



The Influence of Transformational Leadership on Teaching Performance and Subjective Well-being of Lecturers

Agnes Renostini Harefa^{1*}, Nathanael Sitanggang², Elizon Nainggolan³ 

¹ Faculty of Teaching and Education, Universitas Nias, Gunungsitoli, Indonesia

^{2,3} Postgraduate Manajemen Pendidikan, State University of Medan, Medan, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: agnesyuszg@gmail.com

Abstrak

Peningkatan mutu pendidikan tidak dapat dilakukan secara parsial tetapi harus menyeluruh dan berkelanjutan. Dalam meningkatkan kualitas pendidikan di sekolah diperlukan seorang pemimpin yang cakap. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk menganalisis pengaruh kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap kinerja pengajaran. Jenis penelitian ini yaitu kuantitatif dengan menggunakan metode kuantitatif. Responden dalam penelitian ini adalah dosen tetap di lingkungan Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan yang berjumlah 62 orang. Pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui penyebaran kuesioner tertutup kepada para responden. Teknik analisis data menggunakan analisis SPSS 25 yaitu data yang telah terkumpul dianalisis secara kuantitatif menggunakan path analisis, kemudian dilanjutkan dengan mendeskripsikan secara kualitatif untuk memperoleh gambaran hasil yang lebih jelas. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa tidak terdapat pengaruh signifikan kepemimpinan transformasional terhadap kinerja pengajaran dosen, dibuktikan dengan hasil uji struktur I. Hasil ini menunjukkan bahwa variabel Kepemimpinan Transformasional tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap Kinerja Pengajaran Dosen. Kepemimpinan transformasional tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap subjective wellbeing dosen. Hasil ini memberikan kesimpulan bahwa pada regresi struktur II, variabel Kepemimpinan Transformasional (X) tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap Subjective Wellbeing Dosen (Y₂). Hasil ini memberikan kesimpulan bahwa pada regresi struktur II, variabel Kinerja Pengajaran Dosen (Y₁) tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap Subjective Wellbeing Dosen (Y₂).

Kata kunci: Kepemimpinan transformasional, kinerja pengajaran, subjective wellbeing.

Abstract

Improving the quality of education cannot be done partially but must be comprehensive and sustainable. A capable leader is needed to improve the quality of education in schools. This research aims to analyze the effect of transformational leadership on teaching performance. This type of research is quantitative by using quantitative methods. Respondents in this study were permanent lecturers in the Teaching and Education Faculty, totaling 62 people. Data collection was carried out by distributing closed questionnaires to the respondents. The data analysis technique uses SPSS 25 analysis. Namely, the data that has been collected is analyzed quantitatively using path analysis, then proceed with a qualitative description to obtain a clearer picture of the results. This study's results indicate no significant effect of transformational leadership on the teaching performance of lecturers. These results suggest that the variable Transformational leadership has no significant effect on Lecturer Teaching Performance. Transformational leadership has no significant impact on the subjective well-being of lecturers. These results conclude that in structural II regression, the variable Transformational Leadership (X) has no significant effect on the Lecturer's Subjective Well-being (Y₂). These results conclude that in structural II regression, the variable Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y₁) has no significant effect on Lecturer Subjective Well-being (Y₂).

Keywords: Transformational leadership, teaching performance, subjective well-being.

History:

Received : September 02, 2022

Revised : September 03, 2022

Accepted : October 14, 2022

Published : October 25, 2022

Publisher: Undiksha Press

Licensed: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License



1. INTRODUCTION

Leadership is a process that is being discussed a lot at the moment. An organization will be meaningless without being based on and supported by reliable leadership and being responsive to current situational changes, which is the key to increasing corporate excellence. Leadership is both a challenge and an opportunity both leaders and followers face. Leadership is a series of structured activities that influence other people's behavior in certain situations so that they are willing to work together to achieve the set goals (M. Arifin &

Nurjaman, 2022; Fadhlan et al., 2022). Higher education is a higher education institution with the characteristics of a bureaucratic organizational structure that is different from other organizations (Mubyl & Dwinanda, 2019; Nurdin et al., 2020). According to previous study higher education is a professional bureaucracy with a horizontal structure featuring groups of faculties that lead educational and research activities (Jung, 2022). In a tertiary institution, the positions of the faculties and study programs are very important because they are directly related to educators (lecturers) and educational staff. Therefore, this system is complex and unique from other organizational structures.

