

Received: 9 July 2024 Accepted: 7 November 2024
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33182/tbm.v2i2.3368>

Building Private Universities Based on Transformational Leadership and Interpersonal Relationships

Widi Fajar Widyatmoko¹, Ratri Nurina Widyanti², and Mustaqim Pabbajah³

Abstract

Leadership in higher education institutions exhibits a unique, dynamic, and tactical nature, necessitating effective leadership models to address complex organizational challenges. This study investigates the transformational leadership model within the context of higher education, emphasizing the role of leaders' individual characteristics in shaping organizational outcomes. Data were collected using questionnaires distributed to leaders, with 132 valid responses analyzed. Results demonstrate that leaders' individual traits positively correlate with organizational commitment, job satisfaction, unit performance, and interpersonal relationships, while negatively correlating with intention to quit. However, additional analysis indicates only partial support for these findings, suggesting that the predictive capacity of individual leader characteristics on transformational leadership outcomes is not fully substantiated. Furthermore, the limited evidence supporting unique contributions of leader characteristics to organizational variables underscores the complexity of transformational leadership in higher education settings. These findings highlight the need for further research to better understand the interplay between leadership traits and organizational dynamics in academic institutions. The study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on leadership in higher education and offers insights for refining leadership practices to foster improved organizational performance and employee retention.

Keywords: *Transformational Leadership; organizational commitment; interpersonal relationship; private university*

Introduction

Leadership in higher education is a multifaceted phenomenon that requires approaches tailored to the sector's unique, dynamic, and tactical demands. Transformational leadership, characterized by inspiring and motivating followers to achieve beyond expectations, has emerged as a critical model for driving organizational success and innovation in academia (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2021). This study aims to empirically examine transformational leadership in the context of the University of Technology Yogyakarta, focusing on its relationship with organizational characteristics such as commitment, job satisfaction, performance, and employee retention. The findings are expected to provide actionable insights to enhance organizational effectiveness and climate.

Despite significant advancements in leadership theories, research specifically addressing higher education institutions remains limited. Where universities as a generation that has

¹ Widi Fajar Widyatmoko, Universitas Teknologi Yogyakarta, Indonesia. E-mail: widifajar@uty.ac.id

² Ratri Nurina Widyanti, Universitas Teknologi Yogyakarta, Indonesia. E-mail: ratri.nurina@uty.ac.id

³ Mustaqim Pabbajah, Universitas Teknologi Yogyakarta, Indonesia. E-mail: mustaqim_pabbajah@uty.ac.id



strong character can start from leadership (Pabbajah et al, 2020). Leadership in public universities, which often rely on student funding, poses unique challenges and necessitates specialized approaches. Although general leadership models, such as those proposed by Robbins and Judge (2019), have expanded our understanding of leadership in organizational contexts, the lack of targeted research on university leadership creates gaps in both theory and practice.

Historically, leadership studies have evolved from examining innate traits (Mann, 1959; Widyatmoko et al, 2020) to focusing on behaviors that predict leader effectiveness. Recent research underscores the importance of ethical leadership and its impact on organizational outcomes (Brown et al., 2021; Walumbwa et al., 2017). However, transformational leadership has faced criticism for its potential dark sides, such as the exploitation of followers or the pursuit of self-serving goals by charismatic leaders (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Including in higher education management by providing optimal service as part of customer satisfaction (Widyanti, 2019)

Current studies emphasize the interplay of leadership character and ethics in shaping organizational outcomes. Sosik et al. (2020) highlight the role of transformational leadership in fostering positive organizational characteristics, but gaps remain regarding its intersection with individual leader traits and ethics. Furthermore, empirical evidence exploring whether transformational leadership scores align with ethical behaviors is sparse, particularly in academic settings (Hoch et al., 2018).

