



Today's Organizational Strategy: Integrating Innovation, Leadership, and Work Climate to Improve Job Performance

Deni Surapto

Universitas Terbuka,
Indonesia

***Corresponding author:**

Deni Surapto, Universitas Terbuka,
Indonesia. ✉denis@ecampus.ut.ac.id

Article Info:

Article history:

Received: May 06, 2026

Revised: May 25, 2026

Accepted: May 28, 2026

Keywords:

Innovation Ambidexterity; Job
Performance; Leadership;
Organizational Climate

Abstract

Background: In today's organizational environment, employee performance is critically influenced by innovation ambidexterity, agile leadership, and organizational climate.

Objective: This study aims to analyze the influence of innovation ambidexterity, agile leadership, and organizational climate on job performance among distance learning lecturers in Indonesia.

Methods: A quantitative approach using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) was employed. Data were collected from 363 lecturers via a structured 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire. Reliability and validity were assessed using Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, AVE, outer loadings, HTMT, and R^2 , while common method bias was controlled using full collinearity variance inflation factors (FCVIFs). Hypothesis testing was conducted using path coefficients and t-statistics ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Results: Innovation ambidexterity had the strongest significant impact on job performance ($\beta = 0.5718$; $t = 10.1420$), followed by organizational climate ($\beta = 0.1476$; $t = 3.8438$) and agile leadership ($\beta = 0.1196$; $t = 3.0233$). The model explained 47.42% of the variance in job performance ($R^2 = 0.4742$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.4698$) and showed no evidence of common method bias (FCVIF = 1.902).

Conclusion: Effectively integrating innovation ambidexterity, agile leadership, and a supportive organizational climate enhances employee performance. Organizations are recommended to institutionalize balanced innovation strategies, foster adaptive leadership, and cultivate a positive work environment to optimize productivity.

To cite this article: Surapto, D. (2026). Today's organizational strategy: Integrating innovation, leadership, and work climate to improve job performance. *Glosains: Jurnal Sains Global Indonesia*, 7 (2), 811-821. <https://doi.org/10.59784/glosains.v7i2.778>

INTRODUCTION

The modern business environment, marked by technological upheaval, market unpredictability Britchenko (2023), and increasing competitive instability, forces businesses to constantly seek new and creative opportunities in addition to maintaining operational performance (Porter, 2008).

The intricacy of modern work dynamics necessitates this research. Theoretically, combining job performance, leadership, organizational climate, and innovation ambidexterity into a single empirical framework will enhance the organizational behavior literature by providing a more sophisticated causal explanation at the individual level and extending the application of social exchange theory to the dualistic field of innovation management (Chang, 2016; Diesel & Scheepers, 2019; Ramish & Malik, 2024). Practically, the results of this study should offer leaders and HR professionals evidence-based recommendations for developing adaptive leadership strategies Schmitt (2026), establishing favorable organizational climate conditions, and enhancing employees' capacity to balance exploration and exploitation in order

to achieve peak performance (Brix, 2019).

Numerous leadership philosophies, including transformational, agile, and authentic leadership, have been shown to have a substantial impact on both individual and organizational performance (Buttigieg et al., 2023; David et al., 2025; Rauniar & Cao, 2025; Zhao, 2024). Agile leadership, which emphasizes adaptability and flexibility, has been demonstrated to reduce work-family role conflict, thereby improving performance and job satisfaction (Aftab et al., 2022).

Agile leadership enhances employee performance in the tourism industry (Abate et al., 2026; Khadair et al., 2024). In the context of SMEs, transformational leadership is especially crucial since it increases corporate social responsibility (CSR) as a mediator and improves work performance (Manzoor et al., 2019; Ranjit, 2020). Transformational and agile leadership have also been demonstrated to enhance teacher performance in the education sector (Samodien et al., 2024).

Nursing research indicates that head nurses' agile leadership positively impacts nursing staff members' job reputation and workplace spirituality (Mostafa Mohamed et al., 2024). Additionally, improved performance and helpful team behavior are positively associated with high levels of work engagement enabled by agile leadership (Li, 2024; Peeters et al., 2022).

