

# HOW PATH GOAL THEORY ENHANCE VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR PRODUCTIVITY IN INDONESIA COLLECTIVE CULTURE

Siti Nur Azizah <sup>1\*</sup>, Siti Nurhayati <sup>2</sup>, Ade Irma Anggraen<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Doctoral Program Universitas Jenderal Soedirman

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Pekalongan

<sup>3</sup> Universitas Jenderal Soedirman

**Abstract.** Aim of this research is to examine the effect of the head of village path goal leadership styles toward village administrator productivity. The object of the research are 100 village administrator from 10 different village recruited with some requirement . Results show leadership styles explained only 9% of the variance in perceived level of productivity. Achievement-oriented leadership style most significantly improved village administrator productivity in Javanese, Indonesia collective culture.

**Keywords:** path goal theory, productivity, colletive culture

## 1. PRELIMINAY

Path-goal leadership styles from the subordinates' perspective rather than the leader's perspective was explored. We premise that subordinates expect leaders to behave with certain culture characteristics and, when leaders behave as expected and as perceived by the subordinate, the subordinates will show job productivity. Optimism as psychological capital mediates leader behavior to employee productivity. Optimism in rural staff context has received little attention. Optimism has been emerging from positive psychology and social capital theory' studies. Rural staff optimism questionnaires that has been selected for assessment from LOTR (Schier and Bridges, 1984) developed at the individual level and as an important cultural feature . The objective of the current investigation is to extend and confirm the structure and measurement of individual village administrative staff optimism in collective culture.

Indonesian government is fostering development in village area. Many program like "Dana Desa", "Progam Keluarga Harapan" etc play a pivotal role in the village development sector. It was widely believed that there is no nation greater than the quality of village administrator staff. In order to achieve the desired goals and the objectives, village administative staff ' efficiency must be taken into consideration. The quality of work has significant effects in actualizing all progams to foster the development in village area. How improving staff productivity basicly comes from leadership style that motivate their staff. Some studies and reports have indicated village administrator in Indonesia are responsible for under-productivity (Sri Mulyani, minister of finance)

---

\* Corresponding Author, Email: sitinuraziz@yahoo.com

## 2. PATH GOAL THEORY AND CULTURE

Path-goal theory developed by Evans (1970) and modified by House (1971), was designed to identify a leader's most practiced style as a motivation to get subordinates to accomplish goals. This theory reinforces the idea that motivation plays an important part in how a supervisor and a subordinate interact and, based on that interaction, the overall success of the subordinate. The path-goal theory, according to House (1971), presents two basic propositions. Firstly, "One of the strategic functions of the leader is to enhance the psychological states of subordinates that result in motivation to perform or in satisfaction with the job" (House, 1971, p. 3). In other words, leaders need to be cognizant of the necessary steps to clarify goals, paths, and enhance satisfaction through extrinsic rewards, which will in turn increase subordinates' intrinsic motivation. Secondly, House asserted that particular situational leader behavior will accomplish the motivational function. Path-goal theory recognizes four leadership behaviors to increase subordinates' motivation.

The four path-goal leadership styles that function to provide structure and reward to subordinates are directive, supportive, participative, and achievement oriented (House & Mitchell, 1974; Indvik, 1987). The directive leader clarifies expectations and gives specific guidance to accomplish the desired expectations based on performance standards and organizational rules (House & Mitchell, 1974).

Directive style is appropriate with newly hired or inexperienced subordinates and in situations that require immediate action (Negron, 2008). The directive style may be perceived as aggressive, controlling, descriptive, and structured by dictating what needs to be done and how to do it. Research indicates that the directive style is positively related to subordinates' expectations and satisfaction for subordinates who are employed to perform ambiguous, unstructured tasks; however, it is negatively related to satisfaction and expectations of subordinates who are well-structured and receive clear tasks (House, 1971; House & Dessler, 1974; Schriesheim & Von-Glinow, 1977; Al-Gattan, 1983).

Path-goal leadership theory asserts a contingent application of one or more of the directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented leadership styles, consequently increasing subordinates' productivity (House and Mitchell, 1974). This theory has seldom been applied in the context of public sector, especially village administrator.

Supportive leader behaves in a responsive manner, thus creating a friendly climate, and verbally recognizes subordinates' achievement in a rewarding modus (Graen, Dansereau, Minami, & Cashman, 1973; House & Dessler, 1974; House & Mitchell, 1974). Supportive leaders demonstrate respect for subordinates, treat everyone equally, and show concern for subordinates' well-being (House, 1971). According to Reardon, Reardon, and Rowe (1998), supportive leaders "learn by observing outcomes and how others react to their decisions". The supportive style is suitable when subordinates show a lack of confidence in ability to complete a task and little motivation (Negron, 2008).

Participative leader takes on consultative behaviors, such as soliciting subordinates for suggestions prior to making a final decision, albeit, they retain final decision authority (House & Mitchell, 1974). The participative leader shares responsibilities with subordinates by involving them in the planning, decision-making, and execution phases (Negron, 2008). Workers who are motivated become self-directed and generate a creative team, thereby presenting a greater cohesive team and ownership amongst participants (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996). The

participative style is appropriate when subordinates show a lack of judgment or when procedures have not been followed (Negron, 2008).

