



LEARNING AGILITY AND DIGITAL LITERACY AS PREDICTORS OF POTENTIAL SCHOOL LEADERS

Nurkolis^{1*}, Widya Kusumaningsih², Ghuftron Abdullah³

^{1,2,3}Universitas PGRI Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: ✉ nurkolis@upgris.ac.id

Article History

Received : 13/05/2025

Revised : 04/09/2025

Accepted : 25/09/2025

Keywords:

Digital literacy,
Instructional leadership,
Learning agility,
Teacher leader, Teacher
leadership.

Abstract. The selection of potential leaders in schools in Indonesia is still problematic. The objective of this study to determine the effect of learning agility and digital literacy on the potential future school leaders. This article is based on a quantitative research approach with a comparative causal design, a sample of 380 people with a simple random sampling. The research held in Kendal Regency, 2024-2025 school year. The instrument was tested and the results were valid and reliable. The research data were tested for prerequisites which showed normal, homogeneous, and linear. The research hypothesis was tested with Pearson product-moment correlation, determination test, and linear regression. The study result shows that there is positive, significant, and strong influence of learning agility on the potential of future school leaders; there is a strong, positive, and considerable influence of digital literacy on the potential future school leaders; and there is also positive, significant and strong influence of learning agility and digital literacy together on the potential future school leaders. This research contributes to the development of educational leadership concept from the aspect of teacher leadership. It is concluded that the selection of prospective teacher leaders needs to consider learning agility and digital literacy.

How to Cite: Nurwalidainismawati, N., Ramdani, N., Hasanah, U., Firdaus, F. (2025). LEARNING AGILITY AND DIGITAL LITERACY AS PREDICTORS OF POTENTIAL SCHOOL LEADERS. *Prima Magistra: Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 6(4), 795-804. <https://doi.org/10.37478/jpm.v6i4.5687>

Correspondence address:

Jl. Sidodadi Timur No.24, Karangtempel, Semarang Timur,
Kota Semarang, Jawa Tengah 50232. ✉ nurkolis@upgris.ac.id

Publisher:

Program Studi PGSD Universitas Flores. Jln. Samratulangi,
Kelurahan Paupire, Ende, Flores.

✉ primagistrauniflor@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The principal position is not an attractive position for teachers. Many principal positions are vacant and held by principals from other schools. The phenomenon of a shortage of prospective principals occurs in many countries. Of the 22 countries studied, 15 countries (68%) stated a shortage of prospective principals (Pont et al., 2008), is due to retirement or because school leaders are not an attractive position for Generation X (Edge, 2015).

The position of principal in Indonesia is also not attractive for teachers because of the heavy workload but low incentives. Most elementary school teachers refuse to participate in the recruitment and selection of prospective principals, while a small number accept reluctantly (Jabar et al., 2020). Principals who hold concurrent positions have a double burden so they experience physical and mental fatigue. This fatigue reduces the effectiveness of work and the quality of school management (Ardiansyah et al., 2023).

According to the Indonesia national news agency Antara, in early 2024 Indonesia will have a shortage of 63% (22.53 people) of school supervisors from a need of 35,831 people, only 16,280 people have been met (Subagyo, 2024). There is no data available on the number of principal shortages nationally, but most local governments have stated that there is a shortage of principals such as in Mentawai, Probolinggo, Jombang, Tuban, Pangkalpinang, Banjarmasin, Depok, Ciamis, Kutai Kartanegara, Medan, Sragen, Purworejo, Bekasi Regency, and many others.

In response to the shortage of principals, developing countries are preparing quality principal leadership programs (UNESCO, 2016). Likewise in Indonesia, starting in 2020 the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture has created a Teacher Leader Program (Program Guru Penggerak) which is a 6-month leadership education program for teachers to become teacher leaders. Since 2021, the Indonesian Government has required that principals and school supervisors must have a teacher leader certificate. Data up to March 2024 showed that 11,852 graduates of the Teacher Leaders Program from batches 1-8 had been appointed as principals and school supervisors out of a total of 61,256 graduates or 19%.