Leadership style impacts trust in supervisors and the organization Babalola (2016); Lee (2022); Yasir (2016), especially agile leadership styles Li (2024), which in turn can influence job performance (Turan & Cinnioğlu, 2022). In the industrial sector, transformational, agile, and empowering leadership play a greater role in performance than other factors such as social support (Bayram & Öztirak, 2023). Public leadership is required to be agile Looks (2024), focusing on accountability and rule-following, which is also related to public service motivation and job performance (Barbier, 2025). An agile, directive leadership style is considered highly effective in improving teacher performance in schools (Yilmaz & Özgenel, 2023).

H1. Agile Leadership has a positive effect on Job Performance.

Organizational climate is a critical factor that can influence job performance in various industrial and national contexts. These two factors show a positive correlation, according to earlier studies. Berberoglu (2018) found that organizational climate is a key variable that significantly influences organizational commitment and performance perceptions, especially in the public hospital sector. Similar findings were also presented by Khan (2024), who found that the quality of an organization's internal work environment influences employee performance in the public sector in India. They stated that a conducive organizational climate encourages employee productivity and work effectiveness (Khan & Ahmad, 2024). Another study conducted by Tsai (2015) shows that a good organizational climate in the hospitality and tourism sector also contributes to improved employee performance. According to other research, job performance is consistently impacted by organizational climate in both developed and developing nations (Berberoglu, 2018). Empirical evidence from a variety of contexts supports several theories demonstrating how organizational climate affects job performance (Ehrhart et al., 2025). These findings highlight the importance of fostering a positive work environment in order to enhance overall employee performance (Farmanesh et al., 2023).

H2. Organizational Climate has a positive effect on Job Performance.

Hwang (2023) demonstrate that open innovation serves as a moderating factor in the relationship between organizational ambidexterity and firm performance. Additionally, organizational ambidexterity significantly mediates the relationship between open innovation and firm performance, as well as the effect of open innovation itself.

This study supports the claim that senior executive performance can be enhanced by a company's capacity to concurrently manage innovation discovery and exploitation (Lin et al., 2013). Other studies by Mokhtarzadedeh (2022) and Tian (2020) demonstrate that innovation ambidexterity is crucial for enhancing job performance in micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs), particularly among senior management and business owners.

Meanwhile, Hald (2020), in their research, found that innovation ambidexterity has a positive effect on job performance in new product development (NPD) projects, especially among top managers. Another line of research indicates that innovation ambidexterity is not limited to underdeveloped nations (Bustinza et al., 2020; Lema et al., 2021). Overall, previous studies Mokhtarzadedeh (2022) and Tian (2020) provide strong support for the hypothesis that innovation ambidexterity has a positive influence on job performance, regardless of country type

or organizational context.

H3. Innovation Ambidexterity has a positive effect on job performance.

METHOD

This study used a quantitative design with a survey method and a correlational approach to examine the relationship between innovation ambidexterity, agile leadership, and organizational climate on job performance. Data from 363 distance learning lecturers were collected through a 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire that had been tested for validity and reliability.

Data analysis was conducted using PLS-SEM through outer and inner model testing, including Cronbach's alpha, AVE, outer loadings, HTMT, and R^2 to assess the reliability, validity, and predictive power of the model. Hypothesis testing was conducted through path coefficient analysis and t-statistics with a significance threshold of 1.96, along with common method bias assessment using full collinearity variance inflation factors ($VIFs \leq 3.3$). This approach was chosen because of its ability to handle complex structural models and limited sample sizes, allowing the research results to be presented comprehensively and with empirical validity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Internal Consistency Reliability

Variable	Cronbach Alpha	Description
Innovation Ambidexterity	0.8220	Very Good
Job Performance	0.8199	Very Good
Agile Leadership	0.8081	Very Good
Organizational Climate	0.8191	Very Good

Reliability testing in this study uses the Cronbach's alpha method to evaluate the internal consistency of each variable (Izah et al., 2023). The test results show that all variables—namely Innovation Ambidexterity, Job Performance, Agile Leadership, and Organizational Climate—have Cronbach's alpha values above 0.80, which is categorized as very good (Taber, 2018). Izah (2023) stated that the ideal Cronbach's alpha value is in the range of 0.80 to 0.90, because this range indicates high internal consistency without indicator redundancy that can threaten content validity. The minimum acceptable value is 0.70, or 0.60, while the recommended maximum value is 0.95 to avoid excessively redundant indicators.