Achievement-oriented leader “sets challenging goals, expects subordinates to perform at their highest level, continuously seeks improvement in performance and shows a high degree of confidence that the subordinates will assume responsibility, put forth effort and accomplish challenging goals” (House & Mitchell, 1974, p. 83). Negron (2008) noted that the achievement-oriented style is suited for unclear tasks and subordinates who may need a morale booster to increase their confidence in ability to accomplish the given goal.

Research indicate leadership style may be explained by the influence of culture (Alves et al, 2006). Hofstede (1980) indicate four dimensions of culture found by Hofstede’s (1980) classic model namely power distance, individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity and uncertainty avoidance. Power distance dimension describes the values held in a society with respect to the importance of equal distribution of power, wealth and other factors. Individualism carries the belief that everyone should follow the same rule, in a collectivist society members identify themselves first as an in-group rather than individually (Stedham and Yamamura, 2004). The differences between cultures, in terms of values, attitudes and behaviors of individuals have implication for leadership in a particular organization. The concept of leadership tends to differ across culture because of the variation which exists in that particular culture (Wood and Jogulu, 2006)

Javenese culture in Indonesia is collectivist culture according Hofstede (1980). Gill (1998) revealed that individualistic cultures tend to prefer a high level of delegation but in collective culture preferred a leader who will support them, participate in decision making as well as provide challenging goals for them to achieve. Dickson et al (2003) which claims that people in collectivist culture tend to identify themselves with leaders’ goal and purposes and share the vision of the organization. The finding was contradicted with Roselina et al (2002) which found that individualism is significantly related with selling leadership style and participating leadership style

### **3. EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY**

Employees’ productivity is a major source of concern in any organisation. It is regarded as the difference between the very successful and the least successful organisation (Fournier et al, 2011; Shah et al, 2011; Dasgupta, 2013). A lack of universally accepted ‘gold standard’ measures or benchmarks of village administrator productivity compounds the literature paucity. Soedarmayanti (2009) measure employee productivity in Indonesia from attitude, skill level, relationship between leader and member, and work efficiency

#### **Hypotheses**

H1: Participative leadership style influence village administrator productivity

H2: Achievement oriented leadership style influence village administrator productivity

H3: Participative leadership style influence village administrator productivity

H4: Achievement oriented leadership style influence village administrator productivity

#### **4. METHODS**

##### Research design

A quantitative cross-sectional survey design was used to collect data from village administrative staff about their head village leadership styles and how they perceived or rated their own level of productivity.

##### Study setting

The study was carried out in ten villages in Kebumen District, Indonesia. One sample is “Kelurahan” (The head village is government staff), the nine others are “Desa” (The head village is from general election)

##### Sampling

100 staff were recruited and completed and returned the questionnaire used for analysis. A significance level of 0.05 was applied. The inclusion criteria were over one years tenure both staff and principle

##### Research instrument

Northouse (2012) questionnaire was adapted to assess the leadership styles of head village from the perspectives of their followers. It has 20 items, consisting of each leadership style (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) measured using 5 items, with possible scores ranging from 5 to 25. Scores up to 16 and above showed moderate use and scores above 20 showed typical (frequent) use.

Self-rating productivity scale was developed from Soedarmayanti (2009) eight items. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of reliability of the instruments were determined, and the overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient of reliability of the instruments were determined, and the overall Cronbach's alpha was 0.701, which is considered acceptable

#### **5. RESULTS**

##### Socio-demographic characteristics

They are 100 sample of village administrator staff from Kebumen district, The age of respondents ranged from 25 to 60 years . The majority education of the participants (75%) were high school, 25 % of sample are bachelor degree. Of the participants, 78.0% were males while only 21.% were females, all the head leader gender sre men.

Table 1

Socio characteristic

Age	%	Education	%	Sex	%
25-30	35%	High school	75	Male	78
31-40	24%	Bachelor	25	Female	22
41-50	20 %				
<51	21%				

Head Leader leadership styles

The results show that principal higher on the supportive leadership style followed by achievement oriented leadership style and directive leadership style. It means that the principal were moderate users of all leadership styles. They were not typical users of any of the leadership styles, since the average score of the each style was less than 20— each style was applied as and when the situation demanded

Table 2

Score of path goal perception

Path goal perception	Minimum	Maximum	Means
Directive leadership style	4	17	13.15
Supportive leadership style	5	25	16.70
Participative leadership	4	23	15.07
Achievement-oriented	7	24	16.55

Pearson's technique was conducted using relationship between leadership styles and productivity prior to regression analyses, a zero-order correlation, to establish linear relationships between leadership styles and perceived productivity. Results of the Pearson's correlation showed a significant but weak association between each leadership style and administrative staff perceived levels of productivity.

