

# Transformational Leadership and Its Impact on Civil Servant Performance: Empirical Evidence from a Regional Election Commission in West Java, Indonesia

Journal of  
Business  
Evolution and  
Economic  
Management

Ahmad Zulfan  
Tarumanagara University, Indonesia  
Corresponding Author: [zulfan789@gmail.com](mailto:zulfan789@gmail.com)

JBEEM  
February 2026

Received 9 February 2026  
Revised 13 March 2026  
Accepted 15 April 2026

## Abstract

Effective leadership is widely recognized as a critical determinant of organizational performance, yet empirical evidence from public sector institutions in developing countries remains underexplored. This study examines the relationship between leadership quality and employee performance within a Regional General Elections Commission (KPU) office in Bandung Regency, West Java, Indonesia. Employing a quantitative approach with simple linear regression analysis, data were gathered from seventy-five civil servants selected through saturated sampling. Primary data were collected via validated questionnaire instruments, while reliability was confirmed through Cronbach's Alpha testing. Statistical analysis revealed a strong positive and significant association between leadership and employee performance, supported by hypothesis testing outcomes. The coefficient of determination indicated that leadership quality accounts for approximately 92.7% of the variance in employee performance. These findings underscore the pivotal role of adaptive and participatory leadership styles in elevating the productivity and commitment of public sector employees. Practical implications for organizational development and leadership training programs in government institutions are discussed.

**Keyword** Leadership Effectiveness, Employee Performance, Public Sector, Regional Election Commission

## Introduction

In an era of rapid governmental transformation and heightened public expectations, the performance of civil servants has emerged as one of the most intensely scrutinized dimensions of public sector governance. Governments across the globe are under mounting pressure to deliver efficient, transparent, and accountable services, and the quality of those services is inextricably tied to how well individual employees perform their assigned responsibilities (Osborne & Brown, 2011). Within this context, organizational leadership has gained considerable attention as a proximal determinant of employee behavior and institutional outcomes.

Leadership can be broadly understood as the process through which individuals exert purposeful influence over others to achieve collective goals (Yukl, 2020). In organizational settings, effective leaders are not merely administrators; they are architects of motivation, shapers of organizational culture, and facilitators of individual development. The relationship between leadership and employee performance has been theorized and empirically tested across diverse industries, including manufacturing, healthcare, education, and financial services (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2021). A consistent pattern emerges from this literature: organizations whose leaders demonstrate clear vision, participatory decision-making, and individualized concern for their subordinates tend to produce significantly higher levels of employee engagement and performance output.

Despite the breadth of this evidence, relatively few studies have directed their attention toward public sector organizations in developing nations, particularly within the context of

© 2026 Ahmad Zulfan. Published by PT Cendekia Mandiri Nusantara. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution, and reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution, or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.



Journal of Business Evolution  
and Economic Management  
Vol. 1, No. 2  
pp. 77-89  
PT. Cendekia Mandiri Nusantara  
E-ISSN:  
DOI:

electoral governance bodies. This represents a meaningful gap, given that such institutions operate under unique pressures that distinguish them from both private firms and other government agencies. Electoral commissions are accountable not only for internal organizational efficiency but also for sustaining democratic processes, maintaining public trust, and managing complex logistical operations within tightly regulated timeframes (Mozaffar & Schedler, 2002). The performance demands placed on their employees are therefore both multidimensional and consequential.

Indonesia presents a particularly instructive case. As the world's third-largest democracy and the largest archipelagic nation, Indonesia depends on a vast and decentralized network of election administration bodies to manage its democratic processes (Mietzner, 2014). The Komisi Pemilihan Umum (KPU), or General Elections Commission, operates at national, provincial, and district levels, with each office tasked with coordinating voter registration, candidate verification, ballot management, and result tabulation within their respective jurisdictions. The civil servants who staff these offices are the operational backbone of Indonesia's electoral system, and their performance directly determines the quality, credibility, and fairness of democratic exercises at the local level.