Improving the quality of education cannot be done partially but must be comprehensive and sustainable. For the improvement of lecturers, professional education for teaching staff (lecturers) has begun without neglecting performance as lecturers (Kowang et al., 2020; Kusdibyo, 2021). Lecturers have a strategic position in determining the quality of graduates and institutional quality, and lecturer performance is a strategic factor in realizing the quality of higher education (Avando Bastari et al., 2021; Christianingsih, 2011). Teacher performance is the ability of a teacher to carry out learning tasks at school and is responsible for students under his guidance by increasing student learning achievements (Maris et al., 2016; Sihombing, 2020). Teacher performance in schools (classrooms) refers to the behavior of teachers in carrying out teacher work, namely teaching. Performance is closely related to what teachers do in the classroom and how it affects student learning activities. The seriousness and maximum contribution of teachers in carrying out their duties will be seen very clearly in students' learning achievements (Anwar et al., 2022; Sukirno, 2020). Lecturer performance measurement (KDos) must be carried out on an ongoing basis to provide feedback which is important in continuous improvement efforts to achieve the success of educational institutions in the future (S. Arifin & Sukmawidjaya, 2020; Retnowati et al., 2021; Sihombing, 2020).

Happiness and leadership factors can influence lecturer satisfaction in carrying out their duties. Several factors can affect employee performance: internal factors such as intellectual abilities, work discipline, happiness, and engagement, and external factors such as transformational leadership, work environment, compensation, and company management systems (Mubyl & Dwinanda, 2019; Purwanto et al., 2020). The concept of satisfaction is closely related to happiness. It refers to subjective well-being (SWB), a psychological term for happiness. SWB, or subjective well-being, is a person's perception of his or her life experience, which consists of cognitive evaluations and affect on life and is represented in psychological well-being (Affandi et al., 2021; Richard & Diener, 2009). To measure SWB, researchers used the Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) scale to measure the affective domain of SWB (Eddington & Shuman, 2008; Watson et al., 1988). The measuring instruments used to measure the SWB construct, namely the PANAS and SWLS scales in Indonesian, have satisfactory validity and reliability (Akhtar, 2019; Diener et al., 1985).

Base on observation Nias University educational institutions need to apply appropriate leadership in improving teaching performance and the subjective well-being of lecturers as benchmarks for improving the quality of education and performance in regional, national, and even international environments. An appropriate leadership model is needed to achieve high morality and motivation jointly by faculty leaders, study programs, and educators (lecturers) to answer the challenges of a changing era. Leadership can transform the characteristics of a leader that can change something into another form, improve performance, and foster good awareness about management and leadership that looks at people, performance, and even welfare for workers. Some studies state that transformational leadership is important for companies to achieve better employee performance. Previous research find that transformational leadership positively affects performance (Anwar et al., 2022). Transformational leadership style (KpT) is measured by followers' trust, obedience,

admiration, loyalty, and respect. Transformational leaders change followers' values to support the vision and goals of the organization (Arokiasamy et al., 2015; Cetin & Kinik, 2015). Whereas the followers of the transformational leader themselves are motivated and inspire their followers to be involved, committed and have an organizational vision and goals, encouraging followers to innovate, have the competence. Previous study found that transformational leadership significantly and positively affects employee performance (Mubyl & Dwinanda, 2019). It means that transformational leadership can improve employee performance in a company. Transformational leadership also affects lecturer performance and job satisfaction, and there is an indirect effect of transformational leadership on lecturer performance through job satisfaction (Sihombing, 2020; Suastini & Manuaba, 2021). Transformational leadership is important for work engagement and follower performance because it encourages behaviors such as using power and initiative (Bakker et al., 2022; Purwanto et al., 2020).