The small percentage of teacher leader graduates who were appointed as school leaders,

namely principals and school supervisors, is thought to be due to doubts from regional heads about their quality. Even the Head of the Sintang Regency Education Office, West Kalimantan, Yustinus, rejected the regulation on the appointment of school supervisors from teacher leaders (Redaksi Pojok Kalbar, 2024). Yustinus said that school supervisors need to have experience as principals first. This condition shows that graduates of the Teacher Leaders Program cannot yet be trusted as prospective school leaders because there are other factors such as political factor (Sumintono et al., 2015).

Teacher leadership has been widely studied in many countries, but in Indonesia it is still rare (Aziz et al., 2020). Several existing studies on teacher leadership are related to teacher professionalism (Arwildayanto et al., 2023), quality and learning outcomes (Aziz et al., 2020; Don et al., 2020), student character formation (Eliawati et al., 2018), teacher leadership in the classroom (Mubarak, 2022). There has never been a study that predicts the factors that determine the potential of future school leaders. Therefore, this study is very important to fill the gap in references to teacher leadership and predictions of future school leadership. This study is also important as a basis for making policies in selecting school leaders in the future.

There are two ways to define leadership potential in an organization, namely based on past performance and latent ability as an indicator of future potential (Church et al., 2021). However, some consider that past performance as a prediction of leadership is a wrong concept because of differences in environments, relationships, and different jobs (Day & O'Connor, 2017), and the nature of past & future jobs may be different (Finkelstein et al., 2018). Predicting leadership potential based on latent is considered more holistic because it is based on the ability to learn called "learning agility" (De Meuse, 2017; Hoff & Burke, 2017).

Leaders have a great influence on subordinates. The managerial incompetence of leaders has serious moral implications because bad managers cause great misery for subordinates (Hogan et al., 2011). The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health states that 40% of workers in America work very tensely. Approximately 75% of workers report that the most stressful aspect of their job is their immediate supervisor. The managerial failure rate is around 30% to 70% with an average of 50% (Hogan et al., 2011). This failure indicates that the leadership selection and development process is not going well (Hoff & Smith, 2020).

Future leaders in the 4.0 era which is characterized by the rise of digital technology (Brixner et al., 2020), so the characteristics of leaders in this era are network leadership (Herold, 2016). Future leaders must inevitably have good digital literacy and apply digital leadership. Digital leadership theory places great emphasis on the ability of leaders to develop, manage, guide, and apply information and communication technology knowledge to improve institutional performance. Digital leadership refers to the application and use of leadership approaches that are consistent with the digital era (Al Ajmi, 2022). Digital leadership involves the strategic use of information technology assets to achieve goals (DeLuca et al., 2017). Therefore, educational policies for digital transformation must integrate school principals (Navaridas-Nalda et al., 2020).

This study projects the potential of future school leaders from teacher leaders through learning agility and digital literacy. Teacher leaders are the embodiment of teacher leadership. In this study, teacher leaders are teachers who have graduated from the Teacher Leaders Program organized by the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia. Teachers who do not participate in the Teacher Leader Program in this study are called regular teachers. Therefore, this study aims to find out (1) the learning agility effect on the potential of future school leaders, (2) to determine the effect of digital literacy on the potential of future school leaders, and (3) to find out the joint effect of learning agility and digital literacy on the potential of future school leaders. The hypotheses of this research are: (H1) there is an influence of learning agility on the potential of future school leaders, (H2) there is an influence of digital literacy on the potential of future school leaders, and (H3) there is an influence of learning agility and digital literacy together on the potential of future school leaders.

This research contributes to the development of the concept of educational leadership from the perspective of teacher leadership. Teacher leadership is explored in the context of research on driving teachers who act as agents of change in schools. Research on driving teachers as teacher



leaders is unprecedented.

