B., Pakdel Bonab, M., Zemestani, G., & Aghdami, N. (2012). Investigation the Relationship between the Employee's Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Their Effectiveness in Banking. *European Journal of Experimental Biology, 2*(5), 1839-1842.

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. Review of Educational Research, 83(3), 357-385. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483907

Tohidi, H., & Jabbari, M. M. (2012). Measuring organizational learning capability. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31, 428-432. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.079

Vos, D., van der Westhuizen, P. C., Mentz, P. J., & Ellis, S. M. (2012). Educators and the quality of their work environment: an analysis of the organisational climate in primary schools. South African Journal of Education, 32(1), 56–68. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v32n1a520

Walton, R. E. (1973). Quality of Working Life: What Is It?, *Sloan Management Review 15*(1), 11-21.

Walters, S. (2012). *School Climate: A Literature Review.* Temescal Associates.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.