Based on the background of the problem and the results of previous research, which concluded that there is a link between transformational leadership, performance, and subjective well-being. The researchers are interested in digging deeper and predicting the effect of transformational leadership on teaching performance and subjective well-being of lecturers at Nias University, especially in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. Based on the importance of lecturer performance and the subjective well-being of lecturers, this study aimed to analyze the influence of transformational leadership on lecturer performance and subjective well-being of lecturers at the Teaching and Education Faculty of Nias University. It is hoped that this research can become a reference in optimizing the factors that positively influence lecturers' performance and subjective well-being to realize a better quality of education at Nias University.

2. METHODS

This research was conducted at the Teaching and Education Faculty of Nias University. Respondents in this study were permanent lecturers at the Teaching and Education Faculty of Nias University, totaling 62 people. This research uses quantitative methods. This approach is commonly used in research in the social sciences with two paradigms, namely positivism and phenomenology. This paradigm will assist researchers in understanding social phenomena, how knowledge can be formed, what influences problems, their solutions and the criteria for scientific evidence found (Creswell, 2014). The data was obtained by distributing closed questionnaires to the respondents. The instruments used in data collection were: 1) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), consisting of 33 question items related to Transformational leadership with details: for the idealized influence charisma component consisting of 9 statements; the inspirational motivation component consists of 6 statements, the intellectual stimulation component consists of 9 statements, and the individualized consideration component consists of 9 statements (Bass & Avolio, 2000). 2) The lecturer teaching performance assessment questionnaire was developed by researchers, consisting of three indicators, namely preparation for lectures consisting of 6 statements, indicators of lecture implementation, consisting of 23 statements and indicators of evaluation of learning outcomes consisting of 19 statements. For each statement using four level of likert scale. 3) SWLS (Subjective Well-being Life Satisfaction) and PANAS (Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule) questionnaires which have been adopted in Bahasa Indonesia (Afiatin et al., 2016; Diener et al., 1985; Watson et al., 1988). Researchers tested the instruments to determine the validity and reliability of each instrument. Instruments that meet these valid criteria are used in research.

The variables in this study are Transformational Leadership (KpT), in this case as variable X (independent variable), Lecturer Teaching Performance (KDos), and Lecturer Subjective Well-being (SWB), respectively as variables Y_1 and Y_2 (dependent variable). Therefore, this study will test the hypotheses: H_1 : Transformational leadership significantly affects lecturer teaching performance. H_2 : Transformational leadership has a significant effect on lecturer's subjective well-being. H_3 : Transformational leadership has a significant effect on teaching performance and lecturer subjective well-being lecturer together. The data analysis technique uses SPSS 25 analysis; namely, the data that has been collected is analyzed quantitatively using path analysis, then proceed with a qualitative description to obtain a clearer picture of the results.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Precondition Analysis Test

Respondents in this study totaled 62 people, namely permanent lecturers at the Teaching and Education Faculty of Nias University. The instrument's validity is tested using the moment product correlation formula. The instrument is valid if the correlation coefficient scores the items with a total score of $r > 0.3$; otherwise, it is invalid if the correlation coefficient scores the items with a total score of $r < 0.3$. The validity test results of the three research instruments used were valid. In this study, the reliability test used Cronbach Alpha. A construct or variable is said to be reliable if it gives a Cronbach Alpha value of > 0.60 , so it can be said that the instrument used is reliable. The reliability test results for each variable are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Reliability Test Results

Variables	Reliability		
	Alpha coefficient	Criticism Number	Information
KpT	0.95	0.924	Very high
KDos	0.930	0.939	Very high
SWB	0.777	0.771	High

Base on Table 1 show result of reliability test that found variable of KpT and KDos are obtain very high and for SWB variable obtain high category. The normality test was carried out on the sample using the Kolmogorov – Smirnov test by setting a degree of confidence (α) of 5%. The result is show in Table 2.

