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Abstract

This study aims to measure the effect of transformational leadership, organizational learning and organizational structure on the teacher innovation capacity. Data collection was carried out by simple random sampling via electronic on the population of private school teachers in Indonesia. The returned and valid questionnaire results were 645 respondents in the sample. Data processing using SEM method with Smart PLS 3.0 software. The results of this study are transformational leadership, organizational learning and organizational structure have a positive and significant effect on innovation capacity. Transformational leadership has a positive and significant effect on organizational learning and organizational structure. This novel research is proposing a model of building the teacher innovation capacity through transformational leadership in the perspective of learning organizations and organizational structure. This research can pave the way to improve the readiness of the teachers in Indonesia, especially the teachers of private schools to face the industrial revolution 4.0.
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1. Introduction

The influence of organizational leadership to increase innovation acceleration is a hot topic at the moment (Asbari et al., 2020), especially in the 4.0 era. In general, it has been proven that leadership is able to facilitate innovation (Domínguez-Escrig et al., 2016) and, in particular, in the development of innovations in educational organizations (Rikkerink et al., 2016). Leadership can directly affect the capacity of organizational innovation (Chen et al., 2016), or influence the creation of conditions that facilitate innovation, especially those related to organizational learning (Asbari et al., 2020). Among the two main factors that facilitate innovation are the creation of a organizational learning (Chen et al., 2015; Wu, 2016) and the development of organizational structures that are inclined towards learning. These two variables, in turn, are closely related to what are called learning organizations (Senge, 1990). This type of organization develops a culture and structure that is open to change and innovation through a well-facilitated learning process (Castelijns et al., 2013; Santa, 2015). An important feature of innovation in schools is that it is not only done by teachers during class work, but is also facilitated by school management, insofar as they provide an environment for innovation (Preston et al., 2012). In other words, a learning environment is created (Purwanto et al., 2020).

This research contributes to the literature by offering a general analysis about leadership influence on developing learning capacity and innovation in schools, which three main characteristics are related that enable the sustainability of school innovation (Datnow et al., 2002), that is, school management that is actively involved as personnel key (leadership) organizations; organizational learning, as a school spirit; and organizational structure, as a broader learning framework, where school initiatives operate. This study aims to analyze, from the teacher's perspective, the influence of leadership on the organizational learning and organizational structure of schools, and the influence of these two variables on the capacity of educational innovation in private schools in Indonesia.

2. Literature Study and Hypothesis Development

As mentioned earlier, educational innovation is an important key in education because it has a direct impact on improving the teaching and learning process (Sopa et al., 2020); and, more concretely, how to develop the school's innovation capacity. The capacity of innovation has been defined as an effort to continuously improve the ability and resources of organizations to find opportunities (Szeto, 2000). The capacity of innovation will not refer strictly to the concrete results of innovation, but to the opportunities and procedures that lead to innovation (Hall, 2007). The capacity for innovation in the school environment is comprised of teaching practices and school management policies that support innovation (Greany, 2018).

2.1. Effects of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Structure

Leadership is carried out in the context of being influenced and influencing relationships that arise in that context (Swensen et al., 2016). This can mean that organizational structure influences the leadership style and in turn, leadership influences the configuration of certain organizational structures. Leadership, then, determines the organizational structure. In fact, leadership influences organizational behavior and the way members of organization think (Asbari, 2019). Organizational structure is the result of many possibilities, such as strategy,
culture, technology, leadership and organizational size (Daft, 2001). According to Senior and Swailes (2010), certain factors directly affect the organizational structure (environment, strategy, technology and size) and other aspects influence it in the form of moderation (culture and leadership).

Considering more specific aspects in developing organizational structures, it has been emphasized that it is the responsibility of leaders to build communication systems among organizational members and to transfer knowledge and skills to group members (Gino et al., 2010). This is a matter of producing structures that facilitate teamwork and development, for example, "professional learning communities" (Brouwer et al., 2012), by developing dynamic interactions between teachers, work groups and organizations as a whole. Structures that facilitate learning are considered organizational structures (Curado, 2006). In this type of structure, learning is facilitated, and because the transmission of information and the initiatives of people in the organization are promoted, both processes are considered key to the development of organizational learning (Raj and Srivastava, 2013). Therefore, this structure can be called a structure that supports the learning structure. Based on the above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

\[ H1. \text{Transformational leadership has a significant effect on organizational structure.} \]