This study addresses these gaps by investigating whether leaders' ethical traits enhance the predictive power of transformational leadership on organizational outcomes (Widyatmoko et al 2020). It also examines whether the presence of low ethical scores alongside high transformational leadership scores indicates potential "dark" leadership traits. By exploring these dynamics, this research contributes to the understanding of ethical transformational leadership and its implications for organizational effectiveness in higher education contexts.

Numerous studies have investigated the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational performance; however, research specifically examining its connection with organizational characteristics remains limited. Sosik, Gentry, and Chun (2012) emphasize that studies exploring the link between leaders' personal traits and organizational characteristics are notably scarce. To date, few studies have examined whether leaders' individual characteristics can enhance the predictive power of transformational leadership in understanding organizational outcomes (Widyatmoko et al, 2020). One notable exception is the research conducted by Sosik and Cameron (2010), which sought to address two primary objectives.

The first objective was to determine whether leaders' personal traits contribute to a more accurate prediction of organizational characteristics, including organizational commitment, job satisfaction, teamwork performance, employee behavior, and intention to leave. The second was to investigate the interaction between leaders' characters and transformational leadership, exploring how these elements interact to influence organizational dynamics. This research also examined the concept of "dark sides" of leadership, highlighting instances where leaders with high transformational leadership scores but low character scores exhibit traits such as narcissism, authoritarianism, greed for power, or Machiavellianism (Conger & Kanungo, 1998).



Findings from related studies reveal that leaders with such traits can negatively impact organizational functioning, even when transformational leadership traits are strong (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Conversely, leaders scoring high on both transformational leadership and character traits foster positive organizational climates and demonstrate authentic transformational leadership. These insights underscore the importance of ethical dimensions in leadership and provide a foundation for future research into the interplay of leader characteristics and transformational leadership in organizational settings (Sosik et al., 2018; Northouse, 2021).

In this study, organizational characteristics are assessed using several key metrics, including organizational commitment, job satisfaction, teamwork performance, individual behaviors within the organization, and intention to leave. A secondary objective of the research is to investigate the interactions between leader character and transformational leadership, exploring how these dynamics influence organizational outcomes. Additionally, the study seeks to empirically verify the presence and impact of the “dark sides” of leadership.

As a critical measure, the research posits that a high score on transformational leadership accompanied by a low score on leader character indicates the existence of detrimental leadership traits within an organization. These “dark sides” are associated with behaviors such as narcissism, authoritarianism, excessive pursuit of power, and Machiavellian tendencies (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Empirical findings in related studies support the notion that leaders who display strong transformational qualities but lack ethical character can exploit their position, thereby harming organizational health.

Conversely, when leaders demonstrate high scores in both transformational leadership and character, the organization reflects the core principles of authentic transformational leadership. Such organizations are characterized by ethical leadership practices that foster trust, commitment, and positive organizational climates, serving as a benchmark for effective and morally grounded leadership. This dual measurement framework provides valuable insights into the complex interplay between transformational leadership and leader character, advancing the understanding of leadership dynamics in organizational settings.

Literature Review

The Relation between Transformational Leadership and Organizational Characteristics

Based on the previous discussion some researches have proved that leaders are regarded as transformational if they have employees with high working performance, commitment on organization, organizational behaviors satisfaction on leaders’ supervisions (Howell & Hall-Marenda, 1999; Koh, Seers, & Terborg, 1995; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999) and have less intention to quit from the organization (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995). Supports on positives transformational leadership related to organizational characteristics are found in big and various numbers in related researches (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Boerner, Eisensbeiss, & Griesser, 2007; Givens, 2008; Hatter, & Bass 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Jorg & Schyns, 2004; Krickpatrick & Locke, 1996; Nguni, Slegers, and Denessen, (2006); Zhu, Chew, & Spangler, 2005). Bass and Avolio (1993) explain the reason for transformational leadership that influences organizational characteristics is because the leaders motivate the members and inspire them to reach the goals of the organization.

