

The Effect of Transformational Leadership on Lecturer Performance at Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk

Agung Kurniawan S. Djibran, Syamsu Qamar Badu, SittiRoskina Mas, Arwildayanto

Postgraduate Program Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

ABSTRACT : This research focused on the effect of transformational leadership on lecturer performance, specifically at Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk. Data were collected through questionnaire distribution, interviews, observation, and documentation. Data were quantitatively analyzed using statistical and qualitative analyses. The results demonstrated that transformational leadership behaviors had a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance by 53.7%. That was, 53.7% of lecturer performance variation could be elucidated by transformational leadership variation. In other words, hypothesis 1 was accepted. It exhibited that leaders, encompassing the leaders of the university, faculties, and departments at Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk, have positive and significant contributions to elevating lecturer performance.

KEYWORDS: *Transformational Leadership, Lecturer Performance, Qualitative Research*

I. INTRODUCTION

Education is a conscious attempt made to humanize humans. Through education, humans are shaped to have good knowledge, skills, and character. Education is a long-run investment; thus, the results are indirect. Still, it is ascertainable that the results will have an exceptionally positive impact on the future. With adequate education, individuals will have an assured future because of more job opportunities available, especially for university graduates.

Quality education is the main issue in the educational world in our country. According to Tilaar in Purba (2002), higher education should rectify its management as centralistic management has produced educational quality slumps. Thus, rectifying higher education becomes an absolute demand for attaining quality changes and better existence of higher education institutions in the future.

One of the indicators of our low educational quality is university ranks. In many different global rankings, universities or institutes in Indonesia are bottom-ranked. For example, QS WUR 2022 placed Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), which was the top-ranked university in Indonesia, in the 254th rank. Webometric 2020 placed Universitas Indonesia (UI), which was the nationally top ranked university, in the 603rd rank globally. Meanwhile, attributed to Muhammadiyah universities, Universitas Muhammad Surakarta (UMS) is nationally ranked 16th and 1201st globally. According to the Webometric version, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY) is ranked 16th in the national scale and 2173rd in the global scale. Several indicators the institutions employ to carry out ranking are good lecturer performance in the fields of education, teaching, research, and community services. Lecturer productivity in academic fields is the factor determining university prestige.

Lecturers are paramount components to enhance quality education. Lecturers in universities play strategic roles, if examined from the aspects of academic and student development. Lecturers are the best references for students. Research exhibits university quality is determined by lecturer quality. Hendrajaya (1999) states that in innovative and quality universities which are responsive to global development and local changes, their success is contingent upon developmental efforts. The main drivers of the growth are university lecturers.

From the explanation, it is clear that lecturer factors contribute to low university quality. This phenomenon also comes about in Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk, with its relatively low lecturer performance. Some of its indicators are low research productivity, relatively limited book and journal writing, and low innovations. Similarly, bearing on the community service aspect, there are constraints in efficient technology implementation. The conditions adversely influence the rank of Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk.

Based on the explanation, I conduct research on **the Effect of Transformational Leadership on Lecturer Performance at Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk**. This research aims to analyze the effect of transformational leadership on lecturer performance, especially at Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk.

II. METHOD

It was mix-method research using a sequential explanatory method. The variables were two, which were **transformational leadership** (X_1) as the independent variable and **lecturer performance** (Y) as the independent one. Data were collected through questionnaire distribution, interviews, observation, and documentation. Data were analyzed in two ways. Quantitative data were analyzed using statistical analysis, while qualitative ones were analyzed using qualitative analysis, made up of data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing phases.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Analysis Requirement Test

1. Normality Test

Normality test aimed to investigate if a variable was normal. Normally distributed data were the requirement of a parametric test. Data were normally distributed if Sig. was higher than alpha ($\alpha = 5\%$). Meanwhile, data were not normally distributed if Sig. was smaller than alpha ($\alpha = 5\%$). Data from the normality test are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Transformational Leadership (X1)	Lecturer Performance (Y)
N		99	99
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	103.92	85.78
	Std. Deviation	6.538	5.287
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.071	.066
	Positive	.071	.059
	Negative	-.050	-.066
Test Statistic		.071	.066
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200	.200

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Source: SPSS Output 2022

Table 1 points out that the significance (Asymp. Sig.) of the transformational leadership variable) was higher than alpha ($0.200 > 0.05$). Accordingly, it could be concluded that the transformational leadership variable was normally distributed. Besides, it was notable that the significance (Asymp. Sig) of the lecturer performance variable was higher than alpha ($0.200 > 0.05$). As such, the lecturer performance variable was normally distributed.

2. Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity was detected in a regression model if there were independent variables inextricably correlated to each other. To identify multicollinearity, we could look at the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). When the VIF was higher than 10, there was multicollinearity.

Table 2. Multicollinearity Test Results

		Coefficients ^a				Collinearity Statistic		
Model		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	T	Sig.	s	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)		10.235	4.446		2.302	.023		
X1		.178	.059	.220	2.992	.004	.460	2.172

a. Dependent Variable: Y
X1: Transformational Leadership

Source: SPSS Output 2022

Table 2 shows multicollinearity test results. It was noticeable that the VIF of the transformational leadership variable (2.172) was smaller than 10. Hence, it could be interpreted that the independent variable of this research had no multicollinearity symptom and could be exerted in the next analysis.

3. Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test in this research exploited Glejser Test by observing significance levels. Were the test results above the significance level ($\alpha = 5\%$), there was no heteroscedasticity. Meanwhile, were they below the significance level ($\alpha = 5\%$), there was heteroscedasticity.

Table 3. Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.260	2.847		.794	.429
X1	-.009	.038	-.036	-.241	.810

Dependent Variable: RES2

Source: SPSS Output 2022

Table 3 demonstrates the heteroscedasticity test results. From the results, it was notable that the significance of the transformational leadership variable was higher than 0.05. That was, there was no heteroscedasticity symptom, and the variables could be used for the next analysis.

4. Hypothesis Test

a. Simple Correlation Analysis of X_1 and Y

This analysis was carried out to examine the effect of the relationship and correlation of the variables X_1 and Y. Table 4 exhibits the analysis results.

Table 4. Correlation Test Results

Correlations			
		Transformational Leadership	Lecturer Performance
Transformational Leadership	Pearson Correlation	1	.733**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	99	99
Lecturer Performance	Pearson Correlation	.733**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	99	99

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS Output 2022

Based on Table 4, the correlation between X_1 and Y was exhibited by 0.733. The score belonged to the strong relationship category. As such, there was a strong correlation between transformational leadership and lecturer performance. To corroborate the correlation between transformational leadership and lecturer performance, a significance test was conducted. If the t-count \geq t-table, the correlation between X_1 and Y was significant.

Table 5. Significance Test Results

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	24.205	5.817		4.161	.000
	Transformational leadership	.593	.056	.733	10.605	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Lecturer Performance

Source: SPSS Output 2022

Building on Table 5, with $\alpha = 0.05$ and $dk = n - 2 = 99 - 2 = 97$, the t-table = 1.985. As the t-count \geq t-table or $10.605 > 1.980$, the correlation between X_1 and Y was significant. It could also be indicated by observing the significance which was smaller than 0.05. That was, there was a significant correlation between

transformational leadership and lecturer performance. In Table 5, the simple regression equation of the correlation between transformational leadership and lecturer performance was:

$$Y = 24.205 + 0.733X_1$$

A constant of 24.205 exhibited that although the transformational leadership scored zero, lecturer performance remained at 24.205.

B. The Effect of Transformational Leadership on Increases in Lecturer Performance at Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk

Transformational leadership factors intended in this research were the salient dimensions or indicators of the variable with a strong effect on increases in lecturer performance. To further investigate transformational leadership factors and their roles in augmenting lecturer performance, I interviewed several leaders chosen as respondents.

In the interview, the university leader argued that s/he had normatively performed tasks as a leader. The most preeminent factor in transformational leadership was how leaders could be “inspiring ones”. In this context, informants did not point out the factor. The result was reinforced by the results of questionnaires distributed to lecturers. In general, university leaders did not have a “shock force (enforcing)” to stimulate lecturer performance. Their roles were still normative.

Additionally, interviews with faculty leaders pointed out that leadership at faculty levels was normative in operating the organization. For example, to elevate lecturer competitiveness, the attempts made were moderate. Interestingly, humanist leadership could trigger staff togetherness.

The interviews with the heads of departments showed that they always motivated lecturer staff to write articles, research, or books. In addition, they (the departments) promised funding support if possible. Similarly, some deans as informants I interviewed always motivated the lecturer staff to achieve. The motivation served beyond mere lip service, which was boasting which was not realized in reality. However, the motivation was realized in real actions, e.g., assigning lecturers to undertake community service or actively participate in scientific activities outside Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk. The efforts were expected to help lecturer staff achieve inside and outside the campus, which made the campus more reputable.