West Java Province, home to more than 48 million residents, is the most populous province in Indonesia and contains some of its most complex electoral districts (BPS, 2023). Within this province, Bandung Regency stands out as an area of particular significance, characterized by a diverse socioeconomic composition, high voter turnout, and a history of competitive electoral contests. The KPU office in Bandung Regency therefore serves as a high-stakes institutional environment in which the quality of leadership can plausibly have amplified consequences for employee performance. Yet despite the evident importance of the KPU as an institutional actor, the internal management dynamics of district-level KPU offices remain largely understudied. In particular, the mechanisms through which leadership behaviors shape the day-to-day performance of civil servants within these offices have not received systematic empirical investigation. Existing Indonesian public sector management studies have tended to focus on larger bureaucratic agencies or central government ministries, leaving electoral administration bodies at the district level relatively unexplored (Muizu et al., 2019).

This study aims to address that gap by providing rigorous empirical evidence on the relationship between leadership quality and employee performance at the KPU office in Bandung Regency, West Java. Specifically, it tests the hypothesis that leadership exerts a positive and significant effect on employee performance, using a quantitative methodology grounded in simple linear regression analysis. By doing so, the study contributes to three intersecting streams of scholarship: (1) the organizational behavior literature on leadership and performance in public sector contexts; (2) the emerging body of research on institutional management within Indonesian governmental organizations; and (3) the broader conversation on how democratic governance can be strengthened through human resource development and leadership investment.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant theoretical and empirical literature and develops the study's research hypothesis. Section 3 describes the research methodology, including sample characteristics, data collection procedures, and analytical techniques. Section 4 presents the empirical results. Section 5 interprets and discusses the findings in relation to prior research and theoretical frameworks. Section 6 concludes with implications for practice and directions for future research.

---

## Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

### Conceptualizing Leadership in Organizational Contexts

Journal of  
Business  
Evolution and  
Economic  
Management

Leadership is one of the most extensively studied phenomena in the social and management sciences, yet scholars continue to debate its precise definition and mechanisms of influence. At its core, leadership refers to a social influence process through which an individual the leader mobilizes the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral resources of others toward the pursuit of shared objectives (Yukl, 2020; Northouse, 2021). This definition implies that leadership is not a fixed trait possessed by certain individuals, but rather a dynamic and relational process that unfolds through interactions between leaders, followers, and situational contexts.

JBEEM  
February 2026

Over the past century, scholarly understanding of leadership has evolved through several successive paradigms. Early trait-based theories emphasized stable personal characteristics such as intelligence, integrity, and decisiveness as prerequisites for effective leadership (Stogdill, 1948). Behavioral theories shifted attention toward what leaders do rather than who they are, identifying two broad behavioral orientations: task-focused behaviors aimed at structuring work and setting performance standards, and people-focused behaviors directed at building relationships and addressing follower needs (Likert, 1961). Contingency theories further nuanced the picture by arguing that the effectiveness of a given leadership style depends on the characteristics of the situation, including task complexity, follower maturity, and organizational culture (Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969).

Vol. 1 No. 2  
E-ISSN:  
DOI:

Contemporary leadership research has increasingly converged on a set of integrative frameworks that emphasize the relational, inspirational, and contextually adaptive dimensions of leadership behavior. The most influential of these frameworks transformational, transactional, servant, and adaptive leadership theories are reviewed in the subsections below. Each offers a distinct but complementary lens through which to understand how leadership influences organizational outcomes, and each has been applied with varying degrees of emphasis in the public sector management literature.

### Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership, first theorized by Burns (1978) and subsequently operationalized by Bass (1985, 1999), is perhaps the most widely studied leadership framework in contemporary organizational research. Transformational leaders are characterized by four core behavioral dimensions, commonly referred to as the “Four I’s”: Idealized Influence (serving as a role model and inspiring respect and admiration), Inspirational Motivation (articulating a compelling vision and rallying followers around shared goals), Intellectual Stimulation (challenging followers to question assumptions and approach problems creatively), and Individualized Consideration (attending to the unique developmental needs and aspirations of each follower) (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

The performance implications of transformational leadership have been documented across a wide range of organizational settings. Hussain et al. (2019) demonstrated that transformational leadership significantly enhances task performance and organizational commitment among employees in logistics organizations, primarily through its effect on emotional engagement and intrinsic motivation. Wang et al. (2022) extended this finding by showing that transformational leadership strengthens employee performance through dual mediation pathways involving both cognitive and affective trust suggesting that transformational behaviors operate not merely through inspiration but also through the

---

establishment of reliable, trust-based relationships. In the public sector specifically, transformational leadership has been shown to reduce organizational cynicism, increase innovative behavior, and improve service delivery quality among government employees (Fernandez & Pitts, 2011; Wright et al., 2012).

Within the Indonesian context, the transformational framework is particularly salient given the hierarchical organizational culture that characterizes many public sector agencies. Leaders who are able to transcend purely directive authority and instead inspire intrinsic commitment among their subordinates are better positioned to overcome the motivational challenges posed by bureaucratic rigidity and procedural constraint (Muizu et al., 2019). This makes the transformational leadership model a strong theoretical anchor for the present study.

### **Transactional Leadership**

Transactional leadership operates on the principle of contingent exchange: followers comply with leader directives in return for desired rewards, and deviate from expectations at the risk of correction or sanction (Bass & Riggio, 2006). This framework encompasses two primary behavioral components: Contingent Reward, which involves establishing clear performance-outcome linkages and recognizing achievement; and Management-by-Exception, which focuses on monitoring performance and intervening when deviations from standards are detected (Udayanga, 2020).

While transactional leadership is sometimes positioned as inferior to its transformational counterpart, research suggests that its effectiveness depends heavily on the nature of the task and the characteristics of the organizational environment. For structured, procedurally complex tasks with well-defined performance criteria such as those prevalent in electoral administration transactional mechanisms can provide a stable motivational foundation by ensuring that employees understand precisely what is expected of them and what they stand to gain by meeting those expectations (Tuffour et al., 2022). Indeed, Bass and Riggio (2006) argued that transformational and transactional leadership are not mutually exclusive but rather complementary, with the most effective leaders employing both styles in contextually appropriate combinations.

### **Adaptive Leadership**

Adaptive leadership, as theorized by Heifetz et al. (2009), departs from leader-centric models by conceptualizing leadership as a distributed activity involving the mobilization of collective adaptive capacity within organizations and communities. Adaptive leaders are those who create conditions for learning, help followers navigate ambiguity, and sustain organizational functionality in the face of shifting demands and unpredictable challenges. This framework is particularly relevant to public sector organizations, which frequently encounter “wicked problems” complex, multifaceted challenges that do not yield to standard technical solutions and require ongoing organizational learning and adjustment (Grint, 2010).

Sott and Bender (2025) conducted a systematic review of adaptive leadership research and found that adaptive leadership behaviors are positively associated with team resilience, organizational innovation, and sustained performance during periods of institutional crisis. For electoral commission offices, which must adapt rapidly to changing electoral regulations, demographic shifts, and technological developments, the capacity for adaptive leadership is a meaningful determinant of how well employees perform during high-pressure operational periods.

Servant leadership, introduced by Greenleaf (1977) and subsequently refined into a rigorous theoretical framework by van Dierendonck (2011) and Liden et al. (2021), positions the needs and development of followers as the central concern of the leadership process. Servant leaders exhibit key behaviors including empowering and developing employees, expressing humility, demonstrating authenticity, providing direction, and stewardship acting as guardians of organizational values and resources for the benefit of all stakeholders.

In public sector organizations, servant leadership is particularly resonant because it aligns with the ethos of public service, wherein officials are expected to act as stewards of the public interest rather than self-interested agents (Liden et al., 2021). Empirical research has consistently shown that servant leadership enhances employee well-being, increases organizational citizenship behavior, and improves job performance in public service contexts (van Dierendonck, 2011). The servant leadership orientation also fosters a psychologically safe climate in which employees feel empowered to take initiative, share information openly, and engage fully with their work responsibilities all of which are critical drivers of high performance in complex institutional environments.