Some other researches find evidence that transformational leadership has positive relations with organizational commitment in a lot of organizational management (Bono, & Hakim, 2003; Dum Dum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002; Emery & Bateman, 2007; Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995; Lowe, & Kroeck, 1996; Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003).

Other researches also provide evidence that it is not only that transformational leadership has positive relations with organizational commitment, but it also has big impact towards the relations between both (Dee, Henkin, & Singleton, 2004; Koh et al, 1995; Nguni, Slegers, & Denessen, 2006).

Researches which study the relation between transformational leadership and job satisfaction also find various findings. Researches on transformational leadership give consistence evidences that it has positives relation with job satisfaction (Emery & Bateman, 2007; Griffin & Bateman, 1986; Teers & Rhodes 1978; Maeroff, 1988; Walumbwa, Orwa, Wang, & Lawler, 2005). Givens (2008) has done studies on transformational leadership and its impact on organizational characteristics. He gives significant evidence that the transformational has “big and stable impact on employees’ job satisfaction”. Nguni, Slegers, ad Denessen, (2006) record that researches have shown that transformational leadership influences a series of organizational characteristics including performance. Furthermore, Avolio, Sosik, and Berson (2012) in the resume of their researches show evidence that transformational leadership has positive impact on motivation and performance. Liao and Chuang (2007) research the relation between transformational leadership and employees performances. The results of their researches show that transformational leadership has positive relations not only with employees service performance, but also with the tendency of clients to keep their long term relation with the company. More specifically, transformational leadership is found to have positive relations with the performance of Research and Development team (Keller, 2006), proactive team work (Williams, Parker, & Turner, 2010), unit performance (Bass, Avolio 2003, Jung, & Berson 2003; Lim & Ployhart, 2004) and the performance of financial service team (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007).

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) according to Organ (1988) consists of five general forms: altruism, conscientiousness, sportiveness, politeness, and virtue. Williams and Nadin (2012), explain two OCB dimensions, “affiliative” and “challenging” which can be in one of the form of OCB towards individual and collective OCB (Tse & Chiu 2014). The OCB measurement in this research will focus on OCB towards groups and can be characterized that it is similar to the form of altruism in the research done by Organ, and Williams and Nadin. OCB in this research will use affiliative dimension.

Affiliative dimension have been described to have behavior which promotes group cohesion, maintain work relationship which exists in management (Lopez-Domiquez, Enache, Sallan, & Simo, 2013). Other emprical researches which relate the relation between affiliative OCB with organizational leadership are done by by (Kwan, Lu, & Kim, 2011; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005). Transformational leadership has also been found to have direct and indirect relations related to OCB (Podsakoff, 1990; Tse, & Chiu 2014; Walumbwa, Wang, Wang, Schaubroeck, & Avolio, 2010).

Intention to quit is a disposition behavior of employees to resign from their job. Griffin, I Gaertner (2000) in meta-analysis find evidence that intention to quit becomes very predictive form the cycle of the real employees, and Lee and Lu (2006) conclude that intention to stay



or quit is the strongest predictor in an organization. Transformational leadership has been proven to have significant negative relation with intention to quit from the job (Ali, 2009; Lyons, 1971; Pietrse-Landman, 2012; Scandura & Williams, 2004). This is important, for example, Overbey (2010) shows the evidence that employee replacement is very expensive for an organization with the cost to replace telecommuter employees(s) starts from 25 to 200% of their salary in a year. Besides the financial impact, it also creates other dangerous sectors such as the moral decreasing, which has some impact on efficiency and client relation. (Abbasi & Hollman, 2000; Watrous, Huffman, & Pritchard, 2006). Various findings above drive researcher to formulate the first hypothesis as follows:

Hypothesis i: transformational leadership will have positive relation with organizational commitment, job satisfaction, unit performance, interpersonal relationship and has negative relations with intention to quit.