Transformational leadership had a positive impact on increases in lecturer performance. And yet, there were only two prominent dimensions, namely idealized influence and individual consideration. The idealized influence was associated with the charisma of leaders as role models, the understanding of organization visions and missions, and appreciation for lecturer staff or employees. Meanwhile, individual consideration covered the understanding of individual differences and the willingness to listen to aspirations, train, educate, and give suggestions to subordinate lecturer staff and/or employees. As posited by Agus & Muhith (2013), the four components of the transformational leadership model, known as 4I, had different values toward the effects produced. Susanto et al. (2012), grounded on their study, proposed that transformational leadership and organizational culture significantly influenced employee performance. Rodrigues & Ferreira (2015), in their journal, wrote that transformational leadership possessed a greater ability to predict the dimension of organizational citizenship behavior dimension compared to transactional leadership. The simple correlation analysis suggested that variable X_1 (transformational leadership) contributed to variable Y (lecturer performance) by 53.7%.

IV. CONCLUSION

Transformational leadership had a positive and significant effect of 53.7% on lecturer performance. That was, 53.7% of lecturer performance variation could be explicated by transformational leadership variation. In other words, hypothesis 1 was accepted. It demonstrated that university, faculty, and department leaders in Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk gave positive and significant contributions to the endeavors to enhance lecturer performance.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Andriansyah. 2015. *Kepemimpinan Visioner Kepala Daerah*. 1st printing. Jakarta: Faculty of Social Science and Political Science Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo Beragama.
- [2]. Arwildayanto. 2013. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perguruan Tinggi, Pendekatan Budaya Kerja Dosen Profesional*. 1st printing. Bandung: Alfabeta CV.
- [3]. Astuti Juni Rini, Pratolo Suryo, and Anwar Misbahul. 2017. *Manajemen Knowledge: Implementasi Perguruan Tinggi*.
- [4]. Atiqullah. 2013. *Perilaku Kepemimpinan Kolektif Pesantren, Studi Multisitus pada Pesantren Bani-Djauhari, Pesantren Bani-Syarqawi di Sumenep, dan Pesantren Bani-Basyaiban di Pasuruan*. Surabaya: Radja Pustaka.