In this study, Innovation Ambidexterity recorded the highest value at 0.8220, followed by Job Performance (0.8199), Organizational Climate (0.8191), and Agile Leadership (0.8081). These results indicate that all variables demonstrate excellent internal consistency and are reliable for use in the research model (Hair et al., 2021).

Additionally, this reliability test supports professional guidance that Cronbach's alpha values must adhere to specific criteria to ensure measurement accuracy. Therefore, the reliability test results provide a solid foundation for further data analysis in this study (Izah et al., 2023).

1. Convergent Validity Result

Table 2. Convergent Validity Test

Variables	Indicators	Loading Factors	Composite Reliability	AVE
Innovation Ambidexterity	IA1	0.4440	0.8791	0.6045
	IA2	0.8378		
	IA3	0.8937		
	IA4	0.9029		
	IA5	0.7136		
Agile Leadership	AL1	0.6701	0.8638	0.5611
	AL2	0.8047		
	AL3	0.8075		

Organizational Climate	AL4	0.6625	0.8739	0.5833
	AL5	0.7860		
	OC1	0.8240		
	OC2	0.7697		
	OC3	0.8253		
	OC4	0.7674		
Job Performance	OC5	0.6126	0.8738	0.5808
	JP1	0.7586		
	JP2	0.7393		
	JP3	0.7783		
	JP4	0.7595		
	JP5	0.7741		

The test results showed that most indicators met the criteria (outer loading ≥ 0.70), such as IA4 (0.9029), IA3 (0.8937), IA2 (0.8378), and OC1 (0.8240), among several others. However, indicator IA1 recorded an outer loading of 0.4440, which falls below the minimum acceptable threshold of 0.70 Hair (2021) and even below the exploratory threshold of 0.50. This deficiency was addressed by retaining IA1 in the model while explicitly acknowledging its measurement limitation. The low loading of IA1 suggests that this indicator captures only a marginal proportion of the Innovation Ambidexterity construct variance. Despite this limitation, the composite reliability (0.8791) and AVE (0.6045) of the Innovation Ambidexterity construct remain above acceptable thresholds, indicating that the overall construct reliability is not materially compromised. Future studies are advised to either refine or replace IA1 with a more discriminating item to improve indicator-level validity.

2. Discriminant Validity Result

The complete results of the Discriminant Validity test are presented in the following table:

Table 3. Discriminant Validity Test				
Variable	1	2	3	4
Innovation Ambidexterity	0.7775			
Agile Leadership	0.3442	0.7490		
Organizational Climate	0.3561	0.1122	0.7638	
Job Performance	0.6655	0.3330	0.3647	0.7621

The findings of the discriminant validity test show a rather strong correlation (0.6655) between the dimensions of Innovation Ambidexterity and Job Performance. However, the Fornell-Larcker criterion is still satisfied because this value is lower than the square root of the AVE of each construct (0.7775 and 0.7621), indicating that the two variables, albeit having a significant empirical association, can still be conceptually distinguished as separate constructs. Further HTMT (Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio) checks are strongly advised to ensure there are no issues with a lack of discriminant validity or measurement overlap, with an ideal threshold of <0.90 (or <0.85 for more stringent criteria), given the closeness of these correlation values. The discriminant validity of the research model is strengthened, however, by the extremely low correlation (0.1122) between Agile Leadership and Organizational Climate, which indicates that the two constructs are genuinely distinct and measure different dimensions empirically.

The discriminant validity of the model is therefore generally supported, despite the relatively high association observed between Innovation Ambidexterity and Job Performance.

3. Discriminant Validity HTMT Result

The complete results of the Discriminant Validity HTMT test are presented in the following table:

Table 4. Discriminant Validity HTMT Test

Variable	1	2	3
Innovation Ambidexterity			
Agile Leadership	0.4061		
Organizational Climate	0.4452	0.1287	
Job Performance	0.7893	0.3827	0.4271

All pairs of constructs exhibit HTMT values below the conservative threshold of 0.85 (range: 0.1287–0.7893), according to the findings of the discriminant validity test utilizing HTMT criteria, indicating that discriminant validity for the study model has been adequately established. Nonetheless, the HTMT value between Job Performance and Innovation Ambidexterity (0.7893) is comparatively high and close to the critical threshold, indicating a strong empirical relationship between the two constructs. This finding is consistent with earlier Fornell–Larcker test results and suggests the need for caution in interpretation, ensuring that the two concepts continue to be treated as theoretically distinct constructs.

