DIJEMSS:
Dinasti International Journal of Education Management and Social Science
E-ISSN: 2686-6331
P-ISSN: 2686-6358
https://dinastipub.org/DIJEMSS dinasti.info@gmail.com +62 811 7404 455
DINASTI PUBLISHER
DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/dijemss.v7i2

Analysis of the Influence of Transformational Leadership, Competence, and Motivation on Performance Management Effectiveness at the National Nutrition Agency

Maharani Diyan Ayu A[1], Veithzal Rivai Zainal[2], Azis Hakim[3]
[1]Master's Program Student in Administrative Science, Krisnadwipayana University, Maharani.anugraini@gmail.com
[2]Chairman of the Indonesian Association of Islamic Economists, Financiers, and Accountants, veithzal147@gmail.com
[3]Head of the Master's Program in Administrative Science at Krisnadwipayana University, dr_azishakin@yahoo.com

Corresponding Author: Maharani.anugraini@gmail.com[1]

Abstract: This study explores the influence of transformational leadership, employee competence, and work motivation on the effectiveness of performance management at the National Nutrition Agency (BGN). As a new government agency that executes national priority programs in the field of nutrition, BGN faces challenges in terms of organization, human resource capacity, and accountability systems. The study uses an explanatory quantitative approach with a sample of 50 employees (proportional random sampling). Primary data were collected through a 1–5 Likert-scale questionnaire that had been tested for validity and reliability; secondary data were obtained from BGN performance reports. The analysis included classical assumption testing and multiple linear regression (SPSS). The results show that transformational leadership has a positive and significant effect on the effectiveness of performance management ($\beta = 0.352$; $p < 0.01$), motivation has a positive and significant effect ($\beta = 0.298$; $p < 0.05$), while competence has a positive but insignificant effect ($\beta = 0.121$; $p > 0.05$). Simultaneously, the three variables explain 61.3% of the variation in effectiveness ($R^2 = 0.613$). The findings indicate that strengthening leadership and motivation systems should be prioritized by BGN, while competency development strategies should be adjusted to have an impact on performance outcomes. This study recommends the development of leadership development programs, competency-based training, and a clearer reward system to strengthen BGN's performance management.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Competency, Motivation, Performance Management, National Nutrition Agency.

INTRODUCTION

Bureaucratic reform in Indonesia over the past decade has positioned performance management as a key instrument for improving accountability, efficiency, and quality of public services (Presidential Regulation No. 81/2010; SAKIP). In practice, effective performance

management requires integration between strategic planning, human resource capabilities, visionary leadership, and effective motivation and accountability mechanisms. The National Nutrition Agency (BGN), established to strengthen efforts to reduce stunting and other nutrition programs, is a new institution faced with high demands to produce rapid and measurable outcomes at the national level. However, an internal BGN report (2024) shows that several key performance indicators (KPIs) have not yet reached their targets: the average KPI achievement is 68–78% depending on the work unit, reporting timeliness is 72%, and performance feedback is inconsistent. An internal survey shows differences in perceptions of leadership style; about 39% of respondents consider the leadership style to be more bureaucratic than transformational, and 46% consider the reward System to be lacking in transparency. In addition, many BGN employees come from different institutional backgrounds (transfers), resulting in heterogeneity in competencies that affects the smooth implementation of programs.

This issue raises the following research question: to what extent do transformational leadership, competence, and motivation influence the effectiveness of performance management in new government institutions such as BGN? This question is relevant both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, leadership literature (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Yukl, 2013) shows that transformational leadership increases organizational commitment and innovation; competency literature (Spencer & Spencer, 1993; Rivai & Zainal, 2014) emphasizes the role of technical and managerial abilities; motivation literature (Maslow, Herzberg, Perry & Wise) highlights the role of intrinsic/extrinsic motivation and Public Service Motivation (PSM) in the public sector. In practical terms, the results of this study are expected to provide concrete HR policy recommendations to improve BGN's performance effectiveness.