RESEARCH METHODS

This article is based on quantitative research with a comparative causal design. The research was conducted in Kendal Regency, Central Java Province, Indonesia in the 2024/2025 school year at the elementary and junior high school levels. The study population was 6,857 teachers and a sample of 380 teachers consisting of 190 teacher leaders (51% of the total teacher leaders of 370 people) and 190 regular teachers (3% of the total regular teachers of 6,487 people) as seen in Table 1. The sampling technique used simple random sampling. Teacher leaders (Guru Penggerak) are teachers who have participated in or graduated from the Teacher Leaders Program (Program Guru Penggerak), while regular teachers are teachers who did not participate in the Teacher Leaders Program.

Table 1. Sample of Research

Types of teachers	Elementary	Junior Secondary	Total
Teacher Leader	123	67	190
Regular Teacher	148	42	190
Total	271	109	380

This research instrument uses a self-assessment instrument scale which is often used to measure learning agility (De Meuse et al., 2011). The leadership potential variable for prospective principals consists of six dimensions, 15 indicators, and 60 questions. The learning agility variable consists of seven dimensions, 13 indicators, and 40 questions. The digital literacy variable consists of four dimensions, 10 indicators, and a total of 30 questions.

Likewise, instruments for digital literacy and the potential of future school leaders. Measuring the potential of future leaders, learning agility, and digital literacy in this study uses episodic memory, namely related to the implementation of curriculum which began in 2021. Episodic memory is context-specific memory for personal events and experiences that often has an emotional basis and is integrated with information about the self in the referenced context. While semantic memory provides a general source of knowledge that is independent of context regarding objects, facts and meanings and can therefore create false memories (Hansbrough et al., 2021).

The data collection instrument used a questionnaire with a measurement scale of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Respondents were asked to measure the suitability of the statement with the events experienced or the suitability of the statement with the reality experienced during implementing curriculum, as shown in Table 2. Before being used, the instrument was tested on 30 trial respondents. The construct validity test used the Product Moment Correlation formula, the results showed that all statement items were valid with a score of > 0.361 . The instrument was also tested for reliability with Cronbach's Alpha, the results showed that all variables were reliable with a score of > 0.361 .

Table 2. Variable Measurement Scale

Measurement Scale	Conformity Between Statements and Events or Reality	
	Frequency of Occurrence	Conformity to Reality
1	Very Rare Occurs	Very Unsuitable
2	Rarely Occurs	Unsuitable
3	Sometimes Occurs	Sometimes Suitable
4	Frequently Occurs	Suitable
5	Very Often Occurs	Very Suitable

Before the hypothesis test was conducted, the data were tested for prerequisites in the form of normality test, homogeneity test, and linearity test to determine the appropriate statistical analysis. Based on the results of the normality test, each variable obtained a sig. value < 0.05 , the meaning is that the data is normal. The homogeneity test mention that the sig. value ≥ 0.05 , it means that the data variance is homogeneous. The results of the linearity test between the independent variable and the dependent variable obtained a sig. value < 0.05 , meaning that the data is linear. Based on the results of the prerequisite test, the data meets the requirements for

using parametric statistics in the hypothesis test. The hypothesis tests used were correlation test, determination test, regression test, and structural test. The hypothesis test used SPSS software version 26.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

H1. The Influence of Learning Agility (X1) on the Potential of Future School Leaders (Y)

The results of the correlation test between the variable learning agility and the potential of future school leaders obtained $R = 0.877$ with a significance of $0.00 < 0.05$. This correlation is positive, significant, and in the very strong category because it is in the range of 0.80-1.00 (Sugiyono, 2015). The results of the determination test between the two variables obtained R Square = 0.768, which means that the variable learning agility has a 77% influence on the variable potential of future school leaders. The R^2 value of 0.77 is higher than 0.67, it means that the determination of the learning agility on the potential of future school leaders is strong (Chin, 1998). The results of the correlation and determination tests as mention in Table 3.

Table 3. Model Summary X1 and Y

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.877a	0,768	0,768	1,29271

The results of the linear regression test of the learning agility variable on the potential of future school leaders can be seen in Table 4. By using the regression equation $Y=a+b_1X_1$, then $Y=0.176 +1.064X_1$ with a significance of $0.00<0.05$. Thus, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) which states that there is an influence of learning agility on the potential of future school leaders can be accepted.