2.2. Effects of Transformational Leadership on Organizational learning

In initial discussion about learning in organizations, culture has been linked in the context of organizational learning (Cook & Yanow, 1993). Out of conformity between culture and learning in organizations comes the term organizational learning of learning or organizational learning (Asbari, 2020). In this sense, an organization produces a culture that encourages to develop the conditions needed to promote learning. According to Walker (2010), an organizational learning is a synergistic effect produced through the establishment and cultivation of a set interrelated conditions, which promote and encourage learning as a way of professional life. In addition, cultural development has been linked to leadership (Jensen & Markussen, 2007). More specifically, if we refer to transformational leadership, leaders promote the development of a culture that promotes better performance in organizations (Kearney and Gebert, 2009). In relation to the educational context, leadership contributes to learning through the development of structural processes that define the ability of schools to improve academic performance (Southworth, 2002). For example, decision-making abilities and actions for teachers and students are leadership characteristics (Hallinger and Heck, 2011). Thus, school leadership creates situations that support conditions for developing organizational learning and changing capacity (Robinson et al., 2008). For example, the work of Barnett and McCormick (2004) shows that there is a significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and the culture of school learning. In addition, leadership and the culture of school learning influence innovation trends (in the sense that supported teachers feel compelled to participate in innovative teaching and try and improve their professional practice). School leaders can build and maintain a culture of learning (Haiyan et al., 2017). As noted by Wallace et al. (2011) that leaders can work proactively to provide positive influence and impact in promoting reform, transformation in culture and professional work practices in schools. Based on the above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

\[ H2. \text{Transformational leadership has a significant effect on organizational learning.} \]
2.3. Effect of Organizational Structure on Innovation Capacity

The organizational structure represents a set of expectations regarding the behavior of members in the organization, which rules must be followed, how decisions are made and which control system should be used (Donaldson, 1996). Structure provides a set of official recipes so that work can be done. The organizational structure influences the development of learning and innovation. Thus, the learning process must be considered in the organizational structure, especially given that the structure is basically an information base, which makes it possible. For example, specifications of performance standards, desired behavior, responsibilities, and allow anticipation of all possibilities in the future (Yerson and Dekker, 2005). Differences in structure can vary from rigid to flexible, centralized to decentralized (Slevin and Covin, 1997) and, according to Dischner (2015), from bureaucracy to post-bureaucracy. Structures that are too bureaucratic are characterized by high levels of task specifications and highly centralized, so that low autonomy and decision making, standardization and formal punishment become common (Diefenbach and Sillince, 2011). In contrast to post-bureaucratic structures which are characterized by low specialization, they have high autonomy in decision making and low formal standardization (Gittell, 2001). Some authors have shown that organizations with bureaucratic structures lack organizational flexibility and have problems adjusting to the context of change and innovation (Heckscher, 1994). Therefore, changes are proposed for a more flexible post-bureaucratic structure that can improve the innovation process (McKenna et al., 2010).

The same approach can be proposed for the development of learning. As Fiol and Lyles (1985) point out, stating that although often seen as a learning outcome, organizational structure plays an important role in determining this process. Researchers such as Morgan and Ramirez (1984) have shown the importance of flexible, decentralized and organic structures to promote learning in organizations. In addition, other works (Shipton et al., 2002) conclude a negative relationship between centralized structure and organizational learning mechanisms. Based on the above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

\[ H_3. \text{The organizational structure has a significant effect on innovation capacity.} \]

2.4. Effect of Organizational Learning on Innovation Capacity

The culture of each organization is related to its values and beliefs (Schein, 1985). Organizational learning culture is defined as a set of norms and common values shared by members of an organization (Deshpée & Webster, 1989). Trefry (2006) suggests two levels of organizational culture, namely the underlying practice (beliefs and values) and behavior (how things are done here). In more tangible terms, the literature has defined various types of organizational culture. For example, cultures that develop values related to learning have been called organizational learnings and organizations that develop organizational learnings have been identified as learning organizations (Asbari et al, 2020). Thus, the culture of organizational learning is the culture of organizational learning (Marsick & Watkins, 2003). If culture is referred to in the school context, empirical findings have shown the relationship between school and school culture characteristics, the capacity for innovation in teaching and learning (Zhu, 2013). Culture can inhibit and support school improvement and its capacity for change, as well as teacher innovation (Fullan, 2007). It is said that a culture that supports innovation is characterized by culture in respecting teacher opinions (Herr and Brooks, 2003), facilitating interaction and dialogue between teachers, and not
hiding mistakes. Therefore, the authors propose the following hypothesis:

\[ H4. \text{Organizational learning has a significant effect on innovation capacity.} \]

![Figure 1. Research Model](image-url)