Table 2. Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
RES_1	0.177	62	0.000	0.952	62	0.013
RES_2	0.177	62	0.000	0.921	62	0.000

Base on Table 2, show the value of sig. Each variable is < 0.05 , So it is concluded that the data is not normally distributed. Test of equality of error variances is show in Table 3.

Table 3. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Lecturer Teaching Performance	1.137	30	31	0.368
Subjective Well-being Lecturer	2.324	30	31	0.000

Base on Table 3 show sig. value is obtained. Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y_1) = 0.368 > 0.05 means the variance of the data is homogeneous. While the variable Subjective Well-being Lecturer (Y_2) = 0.000 < 0.05, the data variance is not homogeneous. Then for linearity test using ANOVA is show in Table 4.

Table 4. Linearity test using ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Lecturer Teaching Performance *	Between (Combined)	5829.9873	30	194.158	1.592	0.113
	Groups Linearity	658.158	1	658.335	5.390	0.031
	Deviation from Linearity	5171.836	29	178.342	1.461	0.235
Transformational leadership	Within Groups	3784.996	31	122.096		
	Total	9614.984	61			
Subjective Well-being Lecturer *	Between (Combined)	1004.580	30	33.241	0.837	0.683
	Groups Linearity	6.117	1	6.113	0.164	0.698
	Deviation from Linearity	998.467	29	34.352	0.847	0.587
Transformational leadership	Within Groups	1235.805	31	39.856		
	Total	2240.342	61			

Base on Table 4 show the value of sig deviation from linearity (0.235) > 0.05. It means that H_{01} is accepted; there is a linear relationship between Transformational Leadership (X) and Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y_1). The value of sig deviation from linearity (0.587) > 0.05. It means that H_{02} is accepted, meaning there is a linear relationship between Transformational Leadership (X) and the Subjective Well-being of the Lecturer (Y_2). The multicollinearity test determines whether a correlation is found between the regression model's independent variables. The result is show in Table 5.

Table 5. Multicollinearity Test

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	145.563	13.535		10.390	0.000		
Transformational Leadership	0.231	0.112	0.272	2.101	0.041	1.000	1.000

Base on Table 5, good regression model should not correlate with the independent variables. To detect the presence or absence of multicollinearity in the regression model, among other things, this can be done by looking at the tolerance value and factor variance. The commonly used cutoff value to indicate multicollinearity is a tolerance value ≥ 0.1 or 10% or the same as $VIF \leq 10$.

Hypothesis Testing

Prerequisite test was not fulfilled, namely the data were not normally distributed and not homogeneous, non-parametric statistics were used, with further tests (Post Hoc Test) Games-Howell. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects is show in Table 6.

Base on Table 6 show the sig value is obtained. $Y_1 = 0.113 > 0.05$ and sig. $Y_2 = 0.751 > 0.05$, so there is no significant effect of transformational leadership (X) on lecturer teaching performance (Y_1). Furthermore, transformational leadership (X) does not significantly

influence the subjective well-being of lecturers (Y_2). The result of multivariate tests is show in [Table 7](#).

Table 6. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Lecturer Teaching Performance	5829.993 ^a	2	194.333	1.592	0.103
	Subjective Well-being Lecturer	1004.580 ^b	2	33.486	0.840	0.694
X	Lecturer Teaching Performance	1299859.550	1	1299859.550	10646.168	0.000
	Subjective Well-being Lecturer	162275.415	1	162275.415	4070.650	0.000
Error	Lecturer Teaching Performance	5829.993	2	194.333	1.592	0.113
	Subjective Well-being Lecturer	1004.580	2	33.486	0.840	0.751
Total	Lecturer Teaching Performance	3784.990	59	122.096		
	Subjective Well-being Lecturer	1235.807	59	39.865		
Corrected Total	Lecturer Teaching Performance	1887075.000	62			
	Subjective Well-being Lecturer	231724.000	62			
Corrected Total	Lecturer Teaching Performance	9614.984	61			
	Subjective Well-being Lecturer	2240.387	61			