Based on the results of the regression equation, several things can be explained as follows. Intercept (0.176) is the value of Y when X_1 is equal to 0. This shows that if there is no contribution from learning agility, the predicted value for the potential of future school leaders is 0.176. The X_1 coefficient (1.064) shows that for every one unit increase in learning agility, the value of the potential of future school leaders will increase by an average of 1.064 units. This also shows a very strong positive correlation between learning agility variable to the potential of future school leaders. The interpretation of the relationship between X_1 and Y is that if learning agility increases, the potential for success of future school leaders also increases. It can be concluded that there is a positive and significant connection between learning agility and the potential for future school leaders. Model validation is carried out with a structural test that shows a strong influence between learning agility and future leadership potential.

Tabel 4. Coefficients Regression X1 toward Y

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0,176	0,192	-	0,917	0,360
	Learning Agility	1,064	0,030	0,877	35,403	0,000

H2. The Influence of Digital Literacy (X2) on Future School Leadership Potential (Y)

The results of the correlation test between the digital literacy variable and the potential of future school leaders with $R=0.835$ with a significance of $0.00<0.05$. This correlation is also positive and significant and in the very strong category since it is in the range of 0.80-1.00 (Sugiyono, 2015). The results of the determination test between the independent variables and the dependent variables obtained R Square=0.697, which means that the digital literacy variable has a 70% influence on the potential variable of future school leaders. The R^2 value of 0.70 is higher than 0.67, it means that the determination of the digital literacy on the potential of future school leaders is strong (Chin, 1998). The results of the correlation and determination tests sown in Table 5.

Table 5. Model Summary X2 toward Y

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.835a	0,697	0,696	1,47848



According to the results of the linear regression test between the digital literacy variable and the potential for future school leaders, it can be seen in Table 6. Using the regression equation $Y = a + b_2X_2$, then $Y = 2.218 + 0.921X_2$ with a significance of $0.00 < 0.05$. The hypothesis stating that there is an influence of digital literacy on the potential for future school leaders can be accepted.

According to the results of the regression equation, several things can be explained as follows. Intercept (2.218) is the value of Y when X_2 is equal to 0. This shows that if there is no contribution from digital literacy, the predicted value for the potential for future school leaders is 2.218. The X_2 coefficient (0.921) shows that for every one unit increase in digital literacy, the value of the potential for future school leaders will increase by an average of 0.921 units. This also shows that there is a very strong positive relationship between digital literacy and the potential for future school leaders. The interpretation of the relationship between X_2 and Y is that if digital literacy increases, the potential for the success of future school leaders also increases. It is concluded that there is a positive and significant correlation between digital literacy and the potential success of future school leaders. Model validation was conducted using a structural test that showed a strong influence between digital literacy and the potential success of future school leaders.

Table 6. Coefficients Regression X_2 toward Y

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2,218	0,166	-	13,357	0,000
	Digital Literacy	0,921	0,031	0,835	29,482	0,000

H3. The Joint Influence of Learning Agility (X_1) and Digital Literacy (X_2) on the Potential of Future Leaders (Y)

The results of the correlation test between the variables of learning agility and digital literacy together with the potential of future school leaders obtained $R=0.893$ with a significance of $0.00 < 0.05$. This correlation is positive and significant, also in the very strong category because it is in the range of 0.80-1.00 (Sugiyono, 2015). The results of the determination test between the variables of learning agility and digital literacy together with the variable of the potential of future school leaders obtained $R\text{ Square} = 0.797$, which means that the variables of learning agility and digital literacy together have an 80% influence on the variable of the potential of future school leaders. The R^2 value of 0.80 is higher than 0.67, it means that the determination of the learning agility and digital literacy together on the potential of future school leaders is strong (Chin, 1998). The results of the correlation and determination tests as mention in Table 7.