Organizational Characteristics

Researches that study the relation between transformational leadership and organizational characteristics are still rare. Sosik, Gentry, and Chun (2012) also state that researches that relate leadership characteristics with organizational characteristics are rare. Even though it is limited, their research gives evidence that there is a relation on leaders' characteristics which are related to executive performance. Researches done by Cameroon, Bright, and Caza (2004), find the evidence that organization members that have better characters will have better performance, Sosik, Gentry, and Chun, (2012) also find the evidence that positive nature (character) has a relation with the assessment of executive performance. Furthermore, Sosik, (2006) suggests that character is a feature that differentiates great leadership with the other ones.

Although leadership ethics and character building are not perfectly identical, it still seems logical that they must be significantly related. Walumbwa, Mayer, Wang, Wang, Workman, & Christensen (2011) find evidence that leadership ethics have positive relation with the rank of employee performance, Kim and Brymer (2011), Toor & Ofori, 2009; Trevino, Brown, & Hartman (2003) find the evidence that leadership ethics have positive relation with job satisfaction and organizational commitment of middle positions managers.

Other than that, there are also some researches which relate ethics of decision making with organization performance (Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, & Wright, 1997; Wu, 2002) and relate leadership ethics with directness and development of the company (Sirgy, 2002).

Noe et al, 1997) find evidence that appropriate business ethics are related to positive perception of the clients, government institutions, and vendors.

This brings to the next hypothesis which is formulated as follows:

Hypothesis 2: individual characters of the leaders has positive relation with organizational commitment, job satisfaction, quit performance, interpersonal relationship, and has negative relation with intention to quit.

Transformational Leadership Characteristics

The History of Transformational Leadership

The concept of transformational leadership was introduced by a leadership expert, James MacGregor Burns. According to Burns, transformational leadership can be seen when “the leaders and followers support each other to reach higher level of morality and motivation”. Through their strong visions and personalities, transformational leaders are able to change expectations, perceptions, and motivations to work on reaching the organization goals.

Furthermore, Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) widen the original idea of Burns and develop it to be what we know as *Bass ‘Transformational Leadership Theory’*. According to Bass, transformational leadership can be defined based on the impact felt by the followers.

Transformational leaders according to Bass are leaders who are able to gain trust, respectable, and adored by their followers.

The Components of Transformational Leadership

Bass also underlines that there are four different components of transformational leadership:

1. Intellectual Stimulation- transformational leaders do not only challenge status quo; they also supports creativity in the circle of followers. The leader encourages followers to explore new ways in doing something and new chances to learn.
2. Individual Consideration- transformational leadership also involves supports of the victims and encouragement to each follower. In term of encouraging supportive relationship, transformational leaders maintain communication line to be always opened so that followers feel free to share their ideas and so that the leader can offer direct acknowledgement of unique contribution from each follower.
3. Inspirational Motivation- transformational leaders have clear visions that they are able to articulate them to their followers. The leaders can help their followers to get the same passions and motivations to fulfill the goals.
4. Ideal Influence- transformational leaders function as the role models for their followers. Because the followers trust and respect their leaders, they imitate these people and internalized the desires.

Bass and Steidlmeier (1999), state that authentic transformational leadership must commit for high moral quality. Conger and Hollenbeck (2010) in their studies show that characters have been hacked by the character integration as additional dimension of transformational leadership. Avolio, Sosik, and Berson (201) record that authentic leadership has been empirically and theoretically proved to be distinguished from ethical and transformational leadership, and authentic and ethical leadership to have higher construction.

Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) in their research also show the evidence that authentic transformational leadership has moral foundation. Thus, in this research, it is expected that the results of this research will create high score on transformational leadership but low score on individual characters of the leaders as what is suggested by Leslie & Van Velsor (1996) to show the dark sides of transformational leadership.

Thus, researcher studies an additional hypothesis as follows:

Hypothesis 3: Leaders’ characters will give unique variant contributions to transformational leadership in predicting organizational commitment, job satisfaction, quit performance, interpersonal relationship, and intention to quit.