Table 7. Multivariate Tests

	Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
X	Pillai's Trace	0.997	5884.060	2.000	30.000	0.000
	Wilks' Lambda	0.003	5884.060	2.000	30.000	0.000
	Hotelling's Trace	392.271	5884.060	2.000	30.000	0.000
	Roy's Largest Root	392.271	5884.060	2.000	30.000	0.000
	Pillai's Trace	1.040	1.121	60.000	62.000	0.337
	Wilks' Lambda	0.204	1.216	60.000	60.000	0.247
	Hotelling's Trace	2.711	1.310	60.000	58.000	0.152
	Roy's Largest Root	2.154	2.226	30.000	31.000	0.211

Base on [Table 7](#) show the sig value is obtained. of $0.247 > 0.05$. This value means that Transformational Leadership (X) has no significant effect on Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y_1) and Lecturer Subjective Well-being (Y_2). To determine the closeness of the relationship between Transformational Leadership (X) and Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y_1) and the closeness of the relationship between Transformational Leadership (X) and Subjective well-being of the lecturer (Y_2), path analysis is carried out, the result is show in [Table 8](#).

Table 8. Structural Path Analysis KpT (X) to KDos (Y₁)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	35.678	1.283		10.739	0.000
	Transformational Leadership	0.224	0.102	0.272	2.078	0.033

Based on the results of the output structure I, as show in Table 8, the table coefficient shows that the significance value of Transformational Leadership (X) = 0.33 > 0.05. These results conclude that in structural regression 1, the variable Transformational Leadership (X) has no significant effect on Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y₁). The model summary result is show in Table 9.

Table 9. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.272	0.074	0.058	12.017

Base on Table 9 show the Model Summary table, the R Square value is 0.074. It shows that the contribution or influence of Transformational Leadership (X) on Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y₁) is only 7.4%; other variables influence the remaining 92.6%. Structural path analysis of KpT to SWB is show in Table 10.

Table 10. Structural Path Analysis KpT (X) to SWB (Y₂)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	19.578	1.216		8.369	0.000
	Transformational Leadership	-0.022	0.059	-0.047	-0.367	0.715

Based on Table 10 show the output of structure II, the table coefficient shows that the significance value of Transformational Leadership (X) = 0.715 > 0.05. These results conclude that in structure II regression, the variable Transformational Leadership (X) has no significant effect on the Subjective Well-being of Lecturers (Y₂). Model summary is show in Table 11.

Table 11. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.047	0.002	-0.014	6.916

In the Model Summary table as show in Table 11, the R Square value is 0.002. It shows that the contribution or influence of Transformational Leadership (X) on the Subjective Well-being of Lecturers (Y₂) is only 2%; other variables influence the remaining 98%. Meanwhile, structural path analysis KDos (Y₁) to SWB (Y₂) is show in Table 12.

Table 12. Structural Path Analysis KDos (Y_1) to SWB (Y_2)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	12.190	8.630		5.510	0.000
	Lecturer Teaching Performance	-0.044	0.071	-0.079	0.614	0.541

Based on Table 12 show the results of structure II output, the coefficient table shows that the significance value of Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y_1) = 0.541 > 0.05. These results conclude that in structure II regression, the Lecturer Teaching Performance variable (Y_1) has no significant effect on the Subjective Well-being of the Lecturer (Y_2). Model summary is show in Table 13.

Table 13. Summary Model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.079	0.006	-0.010	6.902

In the Model Summary as show in Table 13, the R Square value is 0.006. It shows that the contribution or influence of Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y_1) on Lecturer Subjective Well-being (Y_2) is only 6%; other variables influence the remaining 94%. Based on the three path analysis structures, it is concluded that X has no significant effect on Y_1 , X also has no significant effect on Y_2 , and Y_1 also has no significant effect on Y_2 .