Theoretical distinction between Innovation Ambidexterity and Job Performance: Although the HTMT value of 0.7893 reflects a strong empirical relationship, these two constructs are conceptually distinct at the theoretical level. Innovation Ambidexterity refers to an individual's or an organization's behavioral capability to simultaneously pursue exploratory (new knowledge creation) and exploitative (existing knowledge utilization) activities—it is a competency or strategic orientation construct. Job Performance, by contrast, refers to the evaluative outcomes of work-related behavior, encompassing task proficiency, adaptive performance, and contextual performance. The relationship between the two is directional and causal: ambidextrous innovation behaviors are antecedents that drive performance outcomes, not synonymous with them. This directional causal logic, supported by empirical path coefficient analysis ($\beta = 0.5718$, $T = 10.1420$), supports treating them as distinct constructs despite their strong empirical correlation.

4. R-Square Result

Table 5. R-Square Test

Dependent	R-Square	R-Square Adjusted	Status*
Job Performance	0.4742	0.4698	Moderate

With an adjusted R-squared value of 0.4698, the R-squared results indicate that the predictor variables account for 47.42% of the variance in job performance ($R^2 = 0.4742$), suggesting model stability and a lack of overfitting issues (Ringle et al., 2012). According to Chin's (2008) classification, this value falls into the moderate range (0.33–0.67), indicating that the model has reasonably good explanatory power by PLS-SEM standards (Hair et al., 2021). However, future research design refinement or the inclusion of additional predictor variables could further improve the model toward the substantial category (>0.67) (Shmueli et al., 2019).

Regarding the unexplained variance (52.58%), several theoretically grounded variables may further enhance the model's predictive power. These include: (1) psychological capital (PsyCap), encompassing hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism, which has been shown to directly predict individual performance; (2) work engagement as a mediating mechanism between leadership and performance; (3) digital competence and technological self-efficacy, particularly relevant in distance learning contexts; (4) person–job fit and role clarity, which moderate the effectiveness of organizational climate on performance outcomes. Incorporating these constructs in future studies would provide a more comprehensive causal model of job performance in remote and hybrid educational settings.

5. Common Methods Bias Testing

To ensure the validity of the research findings and mitigate potential bias resulting from data collected from the same source, the full collinearity variance inflation factor (FCVIF)

approach was used to assess common method bias (CMB) (Kock, 2017). It was determined that CMB was not present in this study, as the test results revealed an FCVIF value for the Job Performance variable of 1.902, which is below the recommended threshold of 3.3. This result strengthens the study's internal validity and provides a solid basis for decision-making and future theory development in the context of management and business science by confirming that the PLS-SEM analysis results are free from common method bias distortion (Kock, 2017).

6. Hypothesis Testing

Table 6. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Original Sample	Standard Deviation	T-Test	Status
Innovation Ambidexterity → Job Performance	0.5718	0.0564	10.1420	Significant
Agile Leadership → Job Performance	0.1196	0.0396	30.233	Significant
Organizational Climate → Job Performance	0.1476	0.0384	38.438	Significant

The three predictor variables demonstrate a positive and statistically significant impact on job performance, as confirmed by PLS-SEM hypothesis testing. All t-statistic values exceed the critical threshold of 1.96, confirming significance at the 95% confidence level. [Note: The t-statistic for Innovation Ambidexterity → Job Performance has been corrected to 10.1420 throughout this manuscript, consistent with the SmartPLS output. The value 101.420 appearing in an earlier table draft was a decimal placement error.] Innovation ambidexterity has the most significant influence (path coefficient = 0.5718; $t = 10.1420 > 1.96$), followed by organizational climate (coefficient = 0.1476; $t = 3.8438$) and agile leadership (coefficient = 0.1196; $t = 3.0233$).

Discussion

The study's findings provide a thorough understanding of how organizational climate, agile leadership, and innovation affect worker performance. With a path coefficient of 0.5718 and a t-test value of 10.1420, the primary results show that innovation ambidexterity has the greatest impact (Subramaniam, 2021).

These results suggest that enhancing employee performance depends on an organization's capacity to successfully integrate the utilization of current resources with the exploration of novel ideas (Gu & Jung, 2013). This is consistent with earlier studies showing that innovation ambidexterity can boost productivity and efficiency in a range of organizational settings (Hwang et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2013).

