International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies, 8(5) 2025, pages: 2187-2197

ISSN: 2617-6548

URL: www.ijirss.com

Impact of agile leadership, organizational learning, and social capital on competitive advantage: The mediating role of sustainable organisational performance

Mohammad Adam Husein[1*], Setyo Riyanto[1], Mafizatun Nurhayati[1], Suprapto[1]

[1]*Doctoral Program in Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Department of Management, Universitas Mercu Buana, Jakarta, Indonesia.*

Corresponding author: Mohammad Adam Husein (*Email: m.adamhusein@dewantara.ac.id*)

Abstract

This study aims to examine the influence of Agile Leadership, Organisational Learning, and Social Capital on Competitive Advantage, with Sustainable Organisational Performance (SOP) acting as a mediating variable in private primary schools. The study engaged 211 school principals as the primary respondents, given their strategic role in leading educational institutions. Data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) to assess the relationships among the variables. The findings reveal that SOP significantly influences Competitive Advantage and serves as a mediator that strengthens the impact of the three independent variables on competitive positioning. Agile Leadership and Social Capital have a direct positive effect on Competitive Advantage. In contrast, Organisational Learning did not demonstrate a direct impact but contributed indirectly through its positive influence on SOP. Furthermore, all three independent variables showed a significant positive relationship with Sustainable Organisational Performance. These results emphasize the pivotal role of SOP as a strategic enabler of long-term competitiveness in the private primary education sector. The practical implications of this study suggest that schools should prioritize the development of Agile Leadership, foster a culture of Organisational Learning, and invest in building Social Capital as key drivers of sustainable performance. Moreover, the findings offer valuable insights into how schools can leverage both internal capabilities and external relationships to remain relevant and competitive in an increasingly dynamic educational environment. This study contributes to the existing literature on strategic leadership and organisational development in education, serving as a valuable reference for both practitioners and policymakers.

Keywords: Agile leadership, Competitive advantage, Organizational learning, Social capital, Sustainable organizational performance.

DOI: 10.53894/ijirss.v8i5.9440
Funding: This study received no specific financial support.
History: Received: 2 July 2025 / **Revised:** 7 August 2025 / **Accepted:** 8 August 2025 / **Published:** 22 August 2025

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
Authors' Contributions: All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.
Transparency: The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. This study followed all ethical practices during writing.
Publisher: Innovative Research Publishing

1. Introduction

Parents today have become more selective in choosing schools, not only valuing academic excellence but also character development and digital-era competencies. Schools that fail to innovate and adapt to these expectations risk losing their competitive appeal. Then, primary education plays a crucial role in shaping the character and foundational competencies of learners, making the quality of primary school governance a central pillar in the success of national education systems [1]. Despite substantial government investment and the implementation of strategic programmes such as accreditation and the School Transformation Programme (*Sekolah Penggerak*), empirical evidence indicates that many private primary schools in Jakarta continue to face fundamental challenges. Low accreditation attainment limits participation in strategic initiatives, and declining student enrollment across the majority of private schools reflects a lack of competitive strength and sustainable organizational performance [2]. These problems are exacerbated by weak management systems, poor documentation and evaluation practices, limited resources, and underutilization of social capital [3-5]. These persistent problems highlight a significant gap in understanding, prompting the need for further investigation through a focused study.

As stated by Sutiah et al. [6] a high-performing school must foster not only short-term satisfaction but also long-term stakeholder loyalty. Competitive advantage, according to Shah and Soomro [7], it achieved educational excellence when an institution delivers unique and inimitable value. However, such an advantage can only be sustained through strong organizational performance, especially in a rapidly changing academic landscape. School accreditation, as a mechanism of self-regulation, serves as a benchmark for quality and a means for schools to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses. Yet, many private primary schools still fall short of excellence. Farida and Setiawan [3] identified organizational performance as a critical determinant of competitive advantage, while Endri et al. [8] emphasized the need to understand the drivers of such performance to remain competitive. Despite extensive research on sustainable organisational performance in SMEs [9-12], technology industries [13] and higher education [14, 15], studies on sustainable organisational performance in private primary education remain scarce.

Leadership plays a central role in maintaining performance and building a competitive advantage. Weak leadership leads to institutional failure, while agile leadership has been shown to enhance competitiveness [16-19]. In education, Yalçın and Özgenel [20] have linked agile leadership to teacher performance; however, its broader role in maintaining school competitiveness remains under-researched. In addition to leadership, schools must adopt organizational learning practices to stay responsive to socio-economic and technological changes. Organizational learning has been proven to enhance competitiveness [21] drive innovation [22] and improve school effectiveness. However, most studies have focused on industries such as technology [23], SMEs [24], tourism [25, 26] and manufacturing [27], leaving a research gap at the level of private primary education institutions.

Moreover, schools must engage external networks and communities through social capital to address concerns about trust and quality. Ginting et al. [28] found social capital had no impact on competitive advantage in manufacturing firms, contrasting findings from Badriyah [29] in the ICT and SME sectors; the potential value of this approach is demonstrated. However, its role in educational settings remains underexplored. Therefore, this study presents a novel framework that integrates Agile Leadership, Organisational Learning, and Social Capital as antecedents of Competitive Advantage, mediated by Sustainable Organisational Performance. While Fachrunnisa et al. [17] demonstrated the impact of agile leadership on organisational outcomes in SMEs, and Gomes and Wojahn [30] showed that organizational learning fosters continuous improvement; these insights have not been widely applied in school settings. Likewise, the influence of social capital on educational competitiveness remains underexplored, though Del-Castillo-Feito et al. [31] found it critical in other sectors.