### **Employee Performance: Conceptualization and Measurement**

Employee performance is a foundational construct in organizational behavior research, typically defined as the degree to which an individual fulfills the role-based responsibilities assigned to them in a manner that meets or exceeds organizational standards (Schermerhorn et al., 2011). However, contemporary scholarship has moved beyond this narrow conception toward a more multidimensional understanding that encompasses not only task performance the proficient execution of formally assigned duties but also contextual performance, which captures discretionary contributions to organizational effectiveness beyond formal role requirements (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). In public sector organizations, performance assessment is further complicated by the nature of the output, which is often intangible, service-oriented, and subject to political and regulatory constraints (Wardhana et al., 2022). Larasati et al. (2022) argue that public sector employee performance should be evaluated along at least three dimensions: technical quality of work output, adherence to procedural standards and ethical norms, and responsiveness to the needs of internal and external stakeholders. These dimensions collectively capture the breadth of performance expectations placed on civil servants, particularly those in institutions with high accountability requirements such as electoral commissions.

Performance is not a static attribute but a dynamic outcome shaped by a constellation of individual, interpersonal, and organizational factors. Individual-level antecedents include cognitive ability, technical skills, work experience, and personality traits such as conscientiousness and openness to experience (Lianasari & Ahmadi, 2022). Organizational-level antecedents encompass structural design, reward systems, workload allocation, and most relevantly for the present study the quality of managerial leadership (Rahayuningsih, 2018). The interplay between these factors underscores the importance of examining performance not as an isolated individual attribute but as a relational and contextually embedded phenomenon.

### **Leadership and Employee Performance: Empirical Evidence and Mechanisms**

The theoretical expectation that leadership positively influences employee performance has been tested extensively across organizational settings, industries, and cultural contexts,

generating a robust and largely consistent body of empirical evidence. Meta-analytic reviews have confirmed that leadership quality is among the strongest organizational-level predictors of individual and team performance outcomes (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; DeRue et al., 2011).

The mechanisms through which leadership exerts its performance effects are multiple and interdependent. First, effective leadership enhances motivational arousal by linking employees' personal values and aspirations to organizational goals, thereby increasing the intrinsic motivation to perform well (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Second, leadership strengthens employee self-efficacy the belief in one's own capacity to successfully execute required tasks through modeling, encouragement, and the provision of developmental resources (Bandura, 1997). Third, leadership shapes the organizational climate, establishing norms of accountability, collaboration, and continuous improvement that create structural conditions favorable to high performance (Schneider et al., 2013).

Rahayu et al. (2023) established that participatory and supportive leadership styles, particularly those involving employees in decision-making, are significantly and positively associated with performance improvements in Indonesian organizations. Their findings indicate that the performance benefits of participatory leadership operate through enhanced role clarity, reduced work-related stress, and a stronger sense of organizational ownership among employees. Similarly, Wang et al. (2022) demonstrated that transformational leadership produces performance gains through dual mediation pathways involving cognitive trust the belief that leaders are competent and reliable and affective trust the emotional confidence that leaders genuinely care about employee well-being. Within the Indonesian public sector, Muizu et al. (2019) confirmed that leadership quality directly and significantly influences employee performance, with work motivation serving as an important mediating variable. This finding highlights that leadership does not act on performance in a vacuum; rather, its effects are channeled through psychological mechanisms that operate at the level of the individual employee. For practitioners, this suggests that leadership interventions aimed at improving performance should explicitly target motivational and relational pathways rather than focusing exclusively on structural or procedural changes.