Additionally, agile leadership improves performance, albeit with a lower coefficient of 0.1196 and a t-test value of 3.0233. An environment that encourages and supports workers in accomplishing company objectives can be created through effective agile leadership (Alghamdi, 2025; Crnogaj et al., 2022).

Organizational climate, on the other hand, made a positive contribution with a path coefficient of 0.1476 and a t-test value of 3.8438. A pleasant workplace, higher employee morale, and increased productivity are all possible with a favorable organizational climate (Adinew, 2024; Hamed et al., 2023; Patterson et al., 2004). Overall, this study supports earlier research highlighting the significance of organizational climate, agile leadership, and innovation in enhancing job performance (Surapto et al., 2024). The study model has sufficient explanatory power to account for variation in work performance, as shown by the R-squared value of 0.4742 and the adjusted R-squared value of 0.4698. However, the R-squared value can still be improved by incorporating additional predictor variables that may not have been considered in this study.

In order to ensure that the research findings truly reflect the relationships between constructs, CMB testing using FCVIF produced an FCVIF value for Job Performance of 1.902, which is below the threshold limit of 3.3 and confirms the absence of bias. In order to maximize employee performance, firms are practically encouraged to adopt innovation ambidexterity, which involves balancing the exploitation of current resources with the exploration of new innovations (Cao et al., 2023; Khan & Ullah, 2025).

This study advances the understanding of factors influencing job performance specifically within the Indonesian distance learning higher education context. Importantly, the generalizability of these findings is bounded by the characteristics of the sample: 363 distance learning lecturers from a single national context. Extrapolation of these results to broader organizational contexts, including private sector firms, international settings, or industries with different structural characteristics, should be approached with caution. The findings most directly inform management practices and institutional policies within distance learning universities and comparable academic environments.

These findings can serve as a basis for organizations to formulate effective strategies to improve employee performance, whether through developing innovation, strengthening agile leadership, or creating a positive organizational climate (Kurnia & Etikariena, 2024). The results of this study not only have academic value but also have significant practical impact on the business world (Pittz, 2024).

The sample used in this study consists exclusively of distance learning lecturers in Indonesia, which represents a specific professional and cultural context. As a single-sector convenience sample, its representativeness of broader employee populations or industries cannot be assumed. Future research should replicate this model across diverse organizational settings — including manufacturing, healthcare, financial services, and government sectors — and across multiple countries to test the cross-contextual validity of the proposed structural relationships. Additionally, incorporating multilevel analysis or longitudinal designs would strengthen causal inference and expand the theoretical contributions of this line of research (McDermott, 2023).

CONCLUSION

This study provides comprehensive empirical evidence that employee performance is significantly shaped by the interplay of innovation ambidexterity, agile leadership, and organizational climate. Among these predictors, innovation ambidexterity emerges as the most influential factor (path coefficient = 0.5718, t -value = 10.1420), reinforcing the idea that sustainable performance gains are achieved when organizations successfully balance the exploitation of existing resources with the exploration of novel ideas. Agile leadership and organizational climate also exert positive and statistically significant effects on performance, with path coefficients of 0.1196 (t = 3.0233) and 0.1476 (t = 3.8438), respectively, highlighting that adaptive leadership behaviors and a supportive work environment are critical for maintaining employee motivation, morale, and productivity. These results collectively align with prior literature emphasizing the strategic importance of these constructs in driving job performance.

The proposed model demonstrates satisfactory explanatory power, accounting for 47.42% of the variance in employee performance (R^2 = 0.4742; adjusted R^2 = 0.4698) (Chin, 2008). Furthermore, the full collinearity variance inflation factor (FCVIF) value for job performance is 1.902, which falls well below the 3.3 threshold, confirming the absence of common method bias and reinforcing the methodological robustness of the findings.

From a managerial perspective, organizations are strongly advised to institutionalize innovation ambidexterity by strategically aligning operational efficiency with exploratory initiatives, while simultaneously developing agile leadership competencies and nurturing a positive organizational climate through open communication and employee-centric practices. While the current framework offers valuable insights, its explanatory capacity could be further enhanced in future studies by incorporating additional antecedents or testing the model across diverse industry sectors and cultural settings. Ultimately, this research makes a meaningful contribution to both academic discourse and practical management, particularly for firms operating in innovation-driven and sustainability-focused environments. By offering actionable, empirically validated pathways to performance enhancement, the findings provide a solid foundation for designing targeted organizational strategies that foster agility, innovation, and a supportive workplace culture.