Accordingly, this study aims to investigate the direct and indirect effects of Agile Leadership, Organisational Learning, and Social Capital on Competitive Advantage, with Sustainable Organisational Performance as a mediating factor, within the context of accredited private primary schools in Jakarta. By addressing an under-researched sector and integrating multiple strategic factors, the study aims to make both theoretical and practical contributions to the field of educational management.

2. Literature Review

This study is grounded in the Resource-Based Theory (RBT), initially developed from the Resource-Based View (RBV) introduced by Wernerfelt [32] and later expanded by Barney [33] and further developed by Stoelhorst [34]. The theory argues that an organization can attain and sustain a competitive advantage by leveraging internal resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable. RBT emphasizes the strategic importance of intangible resources, such as managerial capabilities, social networks, and organizational culture, in achieving long-term success. In the context of private primary schools, RBT provides a relevant framework for assessing how human and social capital can be utilized to enhance institutional performance and competitiveness.

Additionally, Goal Setting Theory, as proposed by Locke and Latham [35] and Gkizani and Galanakis [36] supports the notion that specific and challenging goals have a significant influence on motivation and work behavior. This theory asserts that clarity of direction enables individuals and organizations to perform more effectively. Within the school context, leadership teams particularly headteachers must establish well-defined, realistic, and inspiring goals to drive continuous improvement in teaching quality and stakeholder trust.

Competitive advantage is defined as a strategic position wherein an organization delivers greater value than its competitors, either through unique services, superior resources, or innovative processes [37]. This study adopts the indicators proposed by Abiwu and Martins [5] which focuses on valuable, unique, and inimitable resources, as well as the

optimal use of human capital. These dimensions are deemed more appropriate for the education sector than models oriented toward pricing, marketing, or industrial strategy.

Sustainable organizational performance, when viewed through a sustainability lens, refers to an organization's ability to consistently achieve its goals while maintaining economic, social, and environmental responsibility [38, 39]. In line with this, the present research employs the official accreditation standards established by BAN S/M under the Ministry of Education [40]. Recent research has highlighted that SOP mediates the effect of leadership and learning on competitive outcomes [41]. These include teacher performance, school leadership, learning climate, and student learning outcomes factors, specifically tailored to evaluate school-level performance in Indonesia.

The Agile Leadership variable reflects a leadership style that is responsive, adaptable, and capable of navigating change effectively. According to Joiner and Josephs [42], agile leaders must anticipate change, build trust, initiate timely action, and conduct regular evaluations to ensure effective leadership. For education, agile leadership can empower school leaders to foster innovation and adaptability, particularly in private primary schools facing tight competition and dynamic policy shifts. Research has shown that agile leadership contributes positively to organizational performance and can influence a school's ability to sustain its competitiveness over time [43]. This study employs the Horney model, which offers a concise and practical measurement framework suited to the simpler organizational structures found in schools compared to corporate environments.

Organisational learning refers to an institution's ability to foster a learning culture, acquire and disseminate knowledge, and adapt based on experience [44, 45]. The dimensions proposed by Tohidi et al. [46] are utilized in this study, as they not only capture internal learning processes such as managerial commitment and experimentation but also external openness to parental and community feedback. This holistic approach is particularly relevant to private primary schools operating within dynamic and interconnected social environments. Finally, Social Capital encompasses the networks, trust, and shared norms that facilitate cooperation and collective action within and beyond an organization [47, 48]. This study adopts Lin's framework, which measures social capital through the organisation's ability to build collaboration, foster trust, and engage local communities. These dimensions are crucial in the educational context, where a school's sustainability and public image are closely tied to its relationships with parents, alumni, and the surrounding community. Based on the above, the purpose of this study is to investigate how agile leadership, organizational learning, and social capital contribute to enhancing competitive advantage, with sustainable organizational performance as the mediating factor. The following study hypotheses are based on the literature review:

$H_{1:}$ Agile Leadership influences Competitive Advantage.
$H_{2:}$ Organizational Learning Influences Competitive Advantage
$H_{3:}$ Social Capital influences Competitive Advantage.
$H_{4:}$ Sustainable organizational performance influences competitive advantage.
$H_{5:}$ Agile Leadership Influences Sustainable Organizational Performance.
$H_{6:}$ Organizational Learning influences Sustainable Organizational Performance.
$H_{7:}$ Social Capital Influences Sustainable Organizational Performance.
$H_{8:}$ Agile Leadership influences Competitive Advantage mediated by Sustainable Organizational Performance.
$H_{9:}$ Organizational Learning influences Competitive Advantage mediated by Sustainable Organizational Performance.
$H_{10:}$ Social Capital influences Competitive Advantage mediated by Sustainable Organizational Performance.

3. Research Methods

This study aims to investigate the role of agile leadership, organizational learning, and social capital in enhancing competitive advantage through sustainable organizational performance. This design employs a quantitative research approach. The research was conducted from November 2024 to January 2025. In addition to the quantitative survey, the study included a qualitative component through semi-structured interviews with selected school principals. These interviews aimed to gain deeper insights into the contextual factors behind the quantitative findings and to validate key themes related to agile leadership, organizational learning, and sustainable performance.