In the specific context of government administrative offices, Fernandez and Pitts (2011) found that managerial leadership behaviors particularly those associated with clarifying mission, supporting innovation, and recognizing performance were among the strongest predictors of employee job satisfaction and performance in U.S. federal agencies. Tuffour et al. (2022) extended this evidence base to the financial sector in sub-Saharan Africa, finding that both transformational and contingent-reward transactional behaviors contributed positively to employee commitment and performance. These cross-national findings strengthen the case for expecting a significant leadership-performance relationship in the Indonesian electoral governance context. Notwithstanding this convergent evidence, important gaps remain. Research specifically examining the leadership-performance relationship within electoral commission offices is virtually absent from the published literature. Moreover, studies from West Java one of Indonesia's most politically significant regions are scarce. The present study therefore occupies a distinct and important niche within the existing literature.

## Research Gap and Theoretical Framework

The review of existing literature reveals three interconnected gaps that motivate the present study. First, while the leadership-performance relationship is well-established in private sector and general public sector contexts, evidence from electoral administration bodies in

developing democracies is virtually nonexistent. Second, studies focusing on the West Java regional context are sparse, despite the province's demographic and political significance. Third, most existing Indonesian public sector studies have relied on relatively small samples and limited theoretical grounding, constraining the generalizability of their conclusions.

To address these gaps, this study anchors its investigation in an integrative theoretical framework that draws on transformational, adaptive, and servant leadership theories as complementary lenses. These frameworks collectively predict that leaders who inspire, empower, and attend to the needs of their subordinates while simultaneously adapting their strategies to contextual demands will produce measurably superior employee performance outcomes. This prediction is formalized in the following hypothesis Leadership quality has a positive and significant effect on employee performance at the KPU office in Bandung Regency, West Java. The conceptual framework underpinning this hypothesis posits leadership as an exogenous organizational variable that directly influences employee performance through motivational, cognitive, and relational mechanisms. While acknowledging that performance is shaped by multiple factors, the framework prioritizes leadership as the primary explanatory variable of theoretical interest in the present study.

## Methods

### Research Design

This study adopts a quantitative research design, which is appropriate for testing theoretically derived hypotheses through statistical analysis of numerical data (Sugiyono, 2013). The positivist epistemological orientation underlying this design aligns with the objective of determining whether a measurable and generalizable relationship exists between the independent variable (leadership) and the dependent variable (employee performance).

The study was conducted at the Regional General Elections Commission (KPU) office in Bandung Regency, West Java Province, Indonesia. Bandung Regency is among the most populous administrative districts in West Java, rendering its KPU office a strategically significant site for examining public sector organizational behavior.

The target population comprised all civil servants employed at the office, totaling 75 individuals. Given the manageable size of this population, the study employed saturated sampling (sampling jenuh), whereby all members of the population were included as research participants (Tarjo, 2020). This approach eliminates sampling bias and enhances the generalizability of findings within the study's context.

Primary data were gathered through structured questionnaires distributed directly to all 75 respondents. The questionnaire comprised two main sections corresponding to the study variables: (1) leadership, measured through six indicator items reflecting decision clarity, information-based problem-solving, communicative capacity, emotional resilience, openness to feedback, and employee-centered attention; and (2) employee performance, assessed through six items capturing task accomplishment, work quality, initiative, responsibility, collaboration, and adherence to standards.

Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). Secondary data, including institutional documents and prior research publications, were also consulted to contextualize the findings.

Construct validity was assessed by comparing item-level Pearson correlation coefficients ( $r$ -values) against the critical  $r$ -table value at the 5% significance level. All indicator items were confirmed as valid when  $r$ -calculated exceeded  $r$ -table. Instrument reliability was

evaluated using Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient, with values above 0.60 deemed acceptable and values exceeding 0.70 considered satisfactory (Hair et al., 2019).

The primary analytical technique employed was simple linear regression, expressed as:

$$Y = a + bX$$

Where Y represents employee performance (dependent variable), X denotes leadership quality (independent variable), a is the regression constant, and b is the regression coefficient. The analysis was performed using SPSS version 25. Hypothesis testing was conducted using the t-test at a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.05$ , and the explanatory power of the model was assessed through the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ).

## Results

### Validity and Reliability Testing

Table 1 reports the item-level validity test results for both study variables, based on a comparison of each item’s Pearson r-value against the critical r-table value of 0.2272 ( $n = 75$ ,  $\alpha = 5\%$ ).