Methods

Participant

The participants consist of 160 lecturers and staffs of University of Technology Yogyakarta with following criteria:

Lecturers:

1. At least have a Master degree
2. Have served for 2 years in row

Staffs:

1. At least have a Diploma 3 degree
2. Have served for 2 years in a row

The number of gained participants consists of 93 lecturers and 67 staff with following details: 20% have Diploma 3 Degree, 29% have Bachelor degree, 32% have Master degree S2, 16% have Doctoral degree, and 3% are professors. The compositions of gender of the lecturers and the staffs are 54% males and 46% females.

Based on 160 questionnaires spread, there are 132 of them which can be processed because 12 of the, are not completely filled, 16 of them are not returned on the maximum time given.

Procedure

In this case study, there are three main parts that become the focus, namely: Work Unit Environment, Leadership Model, and Organization Climate. Further, the participants are asked to answer various questions spread through questionnaires using 5 linkert scales.

Variables and Measurement

Transformational Leadership (LEADER) is measured using 14 questionnaire items with 5 linkert scales. Question items developed in this research are modifications of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) used by United States Air Force research agency to maximize the performance of troop leaders of the institution.

Characters of the leaders (CHARACTER) are measured using character measurement scale which has been developed by Hendrix & Hokins (2003). Some question items are adjusted in any way to make them suitable with the needs of this research.

In another hand, organizational characteristics which are proxied by 5 variables that consist of organizational commitment (COMMITMENT), job satisfaction (SATISFACTION), performance of organization work unit (PERFORMANCE), interpersonal relationship in working unit (INTERPERSONAL), and intention to quit (QUIT) are developed from research instruments used by Sosik, Gentry, and Chu, (2012).

The whole questionnaire items from the variables above use 5 linkert scale (really disagree, disagree, doubt, agree, really agree) whereas for question items from the variable of intention to quit (QUIT) uses 5 linkert scales (really don't want, don't want, doubt, want, really want).

Results

Descriptive Statistic

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation
LEADERSHIP	132	3,50	5,00	4,8317	,33528
CHARACTER	132	2,09	5,00	4,6935	,69972
COMMITMENT	132	2,00	5,00	4,7652	,62223
SATISFACTION	132	1,40	5,00	4,6667	,93242
PERFORMANCE	132	2,50	9,00	4,8542	,59261
INTERPERSONAL	132	1,25	5,00	4,6989	,86698
RESIGN	132	1,00	5,00	1,1364	,57655
Valid N (Listwise)	132				

On table 1 above, transformational leadership (LEADERSHIP) has mean of 4.8217 with standard deviation which is relatively low of 0.33528. this shows that participants tend to confirm that work unit of University of Technology Yogyakarta is led by heads of work units which have transformational leadership model. Individual characters (CHARACTERS) on work unit of University of Technology Yogyakarta is judged by participants as quite good one with mean of 4.6935 (standard deviation 0.69972).

In the other hand, individual commitment on work unit in University of Technology Yogyakarta is relatively good with mean of 4.7652 and standard deviation which is relatively low of 0.62223. job satisfaction of individuals of organization unit in University of Technology Yogyakarta is also relatively good with mean of 4.6667 and standard deviation which is also relatively low of 0.93242.

Participants' assessments on the performance of organization unit (PERFORMANCE) in University of Technology Yogyakarta is indicated good enough with mean of 4.8542 and standard deviation of 0.59261. Participants also assess that interpersonal relationship in organization unit (INTERPERSONAL) in University of Technology Yogyakarta is relatively good enough with mean of 4.6989 with standard deviation which is relatively low of 0.86698, whereas intention to quit from University of Technology Yogyakarta is relatively low enough of 1.1364 with standard deviation of 0.57655.