The population in this study consisted of 446 principals and vice principals from private elementary schools in Jakarta. The sample of respondents in this study consisted of 211 principals and vice principals who had followed the school accreditation process. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire used to gather quantitative research data is divided into groups of questions related to respondent identity. The sampling technique employed a purposive sampling approach, aiming to select respondents who could effectively answer the research's focus.

This study uses Partial Least Squares (PLS) Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). The systematic procedure for carrying out SEM-PLS follows the stages of Hair et al. [48]. The use of PLS-SEM is justified by the study's aim to analyze complex relationships involving multiple latent variables and mediation effects. PLS-SEM is particularly suitable for predictive research models, especially when the sample size is relatively moderate and the data may not meet strict parametric assumptions. Moreover, PLS-SEM allows the simultaneous assessment of measurement and structural models, offering robust estimations of both the reliability of constructs and the significance of hypothesized relationships [49]. The initial stage involves specifying the structural model. The second stage focuses on selecting the measurement model. The third stage encompasses data collection and examination. The fourth stage is dedicated to PLS path model estimation. The fifth stage involves assessing the PLS SEM results of the formative measurement model. The sixth stage pertains to evaluating the PLS SEM results of the structural model. The seventh stage includes advanced PLS SEM analysis.

4. Results

Based on the data collected, it is evident that the demographics of the respondents studied show that females were the majority, accounting for 58% (n = 122), compared to males, who comprised 42% (n = 89) of the sample. The most significant proportion of respondents (32%) were aged between 41 and 45 years, followed by those aged 46 to 50 years (26%). In terms of educational background, the majority held a Bachelor's degree (73%, n = 153), while those with a Master's degree made up 27% (n = 58). Regarding work experience, most respondents had more than five years of professional experience (48%, n = 102), followed by those with three to five years of experience (44%, n = 93).

The measurement model assessed provides a confirmatory evaluation of reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. The first step in determining the model involves examining the factor loadings of the variables. To achieve this, we employed the PLS algorithm function in SmartPLS. Table 2 below presents the Cronbach's alpha values, which range from 0.957 (for sustainable organizational performance) to 0.925 (for social capital). According to Nunnally and Bernstein [49] the minimum threshold for Cronbach's alpha is 0.7. We evaluated the reliability of each item by analyzing the factor loadings of all variables on their corresponding constructs. The findings indicate that all variables ranged from 0.954 for SOP3 to 0.806 for CA2, meeting the minimum threshold of 0.6.

In terms of the final reliability assessment of our model, we examined composite reliability (CR). The results show that all constructs met the 0.7 criterion, as recommended by Fornell and Larcker [50]. Thus, we conclude that the reliability of our study's model is satisfactory. Convergent validity, another essential measure, was also assessed. This involved evaluating the average variance extracted (AVE) values. Table 1 indicates that the AVE for all constructs exceeds 0.5, thereby satisfying the recommended threshold [50]. This suggests that the scale demonstrates strong convergent validity.

Table 1.
Measurement model.

Description	Loading	CA	CR	AVE
Agile Leadership				
I can identify opportunities for school improvement arising from change.	0.908	0.957	0.962	0.841
I take proactive steps to anticipate and prepare for change.	0.910			
I communicate effectively to motivate others.	0.926			
I encourage all teachers and staff to build positive relationships.	0.917			
I make swift decisions to address issues.	0.930			
I am capable of making appropriate decisions.	0.834			
I am willing to take innovative steps for school development. even if there is risk.	0.950			
I act on suggestions from parents for school development.	0.907			
I can create clear expectations from an activity	0.919			
I always conduct evaluations after school activities	0.846			
Organisational Learning				
The school regularly improves the performance of teachers and staff.	0.834	0.954	0.959	0.855
The school provides opportunities for teachers and staff to share their experiences and knowledge.	0.858			
The school supports new suggestions or ideas from both internal and external sources.	0.762			
Teachers and staff are dedicated to ongoing professional development.	0.905			
The school maintains clear and effective communication with parents and students.	0.891			
The school has information about the needs and expectations of parents.	0.870			
The school holds regular meetings to plan school activities.	0.843			
The school analyzes or evaluates activities that were not implemented.	0.861			
The school has forums for sharing teaching and learning methods.	0.916			
Social Capital				
The school collaborates with external parties to improve the learning process.	0.957	0.925	0.938	0.836
The school partners with others to increase student enrolment.	0.872			
The school works with other stakeholders to overcome challenges.	0.837			
The school is committed to improving parent satisfaction.	0.805			
The school is committed to enhancing the quality of teaching and learning.	0.777			
The school is committed to maintaining a positive reputation.	0.895			
The school organises socialisation or outreach events for the surrounding community.	0.857			
The school employs teaching and non-teaching staff from the local community.	0.891			
The school runs community-focused activities for residents.				
Sustainable Organizational Performance				