- [5]. Badu Syamsu Q. and Djafri Novianty. 2017. *Kepemimpinan dan Perilaku Organisasi*. Gorontalo: Ideas Publishing.
- [6]. Bukit Benjamin, Malusa Tasman, and Rahmat Abdul. *Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia, Teori, Dimensi Pengukuran, dan Implementasi dalam Organisasi*. 1st printing. Yogyakarta: Zahir Publishing.
- [7]. Baharuddin and Rahmat Abdul. 2019. *Reformasi Perguruan Tinggi Indonesia: Sebuah Otonomi Semu yang Dijanjikan*. Gorontalo: Ideas Publishing.
- [8]. Daniel C. Feldman and Hugh J. Arnold. 1985. *Managing Individual and Group Behavior in Organizations*. Auckland, MacGraw-Hill Book Company.
- [9]. Djafri Novianty. 2017. *Manajemen Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah (Pengetahuan Manajemen, Efektivitas, Kemandirian Keunggulan Bersaing, dan Kecerdasan Emosi)*. 2nd printing. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- [10]. Danim Sudarwan and Suparno. 2012. *Menjadi Pemimpin Besar Visioner Berkarakter, Visi, Transaksi, Transformasi, dan Karakter Kepemimpinan dan Manajemen Satuan Pendidikan Era Pergolakan Otoritas Negara*. 1st printing. Bandung: Alfabeta CV.
- [11]. Djohan Johannes Agustinus. 2016. *5 Pilar Kepemimpinan di abad 21*. Malang: MNC Publishing.
- [12]. Gardiner-Oey Mayling, Rahayu Imam Susanto, Abdullah Amin Muhammad, Effendi Sofian, Darma Yudi, Darmanto Teguh, and Arua Deniela Cyti. 2017. *Era Disrupsi, Peluang dan Tantangan Pendidikan Tinggi Indonesia*. 1st printing. Jakarta Pusat: Akademi Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia.
- [13]. Haris Abd. 2013. *Kepemimpinan Pendidikan*. Government of Indonesia (GoL) and Islamic Development Bank (IDB).
- [14]. Hakim Abdul. 2014. *Dinamika Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia dalam Organisasi (Pendekatan Konvensional dan Nilai-nilai Islami)*. 1st printing. Semarang: EF Press Digimedia.
- [15]. Irianto Sulistyowati. 2012. *Otonomi Perguruan Tinggi Suatu Keniscayaan*. 1st ed. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- [16]. Juhro Solikin M. 2020. *Transformational Leadership, Konsep, Pendekatan, dan Implikasi pada Pembangunan*. 2nd ed. Jakarta: Bank Indonesia Institute.
- [17]. Laurie J. Mullins. 2005. *Management and Organizational Behavior*. 7th ed. New York: Prentice Hall.
- [18]. Masaong Abd. Kadim. 2022. *Sekapur Sirih Pemimpin Transformasional, Berfikir Out of the Box*. 1st printing. Bandung: Alfabeta CV.
- [19]. Masaong Abd. Kadim and Tilomi A. Arfan. 2011. *Kepemimpinan Berbasis Multiple Intelligence, Sinergi Kecerdasan Intelektual, dan Spritual untuk Meraih Kesuksesan yang Gemilang*. 1st printing. Bandung: Alfabeta CV.
- [20]. Makawimbang Jerry H. 2012. *Kepemimpinan Pendidikan yang Bermutu*. 1st printing. Bandung: Alfabeta CV.
- [21]. Musadad Arif Akhmad, Sumarsono Bambang Raden, Adha Amirul Maulana, Ariyanti Syafira Nova, Abidin Fatah Nur, and Kurniawan Adi Dadan. 2022. *Principal transformational leadership and teacher readiness to teach: Mediating role of self-efficacy*. Vol. 11, No. 4, December 2022, pp. 1798~1807 ISSN: 2252-8822, DOI: 10.11591/ijere.v11i4.2325. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*.
- [22]. Munadi Muhammad. 2020. *Manajemen Pendidikan Tinggi di Era Revolusi Industry 4.0*. 2nd ed. Jakarta: Kencana.
- [23]. Rahmat Abdul and Kadir Syaiful. 2017. *Kepemimpinan Pendidikan dan Budaya Mutu*. Yogyakarta: Zahir Publishing.
- [24]. Suriagiri. 2020. *Kepemimpinan Transformasional*. Lhokseumawe: Radja Publika CV.
- [25]. Syafaruddin. 2015. *Peningkatan Kontribusi Manajemen Pendidikan dalam Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Berkualitas untuk Membangun Masyarakat Ekonomi ASEAN*. 1st printing. Medan: Perdana Publishing.
- [26]. Syafaruddin. 2015. *Peningkatan Kontribusi Manajemen Pendidikan dalam Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Berkualitas untuk Membangun Masyarakat Ekonomi ASEAN*. 1st printing. Medan: Perdana Publishing.
- [27]. Sidiq Umar and Khoirussalim. 2021. *Kepemimpinan Pendidikan*. Ponorogo: Nata Karya CV.
- [28]. Silahuddin. 2016. *Budaya Akademik dalam Sistem Pendidikan Dayah Salafi*. 1st printing. Yogyakarta: Pale Media Prima.
- [29]. Sidiq Umar and Khoirussalim. 2021. *Kepemimpinan Pendidikan*. Ponorogo: Nata Karya CV.
- [30]. Stephen P. Robbins and Timothy A Judge. 2007. *Organizational Behavior*. 12th ed. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [31]. Tim Universitas Negeri Gorontalo. 2011. *Model Pendidikan Karakter di Perguruan Tinggi, Membangun Budaya Akademik melalui Penguatan Program Atmosfir Akademik sebagai Strategi*

- Pendidikan Karakter di Universitas Negeri Gorontalo. 1st printing. Gorontalo: Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Universitas Negeri Gorontalo.
- [32]. Thoyib Muhammad. 2014. Manajemen Mutu Program Pendidikan Tinggi Islam dalam Konteks Otonomi Perguruan Tinggi Studi Kualitatif pada Universitas Islam Indonesia Yogyakarta dan Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta. 1st printing. Ponorogo: STAIN Po PRESS.
- [33]. Usman Husaini. 2020. Kepemimpinan Efektif, Teori, Penelitian, dan Praktik. 1st printing. Jakarta Timur: Buni Aksara PT.
- [34]. Yuki Gary. 2007. Kepemimpinan dalam Organisasi. 5th printing. Jakarta: Indeks PT.
- [35]. Wayne K.HoyandCecil G. Miskel. EducationalAdministration, Theory, Research,andPractice. 6th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill Inc, 2000.
- [36]. Nur Zazin. 2011. Gerakan Menata Mutu Pendidikan: Teori dan Aplikasi Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.