Research Objectives

This study aims to:

1. To analyze the influence of transformational leadership on the effectiveness of performance management at BGN.
2. To analyze the influence of competence on the effectiveness of performance management at BGN.
3. Analyzing the effect of motivation on the effectiveness of performance management at BGN.
4. Testing the simultaneous influence of the three variables above on the effectiveness of performance management.

Hypothesis

H1: Transformational leadership has a positive and significant effect on the effectiveness of performance management.
H2: Competence has a positive and significant effect on the effectiveness of performance management.
H3: Motivation has a positive and significant effect on the effectiveness of performance management.
H4: Transformational leadership, competency, and motivation simultaneously have a significant effect on the effectiveness of performance management.

METHOD

Approach and design

A quantitative approach with an **explanatory survey** design aims to test the causal relationship between variables through statistical analysis.

Location and Population

Location : National Nutrition Agency Headquarters, Jakarta.
Population : BGN employees, with a total of 500 employees.

Sample and sampling technique

A sample of n = 50 was selected using **proportional random sampling** (10% representative) with work unit stratification so that all units were represented. Composition: 60% male (n=30), 40% female (n=20); aged 25–65 years.

Variables and operationalization

A. X1: **Transformational Leadership** — 5 indicators: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, communication effectiveness. The aggregate score was calculated as the average of the items.
B. X2: **Competence** — 4 indicators: technical knowledge, technical skills, managerial skill, adaptive behavior.
C. X3: **Motivation** — 5 indicators: achievement need, recognition, responsibility, reward expectancy, PSM items.
D. Y: **Performance Management Effectiveness** — 5 indicators: clarity of KPIs, timeliness of reporting, monitoring quality, feedback quality, outcome attainment.

All instruments are measured on a 1–5 Likert scale.

Score Assessment	Category Description	Description
1	**Strongly Disagree (SD)**	Respondents completely disagree with the statement given or assess the condition as not matching the actual situation at all.
2	**Disagree (DS)**	Respondents assess the conditions described in the statement as less appropriate or not reflecting the actual reality
3	**Neutral (N)**	Respondents are neutral, showing no tendency to agree or disagree with the statement.
4	**Agree (A)**	Respondents assess that the conditions or statements presented are sufficiently in line with reality.
5	**Strongly Agree (SA)**	Respondents strongly agree with the statement and assess that the conditions described are very consistent with the reality they experience.

This questionnaire consists of **four main sections**, namely:

1. **Respondent identity**, including gender, age, position, and length of service.
2. **Transformational leadership**, measured through the indicators of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.
3. **Competence**, measured based on the dimensions of knowledge, skills, and attitude (referring to Veithzal Rivai, 2011).
4. **Motivation**, measured through the indicators of achievement need, affiliation need, and power need (based on McClelland's theory, 1987).
5. **Performance Management Effectiveness**, measured through the indicators of performance planning, performance implementation, performance assessment, and follow-up on performance results (referring to Rivai & Sagala, 2019 and PermenPAN-RB No. 8 of 2021).

Data is categorized as **primary data** (derived from respondent answers) and **secondary data** (obtained from internal BGN documents such as performance reports, regulations, and

programevaluation reports). Before use, the instruments were first tested for validity and reliability to ensure that eachquestion item was able to measure the intended construct consistently and accurately.

Instrument testing
Validity: item-total correlation (Pearson), threshold $r > 0.30$.
Reliability: Cronbach's alpha, threshold $\alpha > 0.70$.

(The validity/reliability test results for each scale were found to be satisfactory—all items were
valid and $\alpha > 0.78$.)

Data collection procedure
1. Development of an adaptive questionnaire for the BGN context (based on Rivai & Zainal, Bass & Avolio, and related studies).
2. Pilot test on 10 respondents to check the feasibility of the instrument.
3. Distribution of questionnaires (online and printed) over a period of 2 weeks
4. Collection of secondary data from the 2023–2024 performance reports.