Table 7. Model Summary X_1 and X_2 toward Y

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.893a	0,797	0,796	1,21106

The results of the linear regression test between the variables learning agility and digital literacy together on the potential of future school leaders can be seen in Table 8. By using the regression equation $Y=a+b_1X_1+b_2X_2$, then $Y=0.496+0.731X_1+0.356X_2$ with a significance of $0.00<0.05$. Thus, the hypothesis that states that there is a joint influence of the variables learning agility and digital literacy on the potential of future school leaders can be accepted.

According to the results of the regression equation, several things can be explained as follows. Intercept (0.496) is the value of Y when X_1 and X_2 are equal to 0 as seen on Table 8. This shows that if there is no contribution from the variables learning agility and digital literacy, the predicted value for the potential of future school leaders is 0.496. The coefficient X_1 (0.731) shows that for every one unit increase in learning agility, the value of the potential of future school leaders will increase by an average of 0.731 units assuming the variable digital literacy is considered constant. The coefficient X_2 (0.356) shows that for every one unit increase in the digital literacy variable, the potential value of future school leaders will increase by an average of 0.356 units assuming the learning agility variable is considered constant.

The results of this study also show a very strong positive relationship between learning



agility and digital literacy together with the potential of future school leaders. The interpretation of the relationship between X1 and X2 with Y is that if learning agility and digital literacy increase, the potential for success of future school leaders also increases. It is concluded that there is a significant and positive relationship between variable of learning agility and digital literacy together with the potential for success of future school leaders. Model validation was carried out using a structural test which showed a strong influence between learning agility and digital literacy together on the potential for future leadership.

Table 8. Coefficients Regression X1 & X2 toward Y

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0,496	0,185	-	2,674	0,008
	Learning Agility	0,731	0,054	0,602	13,651	0,000
	Digital Literacy	0,356	0,049	0,323	7,327	0,000

The correlation between the variable of learning agility and the potential future school leaders is very strong with a strong level of influence. The results of this study strengthen the findings of previous studies and provide real evidence that learning agility is a very strong determining factor for the potential of future school leaders. Thus, the selection and recruitment of school principals and school supervisors must take into account the learning agility conditions of these prospective leaders.

The variable of learning agility is a leading indicator of potential and growth competencies as main key of components of potential leaders (Milani et al., 2021). The most successful managers and executives are those who are highly agile in learning. They take the right lessons from experience by developing new competencies that lead to career success (Dai et al., 2013). The learning agility is indeed a strong predictor of being identified as a high-potential employee or not. Learning agility has even been shown to be a better predictor than past performance, which is still the main determinant of the high-potential employee identification process in many organizations today (Dries et al., 2012).

What about the influence of learning agility in education? Learning agility is a significant determinant of the work performance of prospective educators (Howard, 2017). Leaders with high learning agility have higher performance scores (Hofkes, 2024). The highest level of education completed has a strong positive relationship with learning agility (Haring et al., 2020).

The relationship between digital literacy variables and the potential of future school leaders is also very strong and its influence is also strong. This finding is also in line with the results of previous studies that the digital literacy skills of school principals have a positive effect on the learning process and student learning outcomes. Theories stating that the integration of educational digitalization in the learning process has a positive impact are also strengthened by the results of this study.

Many studies have shown that principals' technological leadership influences the integration of educational technology, which has a positive impact on student achievement and learning outcomes (Greaves et al., 2010). Principals' digital leadership improves teachers' technological literacy and directly motivates teachers to successfully incorporate technology in the classroom (Chang, 2012). Principals' digital leadership has a positive impact on teachers' technology integration (Al Ajmi, 2022). Principals contribute to building a digital learning culture in schools. To realize digital transformation, first of all principals should demonstrate digital leadership. They also should support the formation of a digital school learning culture (Karakose et al., 2021).

The role of school leaders is crucial in setting the direction and supporting the work of students and teachers in digitalization for teaching and learning. How school leaders prioritize and lead digitalization and support their organizations in this work, that is, leading digitalization, will be critical to school development (Lindqvist & Pettersson, 2018).