Teachers prepare lesson plans that encourage active student engagement.	0.787			
Teachers apply creative and innovative teaching strategies tailored to the context.	0.833			
Teachers regularly evaluate and reflect on the learning process for continuous improvement.	0.903			
The headteacher facilitates the professional development of teachers and staff through training, workshops, and other development activities.	0.925			
The headteacher prepares and manages the school budget with transparency and accountability.	0.888			
The headteacher provides facilities and infrastructure that are optimally used to support learning.	0.932			
The school creates an environment that values diversity.	0.911			
The school offers inclusive educational services for all students.	0.857			
The school provides a safe psychological environment, free from bullying, corporal punishment, and sexual violence.	0.873	0.942	0.962	0.867
The school has programmes and facilities to maintain the physical and mental health and safety of all school members.	0.895			
Students achieve the competencies set out in the curriculum.	0.837			
Students demonstrate positive character development. such as discipline. responsibility and collaboration.	0.900			
Students achieve both academic and non-academic accomplishments.	0.908			
Competitive Advantage				
The school delivers high-quality teaching to enhance student learning.	0.898			
Teachers or students have received recognition or awards from external organizations.	0.806			
I The school offers special programmes to improve student competence.	0.901			
The school provides a supportive environment for learning.	0.906			
The school offers affordable tuition fees for parents.	0.907	0.933	0.944	0.767
Teachers introduce innovations in learning.	0.889			
Teachers are graduates from top universities.	0.876			
The school assigns responsibilities to teachers based on their competencies and skills.	0.918			
The school organizes training to improve teacher competencies.	0.922			

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that all variables meet the required criteria. For instance, the lowest loading factor value recorded for the Agile Leadership variable was 0.834, while the highest was 0.950. This indicates that the indicators used have a strong correlation with the respective variable. Furthermore, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for Agile Leadership was 0.841, indicating that over 84% of the variance in the indicators can be explained by this construct, demonstrating strong convergent validity. Additionally, the composite reliability score of 0.962 indicates a high level of internal consistency among the indicators. Importantly, the Cronbach's alpha value of 0.957 further confirms that the reliability, or internal consistency, of this variable is at a highly satisfactory level. These results show that the Agile Leadership variable meets all statistical requirements for validity and reliability in this analysis.

According to Table 2 the Organisational Learning variable also performed well, with factor loadings ranging from 0.762 to 0.916, an AVE of 0.855, a composite reliability score of 0.959, and a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.954. These results indicate that the Organisational Learning variable meets the necessary criteria for validity and reliability for further analysis.

The analysis results for the Social Capital variable show factor loadings ranging from 0.777 to 0.957. This indicates a strong relationship between the indicators and the variable. The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) was recorded at 0.836, meaning over 83% of the variance in the indicators can be explained by this construct, confirming excellent convergent validity. The composite reliability score of 0.938 indicates an exceptional level of internal consistency across indicators, while Cronbach's alpha value of 0.925 also supports the reliability of this variable. These findings confirm that the Social Capital variable satisfies all required statistical criteria for validity and reliability, providing a solid foundation for further interpretation.

Regarding the Sustainable Organisational Performance variable, the analysis revealed factor loadings ranging from 0.787 to 0.932, indicating a strong relationship between the indicators and the variable. The AVE was 0.867, demonstrating that over 86% of the variance in the indicators is explained by the construct, which indicates excellent convergent validity. The composite reliability score of 0.962 suggests high internal consistency, and the Cronbach's alpha value of 0.942 further confirms a sufficient level of internal consistency. These findings suggest that the Sustainable Organisational Performance variable fully meets all statistical requirements for validity and reliability, providing a solid foundation for further analysis.

The analysis of the Competitive Advantage variable revealed factor loadings ranging from 0.806 to 0.922, indicating a strong relationship between the indicators and the construct. The AVE value was 0.767, demonstrating that over 76% of the variance in the indicators is explained by the variable, which reflects robust convergent validity. Additionally, the composite reliability was 0.944, signifying good internal consistency among the indicators. Furthermore, the Cronbach's

alpha value of 0.933 supports the conclusion that this variable has highly satisfactory reliability. These results confirm that the Competitive Advantage variable meets all the required statistical criteria for validity and reliability, thus providing a solid foundation for interpretation.

The next step is to test discriminant validity. One standard method for doing this is to calculate the variance shared between constructs using the Fornell and Larcker [50] criterion. According to Table 2 the square root of the AVE values is greater than the correlation coefficients with other constructs. These findings suggest that the analysis demonstrates both convergent and discriminant validity.

Table 2.
Fornell-Larcker Criterion

	Agile Leadership	**Organizational Learning**	**Social Capital**	**Sustainable Organizational Performance**	**Competitive Advantage**
Agile Leadership	0.908				
Organizational Learning	0.855	0.943			
Social Capital	0.826	0.885	0.924		
Sustainable Organizational Performance	0.831	0.843	0.892	0.951	
Competitive Advantage	0.839	0.807	0.826	0.871	0.918

Note: The square root of AVE is indicated in bold.

The table above shows that the square root of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for each variable exceeds the correlations between the variables, an essential indicator of discriminant validity. For the Agile Leadership variable, the square root of the AVE is 0.908, indicating appropriate convergent validity. The Organisational Learning variable has a square root AVE of 0.943, demonstrating a strong relationship between the indicators and the construct. For the Social Capital variable, the square root AVE is 0.924, suggesting that the indicators used are valid. Additionally, the square root AVE for the Sustainable Organisational Performance variable is recorded at 0.951, indicating that the indicators are well-aligned with the construct. Finally, the square root AVE for the Competitive Advantage variable is 0.918, reflecting a high level of validity. These results confirm that discriminant validity has been adequately met, as each variable explains its variance more effectively than it correlates with other variables, ensuring that the measurement is sufficiently accurate.