Discussion

Discussion is the most important part of the entire content of scientific articles. The objectives of the discussion are: to answer research problems, interpret findings, integrate findings from research into existing sets of knowledge, and compose new theories or modify (Cetin & Kinik, 2015; Ghozali & Imam, 2019). Based on the results of research data analysis, the first finding shows that transformational leadership (X) has no significant effect on lecturer teaching performance (Y_1). The results of the analysis of the output structure I, in the coefficient table, it can be seen that the significance value of Transformational Leadership (X) = 0.33 > 0.05. These results conclude that in structural regression 1, the variable Transformational Leadership (X) has no significant effect on Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y_1). It means that the first hypothesis (H_1) is rejected or not accepted. This finding contradicts the results of previous research (Ababil, 2020; Sihombing, 2020). The Summary model obtained an R Square value of 0.074. It shows that the contribution or influence of Transformational Leadership (X) on Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y_1) is only 7.4%; other variables influence the remaining 92.6% . It means that other factors affect the teaching performance of lecturers, but this study was not discussed. These findings can provide feedback to faculty leadership to further explore their role as transformational leaders who are more idealized influence or charismatic, as a source of motivation-inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Nurdin et al., 2020; Wardhani & Gulo, 2017).

Different contexts can also cause different findings because FKIP Nias University has just started to move towards excellence according to its motto, centre of excellence. The second finding in this study shows that transformational leadership (X) has no significant effect on the subjective well-being of lecturers (Y_2). The results of the analysis of output structure II. In the coefficient table, it can be seen that the significance value of

Transformational Leadership (X) = 0.715 > 0.05. These results conclude that the Transformational Leadership variable (X) does not significantly affect the Lecturer's Subjective Well-being (Y_2). It means that the second hypothesis (H_2) is rejected. Then from [Table 12](#). The Summary Model obtains an R Square value of 0.002. It shows that the contribution or influence of Transformational Leadership (X) on the Subjective Well-being of Lecturers (Y_2) is only 2%; other variables influence the remaining 98%. The third finding in this study shows that based on the results of structure II output, in the coefficient, it can be seen that the significant value of Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y_1) = 0.541 > 0.05. This result concludes that in structure II regression, the Lecturer Teaching Performance variable (Y_1) has no significant effect on the Lecturer's Subjective Well-being (Y_2). In the Model Summary table, the R Square value is 0.006. It shows that the contribution or influence of Lecturer Teaching Performance (Y_1) on Lecturer Subjective Well-being (Y_2) is only 6%; other variables influence the remaining 94%. This is in line with previous study that examine the influence of transformational leader behavior by school principals as it related to organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, teacher satisfaction with leader, and student academic performance ([Dumay & Galand, 2012](#)). The result showed that transformational leadership had significant add-on effects to transactional leadership in the prediction of organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and teacher satisfaction. Moreover, transformational leadership was found to have indirect effects on student academic achievement. It is supported by other study that examine the moderating effect of transformational leadership on the impact of instructional leadership on student outcomes ([Kwan, 2020](#)).

This study confirms the moderating effect of transformational leadership through the identification of a disparity in the effect of instructional leadership on student outcomes corresponding to disparate levels of transformational leadership enactment in schools. The implications of this study provide an overview related to the influence of transformational leadership on teaching performance and subjective welfare of lecturers. So this research will be very useful and can be a reference in topics related to transformational leadership and other variables such as teaching performance and well-being. This research is still very limited, one of the limitations that can be seen is the limitations of the research subjects which only involve students from one university. Therefore it is hoped that research will be able to deepen and broaden the scope of research related to transformational leadership.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the data analysis that has been done, it can be concluded that there is no significant effect of transformational leadership on the teaching performance of lecturers at the Teaching and Education Faculty of Nias University. Transformational leadership has no significant effect on the subjective well-being of lecturers at the Teaching and Education Faculty at Nias University. There taken together, there is no significant influence between transformative leadership on teaching performance and the subjective well-being of lecturers at the Teaching and Education Faculty, Nias University. As a follow-up to the results of this study, it is suggested to find the factors that cause the absence of a relationship between the three variables. There are several predictive factors why this happens, including the type or type of leadership that is not appropriate and suitable for faculty leaders to use as a leadership model. It is necessary to reconsider how leadership is carried out properly by leaders at the Teaching and Education Faculty of Nias University to achieve lecturer performance and the level of welfare of lecturers at Nias University to achieve a centre of excellence.