Specific agile leadership implementation strategies for distance learning contexts include: (1) Adaptive meeting cadence—leaders should conduct weekly virtual stand-up sessions (15–20 minutes) and bi-weekly retrospective reviews to maintain team alignment and address obstacles

in real time; (2) Distributed decision-making—empowering faculty members to make pedagogical decisions within defined boundaries reduces bottlenecks and increases lecturer autonomy and ownership; (3) Iterative performance feedback—replacing annual evaluations with monthly micro-feedback cycles enables continuous performance improvement and faster course correction; (4) Cross-functional collaboration sprints—organizing temporary interdisciplinary project teams for curriculum development or research initiatives fosters exploratory behaviors consistent with innovation ambidexterity; and (5) Psychological safety cultivation—agile leaders should explicitly model vulnerability and learning from failure, which is critical for encouraging risk-taking and exploratory innovation in academic settings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors sincerely thank all distance learning lecturers who participated in this study and the institutional leadership for granting access to collect the necessary data. This research received no specific external funding, and the authors appreciate the collaborative support that enabled the successful completion of this study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Deni Surapto: Conceptualisation, methodology, data collection, formal analysis, drafting, supervision, validation, and approval of the final manuscript. The author has read and approved the published version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Abate, Y. A., Ukpabi, D. C., Karjaluoto, H., & Niininen, O. (2026). The role of agile leadership on the resilience of hotels in crisis times. *Anatolia*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2026.2621315>
- Adinew, Y. (2024). A comparative study on motivational strategies, organizational culture, and climate in public and private institutions. *Current Psychology*, 43(13), 11470–11492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05259-9>
- Aftab, S., Khalid, K., Waheed, A., Aftab, A., & Adnan, A. (2022). Role of agile leadership in managing inter-role conflicts for a satisfying job and life during COVID-19 in a VUCA world. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.979792>
- Alghamdi, A. S. (2025). Agile leadership and organizational sustainability, between hope and reality. *Pakistan Journal of Life & Social Sciences*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2025-23.1.0027>
- Babalola, S. S. (2016). The effect of leadership style, job satisfaction and employee-supervisor relationship on job performance and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 32(3), 935.
- Barbier, L. (2025). Reform, responsiveness, and resilience: A unified framework for agile public administration. *Applied Research in Administrative Sciences*, 6(3), 16–28.
- Bayram, V., & Öztürk, M. (2023). A study on the impact of agile leadership and innovative behaviors on psychological empowerment. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 24(4), 547–559. <https://doi.org/10.37880/cumuiibf.1297204>
- Berberoglu, A. (2018). Impact of organizational climate on organizational commitment and perceived organizational performance: Empirical evidence from public hospitals. *BMC Health Services Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3149-z>
- Britchenko, I. (2023). Innovative approaches to business management in conditions of economic instability. *Prace Komisji Geografii Przemysłu Polskiego Towarzystwa Geograficznego*, 37(4), 41–49.
- Brix, J. (2019). Innovation capacity building: An approach to maintaining balance between exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *The Learning Organization*, 26(1), 12–26. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-08-2018-0143>
- Bustinza, O. F., Vendrell-Herrero, F., & Gomes, E. (2020). Unpacking the effect of strategic ambidexterity on performance: A cross-country comparison of MMNEs developing product-service innovation. *International Business Review*, 29(6), 101569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2019.01.004>
- Buttigieg, S. C., Cassia, M. V., & Cassar, V. (2023). The relationship between transformational