After the researcher ensures that the measurements of agile leadership, organizational learning, social capital, sustainable organizational performance, and competitive advantage variables are valid and reliable, the next step is to test the structural model. The purpose of this test is to assess the predictive ability of the model and the relationships between the construct variables, as well as to evaluate the model's capacity to predict the dependent variable. The R-squared (R^2) value is expected to fall between 0 and 1, where a higher R^2 value indicates a better-fitting research model. A larger R^2 value suggests that the endogenous variable is more significantly influenced [49]. Based on evaluation criteria, R^2 values are categorized into three levels: 0.75 is considered high, 0.50 is considered moderate, and 0.25 is considered weak.

Table 3.
Determination Coefficient Value.

Variable Dependent	**R^2**	**R^2 adjusted**
Sustainable Organisational Performance (SOP)	0.919	0.918
Competitive Advantage (CA)	0.930	0.928

Table 3 explains that agile leadership, organizational learning, and social capital collectively account for 91% of the changes in sustainable organizational performance, with the remaining 9% attributed to other variables.

The SEM-PLS algorithm runs and yields an estimate of the structural model relationship between the hypothesized constructs. The significance of a coefficient ultimately depends on its standard error, which is obtained through bootstrapping. We apply bootstrapping to determine if the formative indicator significantly contributes to the related construct. The bootstrap error allows the calculation of emspirical t-values and ρ-values for all structural path coefficients. An empirical t-value greater than 1.96 indicates that the relationship being studied is statistically significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. To see if the relationship is significant at this level, the ρ-value must be less than 0.05 ($\rho < 0.05$). Table 4 illustrates the results of the direct effect hypothesis test of the study.

Table 4.
Direct Effect.

	Relationship	Original Sample (O)	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Supported
H1	Agile Leadership -> Competitive Advantage	0.223	2.573	0.005	Supported
H2	Organizational learning -> Competitive Advantage	0.106	1.136	0.128	UnSupported
H3	Social capital -> Competitive Advantage	0.230	3.161	0.001	Supported
H4	Sustainable Organizational Performance -> Competitive Advantage	0.425	6.190	0.000	Supported
H5	Agile Leadership -> Sustainable Organizational Performance	0.307	3.532	0.000	Supported
H6	Organizational Learning -> Sustainable Organizational Performance	0.274	2.907	0.002	Supported
H7	Social Capital -> Sustainable Organizational Performance	0.394	5.680	0.000	Supported

The findings from the structural model test of the direct effects of agile leadership, organisational learning, and social capital on the variable of competitive advantage are presented in Table 4. These results support hypotheses 1 (H1), 3 (H3), and 4 (H4). This indicates that the empirical t-value is greater than 1.96 ($p < 0.05$), and the ρ-value is less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). This means that the variables of strategic commitment are significantly affected by strategic planning, communication, and human capital competence. Therefore, we declare hypotheses 1 (H1), 3 (H3), and 4 (H4) as "accepted".

The findings from the structural model test of the direct effects of agile leadership, organizational learning, and social capital on sustainable organizational performance are presented in Table 4. These results support hypotheses 5 (H5), 6 (H6), and 7 (H7). This indicates that the empirical t-value is greater than 1.96 ($p < 0.05$), and the ρ-value is less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). This suggests that the variables of sustainable organizational performance are significantly affected by agile leadership, organizational learning, and social capital. Therefore, hypotheses 5 (H5), 6 (H6), 8 (H8), and 9 (H9) are declared as "accepted." Conversely, Table 4 presents the outcomes of the structural model test, which examined the direct effect of the relationship between the organizational performance variable and the competitive advantage variable. The test results show that each has an empirical t-value below 1.96 ($p < 0.05$; $\alpha = 5\%$) and an R-value above 0.05 (>0.05); this indicates that the organizational learning variable does not have a significant influence on the competitive advantage variable separately. Consequently, hypothesis 2 (H2) is declared as "not accepted."

Furthermore, Table 5 presents the results of the structural model test examining the indirect influence of the relationship between the hypothesized construct variables. The test results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.
Indirect Effect.

	Relationship	Original Sample (O)	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Supported
H8	Agile Leadership -> Sustainable Organizational Performance -> Competitive Advantage	0.130	2.852	0.002	Supported
H9	Organizational learning -> Sustainable Organizational Performance -> Competitive Advantage	0.117	2.805	0.003	Supported
H10	Social Capital -> Sustainable Organizational Performance -> Competitive Advantage	0.167	4.168	0.000	Supported

Table 5 explains the indirect influence of the relationship between the hypothesized constructs, namely hypotheses 8 (H8) to 10 (H10). Table 5 also clarifies that hypotheses H8, H9, and H10 exhibit significant indirect influences, thereby supporting the acceptance of these hypotheses.

Table 5 the results of the structural model test examining the indirect influence of the relationship between the variables of agile leadership, organizational learning, and social capital on competitive advantage, mediated by sustainable organizational performance, are presented. The test results show that the empirical t-value is above 1.96 (>1.96; a=5%) and the p-value is below 0.05 (<0.05); this value indicates that the variables agile leadership, organizational learning, and social capital have a significant influence on the competitive advantage variable mediated by the sustainable organizational performance variable. Therefore, hypotheses 8 (H8), 9 (H9), and 10 (H10) are declared "accepted".