*Hypothesis Testing***Table 2.** Correlationship

		LEADERSHIP	CHARACTER	COMMITMENT	SATISFACTION	PERFORMANCE	INTERPERSONAL	QUIT
LEADERSHIP	Pearson Correlation	1	,543**	,289**	,635**	,508**	,555**	-,256**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,001	,000	,000	,000	,003
	N	132	132	132	132	132	132	132
CHARACTER	Pearson Correlation	,543**	1	,319**	,451**	,380**	,670**	-,007**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,933
	N	132	132	132	132	132	132	132
COMMITMENT	Pearson Correlation	,298**	,319**	1	,156	,132	,317**	-,251**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,001	,000		,074	,133	,000	,004
	N	132	132	132	132	132	132	132
SATISFACTION	Pearson Correlation	,635**	,451**	,156	1	,482**	,713**	-,199*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,074		,000	,000	,022
	N	132	132	132	132	132	132	132
PERFORMANCE	Pearson Correlation	,508**	,380**	,132	,482**	1	,300**	-,103
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,133	,000		,000	,238
	N	132	132	132	132	132	132	132
INTERPERSONAL	Pearson Correlation	,555**	,670**	,317**	,713**	,300**	1	-,001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,989
	N	132	132	132	132	132	132	132
QUIT	Pearson Correlation	-,256**	-,007	-,251**	-,199*	-,103	-,001	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,003	,933	,004	,022	,238	,989	
	N	132	132	132	132	132	132	132

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

By using Pearson Correlation testing, transformational leadership (Leadership) has positive and significant relation of 0.289 with individual commitment towards organization

(COMMITMENT), has positive and significant relation of 0.635 with satisfaction of individual performance from organization unit (SATISFACTION), has positive and significant relation of 0.508 with the performance of organization unit (PERFORMANCE), has positive and significant relation of 0.555 with interpersonal relationship of individuals in organization unit (INTERPERSONAL), and has negative relation of -0.256 with the intention to quit (QUIT).

This show that the first hypothesis which states that *Transformational leadership will have positive relations with organizational commitment, job satisfaction, unit performance, interpersonal relationship, and has negative relations with intention to quit* is supported by the evidence.

Table 1 also proves that individual characters of the leaders (CHARACTER) has positive and significant relation of 0.319 with individual commitment towards organization (COMMITMENT), has positive and significant relation of 0.451 with satisfaction of individual performance of organization unit (SATISFACTION), has positive and significant relation of 0.380 with performance of organization unit (PERFORMANCE), has positive and significant relation of 0.670 with interpersonal relationship between individual in organization unit (INTERPERSONAL), and has negative but not significant relation of -0.0007 with intention to quit (QUIT). This causes the second hypothesis which states that *Individual characters of the leaders will have positive relation with organizational commitment, job satisfaction, unit performance, interpersonal relationship, and will have negative relation with intention to resign* is poorly supported by the evidence.

Table 3. Test on Based Between-Subject Effects^b

Dependent Variable: LEADERSHIP

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	28,743 ^a	5	5,749	23,045	,000
Intercept	37,284	1	37,284	149,460	,000
COMMITMENT	,398	1	,398	1,597	,209
SATISFACTION	2,415	1	2,415	9,682	,002
PERFORMANCE	2,209	1	2,209	8,857	,004
INTERPERSONAL	,611	1	,611	2,451	,120
QUIT	1,201	1	1,201	4,815	,030
Error	31,432	1126	,249		
Corrected Total	14685,538	132			
	60,175	131			

* R Squared=,487 (Adjusted R Squared=,457)

* Weighted least Squares Regression-Weighted by CHARACTER

Using GLM Unvarite in this research, a test is done to know whether leader's characters contribute unique variant to the impact of transformational leadership on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, unit performance, interpersonal relationship, and intention to quit. Then, the test is done using Weighted Least Square Regression with variable of leadership characters (CHARACTERS).