The directive leadership style correlated positively with as supportive leadership style was positively correlated with perceived levels of productivity ( $r = 0.15$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Similarly, participative leadership style showed a positive significant, albeit weak correlation with perceived levels of productivity ( $r = 0.14$ ,  $p < 0.03$ ). An achievement-oriented leadership style also correlated positively with perceived levels of productivity ( $r = 0.22$ ,  $p < 0.001$ )

The village administrative review their level self productivity as high perception. In Indonesia, village administrator carry out many task in relation with society, They work 24 hour anticipate many problems.

Table 3

Self reported productivity level

Self reported productivity level	Means	SD
Attitude	7.31	(1.79)
Skill level	8.02	(1.38)
Relation between leader and member	8.09	(1.42)
Work efficiency	7.06	(1.05)

This study found a weak statistically significant correlation between each leadership style rural staff levels of productivity. Consequently, each leadership style to some extent could be used to improve productivity levels depending on the context. Perhaps this is why there is a lack of consensus surrounding the literature on which leadership style creates the best performance of employees. However, there is the need to examine the proportion of rural staff productivity attributable to leadership styles individually and joint

Table 4

Corelation between leadership style and productivity

Leadership style	r	p
Directive	0,15	0,01
Supportive	0,16	0,01
Partisipative	0, 14	0,03
Achievement orientation	0,22	0,001

This research indicates that achievement oriented is the only leadership style that push staff productivity. The relation ( $\beta = 0.18$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ). The contribution of achievement-oriented leadership style could be low as 13% or as much as 24% at the 95% confidence level. The other leadership styles, directive ( $\beta = 0.07$ ,  $p = 0.38$ ), supportive ( $\beta = 0.04$ ,  $p = 0.64$ ) and participative ( $\beta = 0.01$ ,  $p = 0.96$ ), did not significantly contribute to the predictive power of the model. This research indicates that in collective culture workplace, leader behavior that challenging goals, expects subordinates to perform at their highest level, continuously seeks improvement in performance and shows a high degree of confidence that the subordinates will assume responsibility, put forth effort and accomplish challenging goals are needed. This study shows male leaders are expected to be more achievement-oriented

## 6. DICUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Research show only achievement oriented leadership style significantly predicted the productivity levels of village administrative staff. This research suggest that in collectivict culture (Dickson, 2013), achiement orientation leadership style is suitable to pursue employee productivity. Head

village leadership style could lead to greater improvements for their staff in rural activity. However, it is acknowledged that even though the concept of leadership is widely considered to be universal across cultures, its practice is usually viewed as culturally specific

## **7. IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT**

Despite the high perceived productivity levels in this study, there are concerns about the general levels of productivity of village administrative staff. This implies there is a need to strengthen supervision and establish performance benchmarks within the public school sector against which actual staff in rural area performance would be measured. The issue of rural staff productivity should therefore be addressed more seriously through research and policy

## **8. LIMITATION**

The current study is based on self-reports, so it should be interpreted with caution, it provides the first empirical evidence of productivity levels village administrator. study adopted a self-reported technique in measuring productivity, which has potential for bias. Future studies should consider developing independent tools/benchmarks for productivity assessment.

## **REFERENCE**

- Alves, J.C., Lovelace, K., Manz, C., Matsypura, D., Toyasaki, F. and Ke, K. 2006. A cross-cultural perspective of self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 21, pp.338-59.
- Dickson, M.W., Den Hartog, D.N. and Mitchelson, J.K. 2003. Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: making progress, and raising new questions, *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 14, pp. 729-68.
- Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Hofstede, G. 1993. Intercultural Co-operation in Organization. *Management Decision*, Vol. 20 No. 5 pp. 53-67
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and organizations across nations*, 2nd edition, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hofstede, G. and Hofstede, G.J. 2005. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, McGraw Hill, New York, NY.
- House, R.J. 1971. A Path-goal Theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 16, pp. 321-328.

- House, R.J. 1996. Path-Goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy and a Reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 7 No. 3 pp. 323-352.
- Gill, R. 1998. Cross-cultural Comparison of the Leadership Styles and Behavior of Managers in the UK, USA and Southeast Asia. *Asian Academy of Management*, Vol. 3 p. 21-34.
- Indvik, J. 1988. A Path-Goal Theory investigation of superior subordinate relationship.  
Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Jogulu, U.D. 2010. Culturally-linked leadership style. *Leadership and Organization development journal*. Vol. 31 No. 8, pp. 705-719.
- Northouse PG (2012) *Leadership: Theory and practice*. 6th edn. Sage, London
- Roselina A. Saufi, Syed Azizi Wafa & Mohd Yusoff Zainun. 2002. "Leadership Style Preference of Malaysian Managers". *Malaysian Management Review*, vol. 37, no 1, June, pp1-10
- Seodarmayanti.2009.*Tata Cara Kerja dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Mandar Maju. Jakarta
- Stedham, Y.E. and Yamamura, J.H. 2004. Measuring national culture: does gender matter?.  
*Women in Management Review*. Vol. 19 No. 5, pp. 233-243.