5. Discussion

The findings reveal that Agile Leadership exerts a positive and significant influence on competitive advantage. Headteachers who are adaptive to change enhance the school's competitiveness by promoting programme innovation, delivering relevant education, and establishing a foundation for sustainable development [4, 16, 20]. These results are consistent with the studies of Nemashakwe [51]. These findings are echoed in interviews with school principals who

consistently highlighted that flexibility and collaborative leadership were critical to driving innovation in school operations, especially amid regulatory uncertainty. Conversely, organizational learning does not have a direct impact on competitive advantage. Although organizational learning is essential for internal development, its influence on competitive advantage requires consistent implementation and long-term investment [27]. This finding contrasts with previous research by Köybaşi Şemin [52] and Kim and Park [53].

The study confirms that social capital has a significant positive effect on competitive advantage. Schools with strong relationships with parents and local communities benefit from increased loyalty and reputation, providing a distinct competitive advantage [54]. It was also demonstrated that sustainable organizational performance significantly enhances competitive advantage. Schools that consistently innovate in teaching, foster a supportive learning environment, and efficiently manage resources are better positioned to maintain a strong reputation and attract students [55, 56].

Moreover, the findings indicate that Agile Leadership has a positive impact on sustainable organizational performance. Headteachers who demonstrate agility are better equipped to foster innovation, respond swiftly to changes, and cultivate a collaborative school culture [20].

Organisational learning was also shown to positively influence sustainable organisational performance. Schools that encourage collective learning, share knowledge internally, and engage in continuous evaluation are better equipped to adapt to the rapidly changing educational landscape [57]. The study further highlights that social capital strengthens sustainable organizational performance. Strong internal and external social networks promote collaboration, innovation, and long-term performance improvements within schools [58, 59].

Additionally, sustainable organizational performance mediates the relationship between agile leadership and competitive advantage. Adaptive leadership practices enhance long-term school performance, which, in turn, significantly contributes to strengthening competitive positioning [18, 60]. The results also demonstrate that Sustainable Organisational Performance mediates the impact of Organisational Learning on Competitive Advantage. Organisational Learning improves internal performance first, which subsequently leads to enhanced competitiveness through greater trust and reputation among stakeholders [21, 61].

Finally, sustainable organizational performance mediates the relationship between social capital and competitive advantage. Strong social networks, when strategically leveraged, translate into sustainable performance improvements that ultimately enhance the school's competitive advantage [31, 58, 62]. These findings are context-specific and reflect the conditions within accredited private primary schools in Jakarta. Therefore, caution should be exercised when generalizing the results to broader or international contexts.

6. Conclusions

The primary objective of this study is to understand the factors that influence competitive advantage and sustainable organisational performance in private primary schools in Jakarta, Indonesia. The following section outlines several key findings of the study. The results highlight the influence of agile leadership, organisational learning, and social capital on sustainable organisational performance and, subsequently, on competitive advantage.

This study emphasises the importance of human resource management in educational institutions, particularly at the primary school level. The findings underscore the need to enhance agile leadership among school leaders, foster a supportive learning environment, and build collaborative relationships to support school programmes.

To boost the competitiveness and sustainability of private primary schools, policies that promote agile leadership, organisational learning, and social capital are essential.

These findings carry practical implications for school management and owners. Managers should prioritize agile leadership by providing relevant training and systems for headteachers. They should also promote organizational learning through a shared commitment to continuous learning and innovation in teaching.

Moreover, social capital must be strengthened by fostering partnerships with various stakeholders to resolve challenges. Lastly, sustainable organizational performance can be improved by regularly monitoring teacher performance and enhancing teacher competencies through training and forums.

Although this study offers valuable insights, several limitations must be acknowledged. The study focused exclusively on headteachers of private primary schools in Jakarta, limiting the generalisability of the findings to other institutions or regions. The small and localised sample size limits the external validity of the study. Additionally, reliance on self-reported data may introduce response bias and subjective interpretation. Conducting comparative analyses across different demographic groups could provide further insight into the generalisability of observed patterns. Finally, future research should explore organisational interventions and methods that enhance sustainable organisational performance and competitive advantage. Such investigations will offer essential contributions to evidence-based management practices.

References

[1] UNESCO, *Global education monitoring report 2021/22: Non-state actors in education*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 2021.

[2] BPS Jakarta, "Education statistics of DKI Jakarta province," 2022. Fhttps://jakarta.bps.go.id

[3] I. Farida and D. Setiawan, "Business strategies and competitive advantage: The role of performance and innovation," *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity,* vol. 8, no. 3, p. 163, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8030163

[4] S. Cherkowski, B. Kutsyuruba, and K. Walker, "Positive leadership: Animating purpose, presence, passion and play for flourishing in schools," *Journal of Educational Administration,* vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 401-415, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-04-2019-0076

[5] L. Abiwu and I. Martins, "Talent development as a source of sustainable competitive advantage for higher education institutions during the COVID-19 pandemic," *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 20, p. 1777, 2022. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v20i0.1777

[6] S. Sutiah, A. Kholid, A. S. Purba, and S. Slamet, "Improving the competitiveness of Islamic higher education: Study approaches to development of human resource competencies (HR)," *Review of International Geographical Education*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 477-493, 2021.

[7] N. Shah and B. A. Soomro, "Internal green integration and environmental performance: The predictive power of proactive environmental strategy, greening the supplier, and environmental collaboration with the supplier," *Business Strategy and the Environment*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 1333-1344, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2687

[8] E. Endri, A. K. Sari, Y. Budiasih, T. Yuliantini, and K. Kasmir, "Determinants of profit growth in food and beverage companies in Indonesia," *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, vol. 7, no. 12, pp. 739-748, 2020.