As what is seen on table 3, factually the contribution of unique variant of leadership variable towards the impact of transformational leadership on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, unit performance, interpersonal relationship, and intention to quit is not fully proved. It is only the unit performance (PERFORMANCE) with alpha of 0.04 to quit (QUIT) with alpha 0.030 which are significantly proved.



This shows evidence that the variant of leaders' characters (CHARACTER) only has significant contribution on the impact of transformational leadership (LEADERSHIP), performance of organization unit (PERFORMANCE), and intention to quit (QUIT).

Thus the third hypothesis which states that *Leaders' characters will give uniques variant contributions to transformational leadership in predicting organizational commitment, job satisfaction, unit performance, interpersonal relationship, and intention to quit* is not really supported by the evidence.

Discussion, Conclusion, and Suggestion

The analysis of the first hypothesis reveals substantial evidence supporting its validity. These findings align with prior research job satisfaction and organizational commitment by Čulibrk et al (2018), Setiawan et al (2023), Othman & Khrais (2022), Mekonnen & Bayissa, (2023). This is also confirmed by the results of the study Stenmark (2024) that transformational and transactional leadership behavior is related to ethical perception. where leadership transformation is needed in the development of an organization Walumbwa et al. (2017), Kwan (2020). Likewise, the interaction effect of transactional-transformational leadership on employee commitment in a developing country (Puni et al., 2021). This outcome provides indirect evidence of the presence of a transformational leadership model at the University of Technology Yogyakarta, which serves as a driving force for organizational performance across various work units within the university.

In contrast, the findings related to the second hypothesis deviate somewhat from previous studies, including those by Kim and Brymer (2011), Toor and Ofori (2009), and Trevino et al. (2003). The results suggest that transformational leadership is influenced by the leader's personal characteristics, particularly in relation to organizational commitment, job satisfaction, unit performance, interpersonal relationships, and intention to quit. These observations indicate the necessity for future research to investigate the role of individual leader characteristics as a foundational element of transformational leadership in shaping organizational characteristics.

Another possibility arises from the unique organizational context of the University of Technology Yogyakarta. The predominant influence of senior leaders, characterized by strong transformational tendencies and individual traits, may shape the leadership styles of subordinate unit leaders, resulting in a leadership pattern that mirrors that of the senior leadership. Additionally, as the questionnaires utilized were adapted from tools developed by the U.S. Air Force Research Agency, which are inherently militaristic, it is plausible that the university has unconsciously adopted elements of the Air Force's transformational leadership model. This phenomenon, including its impact on the leadership styles and traits of unit leaders, warrants further exploration.

Findings related to the third hypothesis also diverge from those in studies by Conger and Hollenbeck (2010), Avolio et al. (2012), and Bass and Steidlmeier (1999). Specifically, the data indicate that the individual characteristics of leaders contribute minimally to the influence of transformational leadership on organizational characteristics. As shown in Table 1, the individual characteristics of leaders at the University of Technology Yogyakarta are relatively homogeneous, with a low standard deviation of 0.66972. This homogeneity, also reflected in the assessments of transformational leadership, suggests that the senior leadership's dominant

transformational style likely influences the perceptions and leadership behaviors of subordinate leaders.

Limitation and Suggestion

This study faces notable limitations, particularly regarding the development of instruments tailored to assess transformational leadership in educational institutions. The scarcity of such tools posed challenges for the research. Future studies should focus on creating more refined and context-specific instruments to evaluate transformational leadership within educational settings.

As is typical of case studies, the findings of this research have limited generalizability. It is possible that the observed phenomena are specific to educational institutions or, more narrowly, to the University of Technology Yogyakarta.

Conclusion

This research was motivated by observations of the remarkable growth of the University of Technology Yogyakarta over the past 11 years, likely driven by a distinctive leadership model with strong transformational characteristics. Based on data collected from 132 respondents, the study confirms the existence of transformational leadership at the university, which acts as a catalyst for organizational performance across its units.