3. Research Method

3.1. Operational Definitions of Variables and Indicators

The method used in this study is quantitative method with a correlational research approach. Data collection was carried out by simple random sampling via electronics in a population of the teachers of private schools in Indonesia. The instrument used 4 items to measure transformational leadership (X1) was adapted from Bass & Avolio (2000). Six items of organizational structure (Z1) was adapted from Afsar et al., 2018. Four items of organizational learning (Z2) adapted from Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle (2011). Five items of innovation capacity (Y) was adapted from Lee & Choi (2003). The questionnaire was designed closed except for questions / statements about the identity of respondents in the form of a semi-open questionnaire. Each closed question / statement item is given five answer options, namely: strongly agree (SA) score 5, agree (A) score 4, disagree (DA) score 3, disagree (DA) score 2, and strongly disagree (SDA) score 1. The method for processing data is by PLS and using SmartPLS software version 3.0 as a tool.

3.2. Population and Sample

The population in this study are private school teachers whose exact numbers are unknown. The questionnaire was distributed
electronically with a simple random sampling technique. The returned and valid questionnaire results were 645 samples.

4. Result and Discussion

4.1. Sample Description

Table 1. Sample Descriptive Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (per March 2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years old</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>22.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 40 years old</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>41.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 40 years old</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working period as a permanent teacher &lt; 5 years old</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years old</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>58.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years old</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last formal education S2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>73.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA/ Equal</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Test Results Validity and Reliability of Research Indicators

The testing phase of measurement model includes convergent validity, discriminant validity and composite reliability testing. The results of PLS analysis can be used to test research hypothesis if all indicators in PLS model have met the requirements of convergent validity, discriminant validity and reliability testing.

4.2.1. Convergent Validity Testing

Convergent validity test is done by looking at the loading factor value of each indicator to the construct. For most references, a factor weight of 0.5 or more is considered to have validation that is strong enough to explain latent constructs (Chin, 1998; Hair et al, 2010; Ghozali, 2014). In this study the minimum limit on the size of loading factor received was 0.5, with the requirement that the AVE value of each construct > 0.5 (Ghozali, 2014).

Based on the estimation results of PLS model in the picture above, all indicators already have a loading factor value above 0.5 so that the model meets convergent validity requirements. Apart from looking at the loading factor value of each indicator, convergent validity is also assessed from the AVE value of each construct. PLS model is stated to have fulfilled convergent validity if the AVE value of each construct is > 0.5 (Ghozali, 2014). The full AVE value for each construct can be seen in the following tables:
Table 2. Items Loadings, Composite Reliability, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership (X)</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure (Z1)</td>
<td>Z1.1</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z1.2</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z1.3</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z1.4</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z1.5</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z1.6</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning (Z2)</td>
<td>Z2.1</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z2.2</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z2.3</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z2.4</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Capacity (Y)</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2. Discriminant Validity Testing

Discriminant validity is carried out to ensure that each concept of each latent variable is different from the other latent variables. The model has good discriminant validity if the AVE squared value of each exogenous construct (the value on the diagonal) exceeds the correlation between the construct and the other construct (values below the diagonal) (Ghozali, 2014). The results of discriminant validity testing using AVE squared value, namely by looking at the Fornell-Larcker Criterion Value obtained as follows:
The results of discriminant validity test in the table above show that all constructs have the AVE square root value above the correlation value with other latent constructs (through the Fornell-Larcker criteria) so that it can be concluded that the model meets the discriminant validity.

### 4.2.3. Constructive Reliability Testing

Construct reliability can be assessed from the value of Cronbach's Alpha and composite reliability of each construct. The recommended composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha values are more than 0.7 (Ghozali, 2014). The reliability test results in table 2 above show that all constructs have composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha values greater than 0.7 (> 0.7). In conclusion, all constructs have met the required reliability.

### 4.3. Hypotheses Test

Hypothesis testing in PLS is also called the inner model test. This test includes a test the significance of direct and indirect effects and measurement magnitude the influence of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. To determine the effect of transformational leadership, organizational structure and organizational learning on school innovation capacity, it requires a test of direct influence. The direct effect test is performed using the t-statistic test in the partial least squared (PLS) analysis model using the help of SmartPLS 3.0 software. With the bootstrapping technique, R Square values and significance test values are obtained as the tables below:

#### Table 3. Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z1</th>
<th>Z2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4. R Square Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 5. Hypotheses Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P-Values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>X -&gt; Z1</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>37.038</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>X -&gt; Z2</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>11.132</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Z1 -&gt; Y</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>28.316</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Z2 -&gt; Y</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 4 above, the R Square value of organizational structure (Z1) is 0.578 which means that the organizational structure variable (Z1) is able to explain the transformational leadership variable (X) by 57.8%, while...
the remaining 42.2% is explained by other variables not discussed in this study. Meanwhile, the R Square value of organizational learning (Z2) is 0.144 which means that the organizational learning variable (Z2) can be explained by transformational leadership variables by 14.4%, while the remaining 85.6% is explained by other variables not discussed in this study. While the value of R Square innovation capacity (Y) of 0.602 which means that the innovation capacity variable (Y) can be explained by the transformational leadership, organizational structure and organizational learning by 60.2%, while the remaining 39.8% is explained by other variables not discussed in the study. Table 5 displays the T Statistics and P-Values which show the influence between the mentioned research variables.