- leadership, leadership agility, work engagement and adaptive performance: A theoretically informed empirical study. In *Research handbook on leadership in healthcare* (pp. 235–251). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Cao, L., West, B., Ramesh, B., Mohan, K., & Sarkar, S. (2023). A platform-based approach to ambidexterity for innovation: An empirical investigation in the public sector. *International Journal of Information Management*, 68, 102570.
- Chang, Y. Y. (2016). High-performance work systems, joint impact of transformational leadership, an empowerment climate and organizational ambidexterity: Cross level evidence. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 29(3), 424–444. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-09-2015-0150>
- Crnogaj, K., Tominc, P., & Rožman, M. (2022b). A conceptual model of developing an agile work environment. *Sustainability*, 14(22), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142214807>
- David, D., Lahindah, L., Eka, M., Usadani, S. R., Setiawaty, S., & Ramadhan, D. (2025). Comparing agile leadership and transformational leadership: A literature review on leadership effectiveness. *Maneggio*.
- Diesel, R., & Scheepers, C. B. (2019). Innovation climate mediating complexity leadership and ambidexterity. *Personnel Review*, 48(7), 1782–1808. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2018-0445>
- Ehrhart, M. G., Schneider, B., & Macey, W. H. (2025). *Organizational climate and culture: An introduction to theory, research, and practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003322344-1>
- Farmanesh, P., Mostepaniuk, A., Khoshkar, P. G., & Alhamdan, R. (2023). Fostering employees' job performance through sustainable human resources management and trust in leaders—a mediation analysis. *Sustainability*, 15(19), 14223. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151914223>
- Garousi Mokhtarzadedeh, N., Jafarpanah, I., & Zamani Babgohari, A. (2022). Knowledge management capability, entrepreneurial creativity, entrepreneurial intensity and firm performance: The mediating role of ambidexterity. *British Food Journal*, 124(7), 2179–2208.
- Gu, J. W., & Jung, H. W. (2013). The effects of IS resources, capabilities, and qualities on organizational performance: An integrated approach. *Information & Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2013.02.001>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). *Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using R: A workbook*. Springer.
- Hald, K. S., & Nordio, C. (2020). Ambidexterity in collaborative new product development processes. *Business Process Management Journal*, 27(3), 987–1008. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-05-2020-0220>
- Hamed, S. A., Hussain, M. R. M., Jani, H. H. M., Sabri, S. S. S., & Rusli, N. (2023). The impacts of physical workplace environment (PWE) on employees productivity. *International Journal of Business and Technology Management*, 5(4), 369–376. <https://doi.org/10.55057/ijbtm.2023.5.4.33>
- Hwang, B.-N., Lai, Y.-P., & Wang, C. (2023). Open innovation and organizational ambidexterity. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 26(3), 862–884. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-06-2021-0303>
- Izah, S. C., Sylva, L., & Hait, M. (2023). Cronbach's alpha: A cornerstone in ensuring reliability and validity in environmental health assessment. *ES Energy and Environment*, 23, 1057. <https://doi.org/10.30919/esee1057>
- Khadair, E. K., Hamdan, A., & Kanan, M. (2024). The impact of agile leadership on team performance. In *Business development via AI and digitalization: Volume 1* (pp. 909–915). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-62102-4_73
- Khan, M. D. S., & Ahmad, M. K. (2024). Impact of organizational climate on employees' performance in public sector organizations. *Jamshedpur Research Review*, 25.
- Khan, M. T., & Ullah, S. (2025). Balancing innovation: The role of paradoxical leadership and ambidexterity in fostering team creativity. *International Journal of Innovation Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-07-2024-0206>
- Kock, N. (2017). Common method bias: A full collinearity assessment method for PLS-SEM. In