**Table 1. Validity Test Results**

Variable & Item	r-calculated	r-table	Sig.	Result
Leadership – Item 1 (X1)	0.821	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Leadership – Item 2 (X2)	0.849	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Leadership – Item 3 (X3)	0.837	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Leadership – Item 4 (X4)	0.856	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Leadership – Item 5 (X5)	0.843	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Leadership – Item 6 (X6)	0.818	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Emp. Performance – Item 1 (Y1)	0.872	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Emp. Performance – Item 2 (Y2)	0.904	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Emp. Performance – Item 3 (Y3)	0.889	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Emp. Performance – Item 4 (Y4)	0.861	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Emp. Performance – Item 5 (Y5)	0.917	0.2272	0.000	Valid
Emp. Performance – Item 6 (Y6)	0.895	0.2272	0.000	Valid

Source: Primary data processed via SPSS v.25 (2024)

All twelve items returned r-calculated values considerably greater than the r-table threshold, with significance levels of 0.000 in each case, confirming the discriminant and convergent validity of the measurement instruments.

**Table 2. Reliability Test Results**

Variable	Cronbach’s Alpha	Threshold	Result
Leadership (X)	0.931	0.70	Reliable
Employee Performance (Y)	0.944	0.70	Reliable

Source: Primary data processed via SPSS v.25 (2025)

Both variables demonstrated excellent internal consistency, with Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.931 and 0.944 respectively, well above the 0.70 threshold (Hair et al., 2019), affirming the reliability of the questionnaire instruments.

### Simple Linear Regression Analysis

**Table 3. Simple Linear Regression Coefficients**

Model	B (Unstd.)	Std. Error	Beta (Std.)	t	Sig.
(Constant)	-2.841	1.634		-1.739	0.086
Leadership (X)	1.118	0.041	0.963	27.415	0.000

Dependent Variable: Employee Performance (Y). Source: Primary data processed via SPSS v.25 (2025)

The regression equation is:  $Y = -2.841 + 1.118X$ . The positive coefficient ( $B = 1.118$ ) indicates that each one-unit increase in leadership score corresponds to a predicted 1.118-unit increase in employee performance. The standardized beta of 0.963 confirms the dominant explanatory contribution of leadership.

### Hypothesis Testing (t-Test)

**Table 4. Hypothesis Testing Results (t-Test)**

Variable	t-calculated	t-table	Sig.	Decision
Leadership → Employee Performance	27.415	1.993	0.000	Accepted

Source: Primary data processed via SPSS v.25 (2025)

With t-calculated (27.415) substantially exceeding t-table (1.993) and significance at  $0.000 < 0.05$ , the null hypothesis is rejected and H1 is accepted. Leadership quality exerts a positive and statistically significant effect on employee performance.

### Correlation and Coefficient of Determination

**Table 5. Model Summary Correlation and Coefficient of Determination**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Std. Error of Estimate
1	0.963 <sup>a</sup>	0.927	0.926	1.312

Predictor: (Constant), Leadership. Source: Primary data processed via SPSS v.25 (2025)

The correlation coefficient ( $R = 0.963$ ) denotes a very strong linear relationship. The R<sup>2</sup> of 0.927 indicates that 92.7% of variance in employee performance is explained by leadership quality, with the remaining 7.3% attributable to factors outside the model.

---

## Discussion

The empirical results affirm, with considerable statistical strength, that leadership quality positively and significantly influences the performance of civil servants at the KPU office in Bandung Regency, West Java. These findings are consistent with and extend prior scholarship in multiple important dimensions.