5. Conclusion

The sustainability of educational reform or innovation is very dependent on the willingness all leaders and members of the institutions involved. That is, it depends on the willingness of teacher and school management team to change their understanding and behavior related to their didactic actions (März et al., 2013). The work of school leadership is very important for developing attitudes of change and innovation, as shown by Chan Lin et al. (2006) that school leaders use various activities and various management strategies to facilitate innovation among teachers. In fact, several studies (Asbari, 2019; Asbari et al, 2019; asbari et al, 2020; Purwanto et al, 2019; Purwanto et al, 2020; Gumusluoglu and Ilsev, 2009; Scott and Bruce, 1994) have found that leadership support for innovation can influence the development of innovation in educational organizations. Lewis et al. (2017), Asbari et al (2020), Santosos et al (2019) and Purwanto et al (2020) have proven that leadership directly influences the capacity of innovation. In this case, innovation initiatives are strengthened by leadership encouragement, especially when a transformational leader motivates teachers in developing a process of improvement and innovation (SantizoRodall and Ortega Salazar, 2018). In general, it has been shown that the importance of management team is the key to school efficiency (Medina, 1997). Specifically, the management team is the driver of innovative educational activities and promoters of new pedagogical methodologies (Bernal, 2001), and, therefore, are key to implementing school innovations.

Innovative schools must be able to create learning environments that stimulate teacher innovation (Waslyer, 2010). In this case, school leaders play an important role in creating an appropriate and adequate learning environment (Sammons et al., 1995). It is important that school leaders know how to produce positive changes in teacher innovation (Kaniuka, 2012). School leaders must not only make policies and strategies aimed at technological innovation, but must also enhance the culture of learning in organizations and involve teachers in the innovation process (Zhu, 2013). In the long run, it is important that schools develop a culture of change and promote leadership that facilitates collaboration and improves school environment for the purpose of encouraging educational innovation (Patterson, 2003). Initiatives should be proposed based on leadership models designed to encourage all school members to participate in the process of innovation and change. As proposed by Sharan et al. (1999), namely that capacity for innovation not only applies to the strategy of a teacher with students, it is characteristic of the learning community as a whole, where, together with school leaders, all teachers are also students involved in the change process. This research has the main objective to analyze the impact of leadership on the generation of learning environment, because both constructs are considered fundamental to the development of innovation in schools. Whereas the role of learning environment in such a broad organization can be summarized by
saying that, through the learning environment, conditions are created for members of the organization to promote their maximum learning potential, which, in turn, can enhance personal and organizational development. The creation of a positive learning environment is very important for innovation because it has been emphasized that learning is a precedent for innovation (Alegre and Chiva, 2013). A leader can influence the development of values and structures that influence people’s behavior towards learning and innovation. As is indicated by much literature that leadership has been shown to have a significant impact both on organizational learning and organizational structure (Prameswari et al., 2020; Sopa et al., 2020; Gino et al., 2010). In this study, leadership has been proven to positively and significantly influence organizational learning and organizational structure. As shown by Moolenaar et al. (2010), transformational leaders facilitate communication and ability to take risks in a psychologically safe environment. Therefore, leaders are one of the key elements to encourage a school climate that supports innovation. In addition, this study proves that the organizational learning and organizational structure influence the capacity of school innovation. Culture is a strategic element that determines innovation (Petrakis et al., 2015). School change and innovation require a lasting value framework (Greany, 2018). Therefore, schools need a organizational learning that supports an effective change process. With regard to organizational structure, it has been shown that, through ongoing, frequent, active and reciprocal communication, organizations can achieve positive results from organizational change (Král and Králová, 2016). This type of organizational structure is also an element that identifies the model of learning organization proposed by Örtzenblad (2004), which shows that the learning organization is a type of organization that facilitates innovation (Santa, 2015). The literature shows that leadership, culture and organizational structure are key aspects that influence innovation (Datnow et al., 2002). This research has shown that indirectly, transformational leadership influences the capacity for school innovation and also, this type of transformational leadership affects the organizational learning and organizational structure, while the organizational learning and organizational structure affect the capacity of innovation.
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