The relationship between the variables of learning agility and digital literacy with the potential of future school leaders is also very strong with a strong influence. However, there has

never been a study together between learning agility and digital literacy on the potential of future school leaders. However, the two independent variables give a signal about the importance of appointing school leaders based on competence, not on personal sentiment and political sentiment, and through leadership training preparation.

Recently, the policy of appointing school principals or school supervisors who come from teacher leaders has met with resistance from the old regime, it is difficult to change the top-down organizational culture, and it is difficult to build collaboration with various related parties. The appointment of school principals or school supervisors who are graduates of teacher leaders provides great benefits for optimizing, increasing efficiency, and increasing the effectiveness of school resource management (Sauri et al., 2024). In Indonesia, the problems related to school leadership are the lack of capacity to lead and manage schools and the inaccuracy of the principal selection process (Lumban Gaol, 2023). Although principal training in Indonesia has been standardized, micro-political influences still govern the appointment of principals (Sumintono et al., 2015).

The preparation of school leadership through the Teacher Leader Program is in line with international trends. The same international trends in the development of school principals, such as school leader qualifications include preparation qualifications, broad and comprehensive programs, multiphase design, and modularization (Huber, 2010). However, many have criticized that the Teacher Leader Program is still weak in leadership development because it focuses more on the learning aspect. It would be better if the Teacher Leader Program could strengthen the instructional leadership aspect as in Malaysia. The emphasis of school leadership preparation in Malaysia is on instructional leadership to improve student learning (Yoon-Mooi Ng, 2017).

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

It can be concluded that there is a positive, significant, and linear relationship and influence between the independent variables and the dependent variables, both individually and together. The higher the level of teacher learning agility, the better the potential for success of future school leaders. Likewise, the higher the level of teacher digital literacy, the better the potential for success of future school leaders. Based on the results of the hypothesis test, this research model has been proven valid and convincing. Selection to be school leaders should take into account the teacher's learning agility. Further research needs to be conducted regarding the success of principals and school supervisors comparing those who have different learning agility and digital literacy.

REFERENCES

- Al Ajmi, M. K. (2022). The Impact of Digital Leadership on Teachers' Technology Integration During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Kuwait. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 112, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101928>
- Ardiansyah, Z., Julia, J., & Sunaengsih, C. (2023). Rangkap Jabatan Kepala Sekolah Dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Manajemen Sekolah Dasar: Studi Kasus Di Kota Cirebon. *Jurnal Elementaria Edukasia*, 6(2), 490–505. <https://doi.org/10.31949/jee.v6i2.5280>
- Arwidayanto, Haris, I., Nawai, F. A., Ardhiani, N. L., Hardiyanti, W. E., Tuasikal, J. M. S., Isnanto, Wiyono, B. B., & Rusdinal. (2023). Nurturing Pre-Service and In-Service Education as The Pathway to Fostering The Teacher Leadership Skills. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Pendidikan*, 7(2), 294–305. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jppp.v7i2.62156>
- Aziz, M. R., Andriani, D. E., & Suharyadi, A. (2020). Indonesian Teacher Leadership Practices. *2nd Yogyakarta International Conference on Education Management/Administration*, 142–146. <https://www.atlantispress.com/proceedings/yicemap-19/125949909>
- Brixner, C., Isaak, P., Mochi, S., Ozono, M., Suárez, D., & Yoguel, G. (2020). Back to the future. Is industry 4.0 a new tecno-organizational paradigm? Implications for Latin American countries. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 29(7), 705–719. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10438599.2020.1719642>
- Chang, I.-H. (2012). The Effect of Principals' Technological Leadership on Teachers' Technological Literacy and Teaching Effectiveness in Taiwanese Elementary Schools.