5. REFERENCES

- Ababil, Z. (2020). *Kepemimpinan Pendidikan*. 12(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/bxg9p>.
- Affandi, L. H., Husniati, H., & Saputra, H. H. (2021). Exploring the source of well-being for high achiever students. *Premiere Educandum: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Dan Pembelajaran*, 11(1), 104. <https://doi.org/10.25273/pe.v11i1.8767>.
- Afiatin, T., Istianda, I. P., & Wintoro, A. Y. (2016). Happiness of Working Mothers Through Family Life Stages. *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal*, 31(3), 101–110. <https://doi.org/10.24123/aipj.v31i3.569>.
- Akhtar, H. (2019). Evaluasi Properti Psikometris Dan Perbandingan Model Pengukuran Konstruk Subjective Well-Being. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 18(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jp.18.1.29-40>.
- Anwar, A., Agustina, Y., Yani, A., Abubakar, A., & Darmawati, D. (2022). The Relationship Between Transformational Leadership Headmaster With Teacher Performance. *Jurnal Serambi Ilmu*, 23(1), 113–130. <https://doi.org/10.32672/si.v23i1.4154>.
- Arifin, M., & Nurjaman, U. (2022). Model Kepemimpinan Pendidikan Masa Depan Berbasis Agama, Filsafat, Psikologi dan Sosiologi. *Al Qalam: Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan Dan Kemasyarakatan*, 16(1), 208. <https://doi.org/10.35931/aq.v16i1.818>.
- Arifin, S., & Sukmawidjaya, M. (2020). Technology Transformation and Its Impact on Lecturer's Performance. *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 9(1), 153–162. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v9i1.24372>.
- Arokiasamy, A. R. A., Abdullah, A. G. K. bin, & Ismail, A. (2015). Correlation between Cultural Perceptions, Leadership Style and ICT Usage by School Principals in Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 176, 319–332. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.478>.
- Avando Bastari, Adi Bandonono, & Okol Sri Suharyo. (2021). The development strategy of smart campus for improving excellent navy human resources. *Global Journal of Engineering and Technology Advances*, 6(2), 033–043. <https://doi.org/10.30574/gjeta.2021.6.2.0011>.
- Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., Kjelleveold Olsen, O., & Espevik, R. (2022). Daily transformational leadership: A source of inspiration for follower performance? *European Management Journal*, 40(4), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2022.04.004>.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). *Mind Garden*, 1–114. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t03624-000>.
- Cetin, M. O., & Kinik, F. S. F. (2015). An Analysis of Academic Leadership Behavior from the Perspective of Transformational Leadership. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 519–527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.122>.
- Christianingsih, E. (2011). Manajemen Mutu Perguruan Tinggi (Studi tentang Kpemimpinan Visioner dan Kinerja Dosen terhadap Mutu Perguruan Tinggi Swasta di Kota Bandung). *Jurnal Manajerial*, 10(1), 31–41. <https://doi.org/10.17509/manajerial.v10i1.1820>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed). SAGE Publications.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13.
- Dumay, X., & Galand, B. (2012). The multilevel impact of transformational leadership on teacher commitment: Cognitive and motivational pathways. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(5), 703–729. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030160404>.