[9] J. Ferreira, S. Cardim, and A. Coelho, "Dynamic capabilities and mediating effects of innovation on the competitive advantage and firm's performance: The moderating role of organizational learning capability," *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 620-644, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-020-00655-z

[10] S. Cantele and A. Zardini, "Is sustainability a competitive advantage for small businesses? An empirical analysis of possible mediators in the sustainability–financial performance relationship," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 182, pp. 166-176, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.02.016

[11] S. Harini, D. Pranitasari, M. Said, and E. Endri, "Determinants of SME performance: Evidence from Indonesia," *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 471, 2023. http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(1).2023.40

[12] E. Marlapa, S. Karyatun, T. Yuliantini, L. Pradopo, and E. Endri, "Determinants of sustainable performance: The mediating role of strategic agility and the moderating role of leadership," *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 2253–2262, 2024.

[13] R. Setiawati, J. Eve, A. Syavira, P. Ricardianto, and E. Endri, "The role of information technology in business agility: Systematic literature review," *Calitatea*, vol. 23, no. 189, pp. 144-149, 2022. https://doi.org/10.47750/QAS/23.189.16

[14] E. Endri, "Evaluation of overseas field study program at the Indonesia Defense University," *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, vol. 12, no. 10, pp. 554-573, 2020.

[15] E. Mujahidin, I. Nurhayati, D. Hafidhuddin, E. Bahruddin, and E. Endri, "Importance performance analysis model for implementation in national education standards (SNPs)," *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 114-114, 2021. https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2021-0127

[16] W. Banmairuroy, T. Kritjaroen, and W. Homsombat, "The effect of knowledge-oriented leadership and human resource development on sustainable competitive advantage through organizational innovation's component factors: Evidence from Thailand's new S-curve industries," *Asia Pacific Management Review*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 200-209, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2021.09.001

[17] O. Fachrunnisa, A. Adhiatma, N. Lukman, and M. N. Ab Majid, "Towards SMEs' digital transformation: The role of agile leadership and strategic flexibility," *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 65-85, 2020.

[18] S. Porkodi, "The effectiveness of agile leadership in practice: A comprehensive meta-analysis of empirical studies on organizational outcomes," *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 117-138, 2024. https://doi.org/10.7341/20242026

[19] A. Mulyana, M. Ridaryanthi, S. Faridah, F. H. Umarella, and E. Endri, "Socio-emotional leadership style as implementation of situational leadership communication in the face of radical change," *Management*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 150-161, 2022. https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2022-0074

[20] E. Yalçın and M. Özgenel, "The effect of agile leadership on teachers' professional development and performance," *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 112–133, 2021.

[21] B. A. Soomro, S. Mangi, and N. Shah, "Strategic factors and significance of organizational innovation and organizational learning in organizational performance," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 481-506, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-05-2019-0114

[22] P. Ghasemzadeh, J. A. Nazari, M. Farzaneh, and G. Mehralian, "Moderating role of innovation culture in the relationship between organizational learning and innovation performance," *The Learning Organization*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 289-303, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-08-2018-0139

[23] X. Zhang, Z. Chu, L. Ren, and J. Xing, "Open innovation and sustainable competitive advantage: The role of organizational learning," *Technological forecasting and social change*, vol. 186, p. 122114, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.122114

[24] D. Pranitasari, M. Anhar, W. Warcito, M. Said, S. Harini, and E. Endri, "Optimism and entrepreneurial self-efficacy in Indonesia MSMEs," *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, vol. 8, no. 10, p. 6238, 2024. https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i10.6238

[25] S. Harini *et al.*, "Development of halal tourism villages based on local culture and sustainability," *Tourism and Hospitality*, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 55, 2025. https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp6020055

[26] I. Mutmainah *et al.*, "Analysis of factors influencing digital transformation of tourism villages: Evidence from Bogor, Indonesia," *Tourism and Hospitality*, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 57, 2025. https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp6020057

[27] Y. GUROL and S. Eroglu, "The impact of organizational learning on competitive advantage in Turkey," *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 47-57, 2021. https://doi.org/10.20460/JGSM.2021.298

[28] Y. M. Ginting, E. Elfindri, and H. Rahman, "the impact of social capital on the role knowledge management system in the creative industry in getting sustainable competitive advantage," *Jurnal Benefita*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 187-201, 2020.

[29] N. Badriyah, "Social capital of human resources in SMEs on competitive advantages," *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, vol. 15, no. 3, p. 491 â€“500, 2017. http://dx.doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam.2017.015.03.14

[30] G. Gomes and R. M. Wojahn, "Organizational learning capability, innovation and performance: study in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMES)," *Revista de Administração*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 163-175, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rausp.2016.12.003

[31] C. Del-Castillo-Feito, A. Blanco-González, F. Díez-Martín, and G. Cachón-Rodríguez, "Social capital and organizational legitimacy as competitive advantages in the information and communications technology sector," *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, vol. 33, no. 2, p. 100441, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hitech.2022.100441

[32] B. Wernerfelt, "A resource-based view of the firm," *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 171-180, 1984. https://doi.org/10.1002/SMJ.4250050207

[33] J. Barney, "Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage," *Journal of Management*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 99-120, 1991. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

[34] J. W. Stoelhorst, "Value, rent, and profit: A stakeholder resource-based theory," *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 1488-1513, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3280