- Educational Technology & Society*, 15(2), 1176–3647.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.15.2.328>
- Chin. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. *Modern Methods for Business Research*, 295(2), 295–336.
<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781410604385-10/partial-least-squares-approach-structural-equation-modeling-wynne-chin>.
- Church, A. H., Guidry, B. W., Dickey, J. A., & Scrivani, J. A. (2021). Is there potential in assessing for high-potential? Evaluating the relationships between performance ratings, leadership assessment data, designated high-potential status and promotion outcomes in a global organization. *Leadership Quarterly*, 32(5), 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101516>
- Dai, G., De Meuse, K. P., & Tang, K. Y. (2013). The role of learning agility in executive career success: The results of two field studies. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 108–131.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43488163>
- Day, D. V., & O'Connor, P. M. G. (2017). *Talent Development: Building Organizational Capacity* (D. G. Collings, K. Mellahi, & W. F. Cascio, Eds.; Vol. 1). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198758273.013.15>
- DeLuca, C., Bolden, B., & Chan, J. (2017). Systemic professional learning through collaborative inquiry: Examining teachers' perspectives. *Teaching and teacher education*, 67, 67–78.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.05.014>
- De Meuse, K. P. (2017). Learning agility: Its evolution as a psychological construct and its empirical relationship to leader success. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 69(4), 267. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-52546-002>
- Don, Y., Awang, I., Kasa, D., Faiz, M., Yaakob, M., Yanti, P. G., Asiah, N., & Yanti, G. (2020). Comparing Distributive Leadership Practices among Teacher Leaders in Malaysian and Indonesian Schools. *International Journal of Management (IJM)*, 11(7), 1197–1211.
<https://doi.org/10.34218/IJM.11.7.2020.106>
- Dries, N., Vantilborgh, T., & Pepermans, R. (2012). The role of learning agility and career variety in the identification and development of high potential employees. *Personnel Review*, 41(3), 340–358. <https://www.emerald.com/pr/article-abstract/41/3/340/318469/The-role-of-learning-agility-and-career-variety-in?redirectedFrom=fulltext> \
- Edge, K. (2015). Generation X leaders in global cities: Emerging perspectives on recruitment, retention and succession planning. In *Leading futures: Global perspectives on educational leadership*. SAGE Publications India New Delhi.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308012646>
- Eliawati, T., & Dina, I. H. (2018). Teacher Leadership in The Class on Student Character Building. *MELT Journal*, 3(2). <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6850.pdf>
- Finkelstein, L. M., Costanza, D. P., & Goodwin, G. F. (2018). Do your high potentials have potential? The impact of individual differences and designation on leader success. *Personnel Psychology*, 71(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12225>
- Greaves, T., Hayes, J., Wilson, L., Gielniak, M., & Peterson, R. (2010). *The Technology Factors: Nine Keys to Student Achievement and Cost-Effectiveness*. www.ProjectRED.org
- Hansbrough, T. K., Lord, R. G., Schyns, B., Foti, R. J., Liden, R. C., & Acton, B. P. (2021). Do you remember? Rater memory systems and leadership measurement. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(2), 101455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101455>
- Haring, S., Shankar, J., & Hofkes, M. K. (2020). *The Potential of Learning Agility The relationship between Learning Agility and Success*. <https://www.hfmentalex.com/en/forms/download-whitepaper-potential-learning-agility/>
- Herold, G. (2016). Leadership in the fourth industrial revolution. *Stanton Chase Business Journals*, 22(12), 1–15. <https://be.stantonchase.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Leadership-in-Fourth-Industrial-Revolution.pdf>
- Hoff, D. F., & Burke, W. W. (2017). *Learning Agility: The Key to Leader Potential*. Hogan Press.