- Eddington, N., & Shuman, R. (2008). *Subjective well being (happiness)*. Continuing Psychology Education Inc.
- Fadhlan, A., Yuwanda, T., & Mulyani, S. R. (2022). Kepemimpinan Digital, Manajemen Inovasi dan Daya Saing di Era Revolusi Industri 4.0: Peran Mediasi dari Quality Management. *Jurnal Bisnis & Kewirausahaan*, 18(2), 2022. <https://doi.org/10.31940/jbk.v18i2.138-148>.
- Ghozali, & Imam. (2019). Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 21 Update PLS Regresi. In *Universitas Diponegoro*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Jung, J. Y. (2022). The Effect of Authentic Leadership of Deans and Directors on Sustainable Organizational Commitment at Universities: Mediated by Organizational Culture and Trust. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 14(17), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141711051>.
- Kowang, T. O., Bakry, M. F., Hee, O. C., Fei, G. C., Yew, L. K., Saadon, M. S. I., & Long, C. S. (2020). Industry 4.0 competencies among lecturers of higher learning institution in Malaysia. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 9(2), 303. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i2.20520>.
- Kusdiby. (2021). Kepemimpinan Dan Kinerja Dosen Dalam Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan Pada Perguruan Tinggi Maritim. *Jurnal Sains Teknologi Transportasi Maritim*, 3(2), 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.51578/j.sitektransmar.v3i2.38>.
- Kwan, P. (2020). Is transformational leadership theory passé? Revisiting the integrative effect of instructional leadership and transformational leadership on student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2), 321–349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19861137>.
- Maris, I. S., Komariah, A., & Bakar, A. (2016). Kepemimpinan Transformasional Kepala Sekolah, Kinerja Guru, dan Mutu Sekolah. *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan*, 13(2), 173–188. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jap.v23i2.5645>.
- Mubyl, M., & Dwinanda, G. (2019). Peran subjective well-being , kepemimpinan transformasional dan komitmen organisasional dalam memprediksi kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Bisnis & Kewirausahaan*, 8(1), 74–85. <http://ejournal.nobel.ac.id/index.php/jbk/article/view/502>.
- Nurdin, F., Ihsan, M., Rahmawati, I., & Lestari, H. (2020). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Perilaku Kerja Inovatif Guru Di SMA Swasta Se-Kecamatan Pamijahan Bogor. *Indonesian Journal of Science*, 1(2), 99–105. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jsi.v1i2.8>.
- Purwanto, A., Bernarto, I., Absari, M., Wijayanti, L. M., & Hyun, C. C. (2020). The Impacts Of Leadership And Culture On Work Performance In Service Company And Innovative Work Behavior As Mediating Effects. *Journal of Reseach in Business, Economics, and Education*, 2(1), 216–227. <https://www.neliti.com/publications/322932/the-impacts-of-leadership-and-culture-on-work-performance-in-service-company-and>.
- Retnowati, T. H., Mardapi, D., Kartowagiran, B., & Hamdi, S. (2021). A Model of Lecturer Performance Evaluation: Sustainable Lecturer Performance Mapping. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 83–102. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.1426a>.
- Richard, E., & Diener, E. (2009). *Personality and Subjective Well-Being*. Guilford. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2350-6_4.
- Sihombing, M. (2020). The Effect of Transformational Leadership, Work Discipline, and Satisfaction on Lecturers' Performance at the Tarbiyah and Teaching Faculty of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. *Journal of K6 Education and Management*, 3(2), 100–108. <https://doi.org/10.11594/jk6em.03.02.01>.

- Suastini, N. M., & Manuaba, I. B. S. (2021). Kontribusi Kepemimpinan Transformasional Kepala Sekolah dan Komitmen Organisasi terhadap Kinerja Guru. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 5(1), 169–178. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jipp.v5i1>.
- Sukirno, S. (2020). Dataset of lecturer performance appraisal. *Data in Brief*, 32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2020.106161>.
- Wardhani, D. T., & Gulo, Y. (2017). Pengaruh Iklim Organisasi, Kepemimpinan Transformasional, Self Efficacy Terhadap Perilaku Kerja Inovatif. *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 19(1), 212–217. <https://doi.org/10.34208/jba.v19i1a-3.287>.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>.