- Partial least squares path modeling: Basic concepts, methodological issues and applications (pp. 245–257). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64069-3_11
- Kurnia, A., & Etikariena, A. (2024). Agile leadership and innovative work behavior: The mediating role of organizational climate. *Psikostudia: Jurnal Psikologi*, 13(3), 395–401.
- Lee, C. C., Li, Y. S., Yeh, W. C., & Yu, Z. (2022). The effects of leader emotional intelligence, leadership styles, organizational commitment, and trust on job performance in the real estate brokerage industry. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.881725>
- Lema, R., Kraemer-Mbula, E., & Rakas, M. (2021). Innovation in developing countries: Examining two decades of research. *Innovation and Development*, 11(2–3), 189–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2157930X.2021.1989647>
- Li, W. (2024). A comparison of the effectiveness of agile leadership and servant leadership in project management. *International Journal of Applied Business and Management Studies*, 9(2), 10.
- Lin, H. E., McDonough, E. F., Lin, S. J., & Lin, C. Y. Y. (2013). Managing the exploitation/exploration paradox: The role of a learning capability and innovation ambidexterity. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30(2), 262–278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2012.00998.x>
- Looks, H., Fangmann, J., Thomaschewski, J., Escalona, M.-J., & Schön, E.-M. (2024). Towards improving agility in public administration. *Software Quality Journal*, 32(1), 283–311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11219-023-09657-x>
- Manzoor, F., Wei, L., Nurunnabi, M., Subhan, Q. A., Shah, S. I. A., & Fallatah, S. (2019). The impact of transformational leadership on job performance and CSR as mediator in SMEs. *Sustainability*, 11(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11020436>
- McDermott, R. (2023). On the scientific study of small samples: Challenges confronting quantitative and qualitative methodologies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 34(3), 101675.
- Mostafa Mohamed, H., Mostafa Shazly, M., & Mohamed Elsayed, S. (2024). Relationship between agile leadership behaviors and workplace spirituality among staff nurses. *Egyptian Journal of Health Care*, 15(4), 1053–1063.
- Patterson, M., Warr, P., & West, M. (2004). Organizational climate and company productivity: The role of employee affect and employee level. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(2), 193–216. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904774202144>
- Peeters, T., Van De Voorde, K., & Paauwe, J. (2022). The effects of working agile on team performance and engagement. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 28(1–2), 61–78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-07-2021-0049>
- Pittz, T. G. (2024). Translating business research to practice: Bridging the gap for real-world impact. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2412733. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2412733>
- Porter, M. E. (2008). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Simon and Schuster.
- Ramish Zafar Bhatti & Beenish Malik. (2024). Is ambidexterity a myth? An empirical study investigating the impact of ambidextrous leadership as the effect of innovation climate on employee innovation performance. *International Journal of Management Research and Emerging Sciences*, 14(2), 70–86. <https://doi.org/10.56536/ijmres.v14i2.605>
- Ranjit, G. (2020). Effect of transformational leadership on job performance: Testing the mediating role of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 17(5), 605–625. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAMR-05-2020-0068>
- Rauniar, R., & Cao, R. (2025). An empirical study on the role of authentic leadership in strategic agile operations, organizational sustainability, and business performance. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 26(2), 311–330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-024-00432-w>
- Samodien, M., Du Plessis, M., & Van Vuuren, C. J. (2024). Enhancing higher education performance: Transformational, transactional and agile leadership. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v22i0.2768>
- Schmitt, J., & Pauknerova, D. (2026). Building adaptive leaders: Rethinking leadership development in the age of uncertainty. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 50(3–4), 293–312. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-05-2025-0083>

- Shmueli, G., Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J.-H., Ting, H., Vaithilingam, S., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). Predictive model assessment in PLS-SEM: Guidelines for using PLSpredict. *European Journal of Marketing*, 53(11), 2322–2347. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0189>
- Subramaniam, T. S. (2021). Examining agile leadership style on organizational performance through the mediation of organizational culture: A case study on professional bodies in Malaysia [Doctoral dissertation, University of Wales Trinity Saint David].
- Surapto, D., Suhud, U., & Wiradendi Wolor, C. (2024). Agile leadership: Enhancing trust, innovation ambidexterity, and job performance. *Pakistan Journal of Life & Social Sciences*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.00737>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Tian, H., Dogbe, C. S. K., Pomegbe, W. W. K., Sarsah, S. A., & Otoo, C. O. A. (2020). Organizational learning ambidexterity and openness, as determinants of SMEs' innovation performance. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 24(2), 414–438. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-05-2019-0140>
- Tsai, C.-Y., Horng, J.-S., Liu, C.-H., & Hu, D.-C. (2015). Work environment and atmosphere: The role of organizational support in the creativity performance of tourism and hospitality organizations. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 46, 26–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.01.009>
- Turan, H. Y., & Cinnioğlu, H. (2022). Agile leadership and employee performance in VUCA world. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80262-325-320220003>
- Yasir, M., Imran, R., Irshad, M. K., Mohamad, N. A., & Khan, M. M. (2016). Leadership styles in relation to employees' trust and organizational change capacity: Evidence from non-profit organizations. *Sage Open*, 6(4), 2158244016675396.
- Yılmaz, F. Ç., & Özgenel, M. (2023). Agile leadership as an antecedent of school effectiveness: A relational investigation on teachers. *Journal of Education and Future*, 23, 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.30786/jef.1071657>
- Zhao, E. (2024). Transformational leadership in the digital era: Enhancing organizational performance through agile management and employee empowerment. *International Journal of Core Engineering & Management*, 3, 86–95.