Transformational leadership was found to have positive relationships with organizational commitment, job satisfaction, unit performance, and interpersonal relationships, and a negative relationship with intention to quit. However, the relationships between individual leader characteristics and these organizational outcomes were not fully substantiated. Furthermore, the findings indicate that individual leader characteristics contribute minimally to the influence of transformational leadership on organizational characteristics, highlighting the need for additional research to better understand these dynamics.

References

- Avolio, B. J., Sosik, J. J., & Berson, Y. (2012). *Leadership development in balance: Made/born*. Psychology Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181–217.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2021). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(3), 295–315.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Sage.
- Ćulibrk, J., Delić, M., Mitrović, S., & Ćulibrk, D. (2018). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement: The mediating role of job involvement. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00132>
- Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 501–529.
- Kim, H., & Brymer, R. A. (2011). The relationship between transformational leadership and commitment in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(3), 621–629.
- Kwan, P. (2020). Is Transformational Leadership Theory Passé? Revisiting the Integrative Effect of Instructional Leadership and Transformational Leadership on Student Outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19861137>



- Mekonnen, M., & Bayissa, Z. (2023). The Effect of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles on Organizational Readiness for Change Among Health Professionals. *SAGE Open Nursing*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23779608231185923>
- Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage.
- Othman, T., & Khrais, H. (2022). The relationship between transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in Jordanian nurses. *Anaesthesia, Pain and Intensive Care*. <https://doi.org/10.35975/apic.v26i3.1896>
- Pabbajah, M., Widyanti, R. N., & Widyatmoko, W. F. (2019). The Factors Of Service, Religiosity and Knowledge in the Decision of Customers to Save Funds in Sharia Banks in Yogyakarta City. *International Journal of Business, Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (IJBHES)*. <https://doi.org/10.46923/ijbhes.v1i2.37>
- Pabbajah, M., Abdullah, I., Widyanti, R. N., Jubba, H., & Alim, N. (2020). Student demoralization in education: The industrialization of university curriculum in 4.0.Era Indonesia. *Cogent Education*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1779506>
- Puni, A., Hilton, S. K., & Quao, B. (2021). The interaction effect of transactional-transformational leadership on employee commitment in a developing country. *Management Research Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-03-2020-0153>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
- Setiawan, H., Herawati, Y., Alhadi, E., Sayuti, A. J., Rini, R., Bustan, J., & Desiana, L. (2023). Model of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *Asean International Journal of Business*. <https://doi.org/10.54099/aijb.v2i1.445>
- <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-07-2023-0206>
- Sosik, J. J., & Cameron, J. C. (2010). Character and authentic transformational leadership behavior: Expanding the ascetic self toward others. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(4), 251–269.
- Sosik, J. J., Chun, J. U., & Gentry, W. A. (2020). Character-based leadership: Advancing evidence-based practice and research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 31(2), 101383.
- Stenmark, C. K. (2024). Transformational and transactional leadership behaviors and ethical perceptions: the effects of sensory processing sensitivity. *Journal of Management Development*. Toor, S.-R., & Ofori, G. (2009). Ethical leadership: Examining the relationships with full range leadership model, employee outcomes, and organizational culture. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90(4), 533-547.
- Trevino, L. K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L. P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations*, 56(1), 5-37.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Christensen, A. L., & Muchiri, M. K. (2017). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating roles of psychological empowerment and ethical climate. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 140(2), 285–298.
- Widyanti, R. N. (2019). Student Perception of the Quality of Service in the Master of Management Study Program of Universitas Teknologi Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*. <https://doi.org/10.18196/mb.10179>
- Widyatmoko, W. F., Pabbajah, M., & Widyanti, R. N. (2020). The Character of Leadership In Human Resources Development: A Critical Review. *International Journal of Management, Innovation & Entrepreneurial Research*. <https://doi.org/10.18510/ijmier.2020.621>