- <https://easiconsult.com>
- Hoff, D. F., & Smith, D. E. (2020). Leadership and Learning Agility: A Lifelong Journey for W. Warner Burke. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(4), 492–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886320954922>
- Hofkes, K. B. F. (2024). Learning Agility Whitepaper. In *HFM Talentindex*. <https://www.hfmentalindex.com/en/news/learning-agility-whitepaper/>
- Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2011). *Management derailment*. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-06019-015>
- Howard, D. (2017). *Learning Agility in Education: an Analysis of Pre-Service Teacher's Learning Agility and Teaching Performance* [Tarleton State University]. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/f816c8411bbc7a4a968a582e5b7cda2a/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750>
- Huber, S. G. (2010). Preparing School Leaders – International Approaches in Leadership Development. In *School Leadership - International Perspectives* (Vol. 10, pp. 225–251). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-3501-1_12
- Jabar, C. S. A., Khuzaimi, I., & Andriani, D. E. (2020). Menarikkah Jabatan Kepala Sekolah Dasar di Indonesia dalam Pandangan Guru? (Is the Primary School Principal Job in Indonesia Attractive in Teachers' Views?). *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi, Manajemen Dan Kepemimpinan Pendidikan*, 2(1), 99–121. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21831/jump.v2i1.31051>
- Karakose, T., Polat, H., & Papadakis, S. (2021). Examining teachers' perspectives on school principals' digital leadership roles and technology capabilities during the covid-19 pandemic. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(23). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132313448>
- Lindqvist, H., & Pettersson, F. (2018). Leading For Digitalization: Exploring The Leadership Perspective. *International Conference on Information Communication Technologies (ICICTE)*, 371–381. <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-151165>
- Lumban Gaol, N. T. (2023). School leadership in Indonesia: A systematic literature review. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 51(4), 831–848. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211010811>
- Milani, R., Setti, I., & Argentero, P. (2021). Learning agility and talent management: A systematic review and future prospects. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 73(4), 349. <https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/2022-19273-004>
- Mubarak, R. (2022). Guru Sebagai Pemimpin di Dalam Kelas Pada Pembelajaran Tatap Muka Terbatas (PTMT). *Ensiklopedia: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Inovasi Pembelajaran Saburai*, 2(01), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.24967/esp.v2i01.1524>
- Navaridas-Nalda, F., Clavel-San Emeterio, M., Fernández-Ortiz, R., & Arias-Oliva, M. (2020). The strategic influence of school principal leadership in the digital transformation of schools. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 112, 106481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106481>
- Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving School Leadership, Volume 1: Policy and Practice*. OECD. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2008/07/improving-school-leadership-volume-1_g1gh8f44/9789264044715-en.pdf
- Redaksi Pojok Kalbar. (2024). Yustinus: Tolak Regulasi Pengangkatan Guru Penggerak menjadi Pengawas Sekolah. *Pojok Kalbar*. <https://pojokkalbar.com/index.php/yustinus-tolak-regulasi-pengangkatan-guru-penggerak-menjadi-pengawas-sekolah/>
- Sauri, R. S., Saadah, E., Jam'an, P., Hermawan, W., Rukhaida, I., Jabar, R., & Sopandi, U. (2024). Implementasi Kebijakan Pengangkatan Kepala Sekolah dan Pengawas Sekolah dari Guru Penggerak Pada Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten Garut. *JIPMuktj: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Kramat Jati*, 5(1), 133–137. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.55943/jipmuktj.v5i1.162>
- Subagyo, T. (2024). Kekurangan pengawas sekolah capai 22.531 orang. *Kantor Berita ANTARA*. <https://www.antaranews.com/berita/3979866/kekurangan-pengawas-sekolah-capai->

22531-orang

- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen* (4th ed.). Alfabeta. https://digilib.stekom.ac.id/assets/dokumen/ebook/feb_35efe6a47227d6031a75569c2f3f39d44fe2db43_1652079047.pdf
- Sumintono, B., Sheyoputri, E. Y. A., Jiang, N., Misbach, I. H., & Jumintono. (2015). Becoming a principal in Indonesia: possibility, pitfalls and potential. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35(3), 342–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2015.1056595>
- UNESCO. (2016). Leading better learning: School leadership and quality in the Education 2030 agenda. In *Regional reviews of policies and practices*. <https://www.wise-qatar.org/app/uploads/2020/12/leadership-report.pdf>
- Yoon-Mooi Ng, A. (2017). School leadership preparation in Malaysia: Aims, content and impact. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 45(6), 1002–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216662922>