The regression coefficient of 1.118 suggests that marginal improvements in perceived leadership quality translate into meaningful gains in employee performance. The coefficient of determination of 92.7% is particularly striking, underscoring the disproportionate importance of leadership in shaping performance outcomes within this institutional environment. While such a high  $R^2$  value should be interpreted with appropriate caution given the single-predictor design, it points to leadership as the dominant organizational factor driving performance variation in this context.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings resonate strongly with Bass and Riggio's (2006) transformational framework, which predicts that leaders who inspire, individualize, and intellectually stimulate their subordinates generate higher organizational performance. High mean scores on communicative capacity (3.95), evidence-based decision-making (4.08), and receptiveness to feedback (4.03) suggest that sampled leaders exhibit key transformational behaviors, reinforcing employee engagement and output quality.

These results also align with Rahayu et al. (2023), who identified participatory leadership styles as positively correlated with performance in Indonesian organizational settings. When employees perceive leaders as attentive and supportive, they are more likely to internalize organizational goals and direct their energies toward achieving them. Tuffour et al. (2022) corroborated this pattern, attributing the leadership-performance link partly to reductions in role ambiguity and increases in emotional commitment.

From the adaptive leadership perspective advanced by Sott and Bender (2025), the findings suggest that the KPU's leadership sustains performance amid the institutional pressures inherent in electoral administration. The ability to maintain clarity, openness, and resilience during complex operational cycles appears to be a key driver of the robust performance outcomes documented here.

Servant leadership theory (van Dierendonck, 2011; Liden et al., 2021) also receives implicit support from the employee performance data. High scores on responsibility (4.08), collaboration (4.12), and initiative (4.05) align with the prosocial orientation that servant leadership is expected to cultivate, suggesting that the follower-centered behaviors of institutional leaders at the KPU create an environment in which employees feel empowered to go beyond minimum role requirements.

The study lends empirical support to Muizu et al. (2019), while contributing a more refined measurement framework and a larger sample base, thereby strengthening the generalizability of conclusions within the West Java regional governance context. The remaining 7.3% of unexplained variance implies that other factors including organizational culture, compensation, interpersonal dynamics, and individual competencies also play a role, warranting investigation in future multi-variable research.

Practically, the findings carry clear implications for institutional leadership at regional KPU offices. Leadership development programs emphasizing transformational and servant behaviors vision communication, individualized support, openness to feedback, and sustained resilience are likely to produce the strongest performance returns. Regular participatory

---

feedback mechanisms can further strengthen the leader-employee relationship and continuously reinforce the conditions under which high performance is sustained.

## Conclusion

This study investigated the effect of leadership quality on employee performance at the KPU office in Bandung Regency, West Java, using simple linear regression analysis on data from 75 civil servants. The results provide compelling empirical support for leadership exerts a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The regression coefficient confirmed a direct and proportional relationship between the variables, while the coefficient of determination revealed that leadership explains 92.7% of the variance in employee performance. The t-test outcome firmly validated the hypothesis, reinforcing the conclusion that leadership is the primary performance determinant within this institutional context.

These findings advance the literature on public sector organizational behavior in Indonesia and contribute to the theoretical conversation on how leadership shapes performance in electoral governance bodies. They provide actionable guidance for public administrators, HR managers, and policymakers seeking to improve institutional effectiveness through leadership investment. Future research should incorporate variables such as organizational culture, work motivation, and compensation into multi-variable structural models. Longitudinal and comparative studies spanning multiple KPU offices across West Java and other provinces would further enhance the external validity and theoretical depth of these findings.

## References

- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. *W. H. Freeman*.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. *Free Press*.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398410>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). *Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617095>
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. in N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp. 71–98). *Jossey-Bass*.
- BPS (Badan Pusat Statistik) (2023). Jawa Barat dalam angka 2023. *Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Barat*.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. *Harper & Row*.
- DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 7–52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x>
- Fernandez, S., & Pitts, D. W. (2011). Understanding employee motivation to innovate: Evidence from front line employees in United States federal agencies. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 70(2), 202–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2011.00726.x>
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. *McGraw-Hill*.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. *Paulist Press*.