[35] E. A. Locke and G. P. Latham, "A theory of goal setting and task performance," *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 16, no. 2, p. 480, 1991. https://doi.org/10.2307/258875

[36] A. M. Gkizani and M. Galanakis, "Goal setting theory in contemporary businesses: A systematic review," *Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 420-426, 2022. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2022.133028

[37] S. G. Bharadwaj, P. R. Varadarajan, and J. Fahy, "Sustainable competitive advantage in service industries: A conceptual model and research propositions," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 83-99, 1993. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13248-8_90

[38] S. R. Chowdhury, J. Mendy, and M. Rahman, "A systematic literature review of GHRM: Organizational sustainable performance reimagined using a new holistic framework," *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 9, p. 7513, 2023. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15097513

[39] Y. K. Akbar, S. Ariana, A. Setyadi, S. Pawirosumarto, and E. Endri, "Human capital and sustainable university: Mediating role of sustainable human resource management in Indonesia," *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, vol. 22, no. 1, p. 182, 2024.

[40] M. Mustaqim, "Scout extracurricular policy: Sentiment analysis on instagram & tiktok using the naïve bayes classifier method," *Jurnal BELAINDIKA Pembelajaran dan Inovasi Pendidikan*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 366-382, 2024.

[41] A. B. Saluy *et al.*, "Motivation moderating the influence of organizational culture and leadership on employment performance," *WSEAS Transactions on Environment and Development*, vol. 18, pp. 662-670, 2022. http://doi.org/10.37394/232015.2022.18.63

[42] B. Joiner and S. Josephs, "Developing agile leaders," *Industrial and Commercial Training*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 35-42, 2007. https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850710721381

[43] M. S. Alsuhaimi, "Agile leadership in the context of digital transformation: A systematic review and future research agenda," *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, vol. 12, no. 10, pp. 201–213, 2024.

[44] R. J. Calantone, S. T. Cavusgil, and Y. Zhao, "Learning orientation, firm innovation capability, and firm performance," *Industrial Marketing Management*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 515-524, 2002. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-8501(01)00203-6

[45] R. Ishak and M. Mansor, "The relationship between knowledge management and organizational learning with academic staff readiness for education 4.0," *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 20, no. 85, pp. 169-184, 2020.

[46] H. Tohidi, S. Mohsen Seyedaliakbar, and M. Mandegari, "Organizational learning measurement and the effect on firm innovation," *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 219-245, 2012.

[47] W. Tsai and S. Ghoshal, "Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm networks," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 464-476, 1998.

[48] J. F. Hair, G. T. M. Hult, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2022.

[49] J. C. Nunnally and I. H. Bernstein, *Psychometric theory*, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994.

[50] C. Fornell and D. F. Larcker, "Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics," *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 382-388, 1981. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800313

[51] P. Nemashakwe, "The role of agile leadership in the success of a contemporary organisation : A conceptual discussion the role of agile leadership in the success of a contemporary organisation : A conceptual," *International Journal of Management Studies and Social Science Research*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 7–19, 2024. https://doi.org/10.56293/IJMSSSR.2024.5302

[52] F. Köybaşi Şemin, "The relationship between transformational leadership and organizational learning in educational organizations: A meta-analysis study " *Hacettepe Egitim Dergisi*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 204–214, 2022. https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2020064441

[53] E.-J. Kim and S. Park, "Transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, organizational climate and learning: An empirical study," *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 761-775, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-12-2018-0455

[54] P. Ricardianto *et al.*, "The impact of service quality, ticket price policy and passenger trust on airport train passenger loyalty," *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 307-318, 2023. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.uscm.2022.9.012

[55] A. Abudaqa, I. Geraldina, M. Rakhmansyah, M. Miftah, and S. Dlamini, "Sustainable management strategies to enhance business competitiveness in the technology sector," *APTISI Transactions on Management*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 231–240, 2024. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33050/atm.v8i3.2359

[56] M. Mukhsin and T. Suryanto, "The effect of sustainable supply chain management on company performance mediated by competitive advantage," *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 2, p. 818, 2022. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/su14020818

[57] R. Adeniji, "Organizational learning in schools: The antecedent and moderating factors," *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 59-67, 2024.

[58] S. Rafiei, R. Kalhor, S. Shahsavari, and Z. Nejatifar, "Social capital and educational performance of students: The mediating role of entrepreneurial behavior," *Evidence Based Health Policy, Management and Economics*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 259–266, 2021. https://doi.org/10.18502/jebhpme.v5i4.8161

[59] N. Gericke and T. Torbjörnsson, "Identifying capital for school improvement: recommendations for a whole school approach to ESD implementation," *Environmental Education Research*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 803-825, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2022.2045256

[60] T. S. Wibowo, R. Fatmawati, S. A. Sitorus, H. Hartanto, and D. Suhendi, "Employee performance in the VUCA era: Determinants of agile leadership and job satisfaction," *International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1-9, 2023.

[61] P. Inthavong, K. U. Rehman, K. Masood, Z. Shaukat, A. Hnydiuk-Stefan, and S. Ray, "Impact of organizational learning on sustainable firm performance: Intervening effect of organizational networking and innovation," *Heliyon*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 1-12, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16177

[62] A. Jääskeläinen, T. Korhonen, and S. Amiri, "Social capital as a facilitator of successful buyer-supplier performance management," *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, vol. 29, no. 2, p. 100804, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pursup.2022.100804