- Grint, K. (2010). Wicked problems and clumsy solutions: The role of leadership. *in S. Brookes & K. Grint (Eds.), The New Public Leadership Challenge (pp. 169–186). Palgrave Macmillan.* [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230277953\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230277953_11)
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review, 31(1), 2–24.* <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world. *Harvard Business Press.*
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal, 23(5), 26–34.*
- Hussain, A., Yousaf, M., Khan, M. A., Diah, M. L. M., & Shahbaz, M. S. (2019). The effect of transformational leadership on employee job performance through mediating role of organizational commitment in logistic sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management, 8(4), 161–170.*
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(5), 755–768.* <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>
- Larasati, A. A., Zainal, V. R., & Nawangsari, L. C. (2022). Konsep penilaian kinerja karyawan berbasis akhlak. *COMSERVA: Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat, 2(6), 734–743.*
- Lianasari, M., & Ahmadi, S. (2022). Pengaruh kompetensi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja dengan motivasi kerja sebagai variabel intervening. *Fokus Bisnis: Media Pengkajian Manajemen dan Akuntansi, 21(1), 43–59.*
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2021). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly, 26(2), 254–269.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.12.001>
- Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. *McGraw-Hill.*
- Mietzner, M. (2014). Indonesia's decentralization: The rise of local identities and the survival of the nation-state. *in H. Hill (Ed.), Regional Dynamics in a Decentralized Indonesia (pp. 45–67). ISEAS Publishing.*
- Mozaffar, S., & Schedler, A. (2002). The comparative study of electoral governance: Introduction. *International Political Science Review, 23(1), 5–27.* <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512102023001001>
- Muizu, W. O. Z., Kaltum, U., & Sule, E. T. (2019). Pengaruh kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Perwira: Jurnal Pendidikan Kewirausahaan Indonesia, 2(1), 70–78.*
- Northouse, P. G. (2021). Leadership: Theory and practice (9th ed.). *SAGE Publications.*
- Osborne, S. P., & Brown, L. (2011). Innovation, public policy and public services delivery in the UK: The word that would be king?. *Public Administration, 89(4), 1335–1350.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01932.x>
- Rahayu, R. S., Yulyasari, D., Tyvado, I. D., & Putri, A. A. (2023). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan transformasional dan lingkungan kerja terhadap strategi kinerja karyawan. *BULLET: Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu, 2(1), 187–195.*
- Rahayuningsih, S. (2018). Pengaruh kompetensi, kompensasi dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Prosiding SENDI\_U 2018, 978–979.*
- Schermerhorn Jr., J. R., Osborn, R. N., Uhl-Bien, M., & Hunt, J. G. (2011). Organizational behavior (12th ed.). *John Wiley & Sons.*

- 
- Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64*, 361–388. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143809>
- Sott, M. K., & Bender, M. S. (2025). The role of adaptive leadership in times of crisis: A systematic review and conceptual framework. *Merits, 5(1)*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3390/merits5010002>
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25(1)*, 35–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362>
- Sugiyono, D. (2013). Metode penelitian pendidikan: Pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D. *Alfabeta*.
- Tarjo, T. (2020). Metode penelitian sistem 3x baca. *Deepublish*.
- Tuffour, J. K., Gali, A. M., & Tuffour, M. K. (2022). Managerial leadership style and employee commitment: Evidence from the financial sector. *Global Business Review, 23(3)*, 543–560. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919844395>
- Udayanga, M. (2020). The impact of transactional leadership on organizational productivity: A monographic study. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Current Educational Research, 2(5)*, 297–309.
- van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management, 37(4)*, 1228–1261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462>
- Wang, X., Lin, H., & Tang, P. (2022). Transformational leadership and employee performance: The mediating roles of cognitive trust and affective trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 43(5)*, 796–813. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-08-2021-0367>
- Wardhana, A., Trisavinaningdiah, A., Susiati, A., Setyaningsih, D., Wiliana, E., & Rachmawati, E. (2022). Manajemen sumber daya manusia. *Widina Bhakti Persada*.
- Wright, B. E., Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2012). Pulling the levers: Transformational leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence. *Public Administration Review, 72(2)*, 206–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02496.x>
- Yukl, G. (2020). Leadership in organizations (9th ed.). *Pearson*.