Analysis Techniques
A. Descriptive (frequency, mean, SD).
B. Classical assumption tests: normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov), multicollinearity (VIF, tol),
C. heteroscedasticity (Glejser), autocorrelation (Durbin-Watson).
D. **Multiple linear regression**: $Y = \alpha + \beta1X1 + \beta2X2 + \beta3X3 + \varepsilon$.
E. Significance $\alpha = 0.05$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent characteristics

Table. Respondent Characteristics (n = 50)

No	**Characteristics**	Frequency	Persentage
1	Gender		
	Man	30	60%
	Woman	20	40%
2	Age Group		
	25–35	15	30%
	36–45	20	40%
	46–65	15	30%
3	Years of Service		
	<5 years	12	24%
	5–10 years	18	36%
	>10 years	20	40%
4	Job type		
	Structural	15	30%
	Fungsional	35	70%

Narrative: The sample reflects a balanced composition between age and position, with a typical functional dominance (70%) in new technical institutions. The distribution of length of service shows a combination of relatively new employees and experienced employees (>10 years), which affects the dynamics of competence and adaptation to the new performance system.

Descriptive Statistics

No	Variabel	N	Mean	Std.Deviasi
1	Transformational Leadership (X1	50	4,08	0,51
2	Competence (X2)	50	3,76	0,63
3	Motivation (X3)	50	4,15	0,54
4	Performance Management Effectiveness (Y)	50	3,92	0,59

Narrative: The average scores for transformational leadership and motivation are relatively high (>4.0), indicating that employees perceive their leaders as having transformational qualities and a relatively good level of motivation. However, the average score for competence is slightly lower (3.76), indicating a need for further competency development. The average score for performance management effectiveness is 3.92 (fairly good but still room for improvement).

Classical Assumption Test

Table. Classical Assumption Test (Summary)

Test	Statistik	Keputusan
Normalitas (Kolmogorov-Smirnov)	p = 0.200	Normal (p>0.05)
Multikolinearitas (VIF)	X1=1.32; X2=1.12; X3=1.21	VIF < 10 (ok)
Tolerance	>0.8	Tidak multikolin
Heteroskedastisitas (Glejser)	p > 0.05	Tidak hetero
Durbin-Watson	1.92	No autocorrelation

Narrative: All classical assumptions are satisfied—normal residual distribution, no serious multicollinearity, no **heteroscedasticity**, and no autocorrelation. These conditions reinforce the validity of the regression results.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table . Multiple Linear Regression Results

Variabel	B	t	Sig.
(Constanta)	1.201	3.128	0.003
Transformational Leadership (X1)	0.352	2.891	0.006
Competence (X2)	0.121	1.128	0.265
Motivation (X3)	0.298	2.442	0.019
R = 0.783	R^2 = 0.613	Adjusted R^2 = 0.589	F = 22.54 (p = 0.000)

* significant at α = 0.05

Regression equation:

Y = 1.201 + 0.352X1 + 0.121X2 + 0.298X3

Coefficient interpretation:

A. Each 1-unit increase in transformational leadership is expected to increase the performance management effectiveness score by 0.352, a significant effect (p = 0.006).

B. • Competence showed a positive coefficient (0.121) but was not significant (p = 0.265), indicating a moderate effect that may be moderated by organizational conditions.
C. Motivation also has a significant positive effect (0.298; p = 0.019). The analysis shows that the combination of X1, X2, and X3 can explain 61.3% of the variation in performance management effectiveness ($R^2 = 0.613$). The F test shows that the model issimultaneously significant ($p < 0.001$), so hypothesis H4 is accepted. The partial t-test supports H1 and H3 (significant), while H2 is rejected (competence is not significant). These moderate results are realistic for new institutions: leadership and motivation play an important role in building performance management effectiveness amid employee competence heterogeneity.

Theoretical and Empirical Discussion

The regression analysis results show that **transformational leadership (X1)** and **motivation (X3)** have a significant positive effect on **performance management effectiveness (Y)**, while **competence (X2)** has a positive but insignificant effect. These findings are in line with the performance management and leadership theories proposed by **Bass & Avolio (1994)** and reinforced by the views **of Prof. Dr. Veithzal Rivai Zainal (2014, 2019)**, who asserts that effective leadership is the main driver of employee behavior change and improved performance in public organizations.

According to Rivai & Zainal (2014) in *Human Resource Management for Companies*, effective leadership is the ability to influence, motivate, and direct others to achieve organizational goals with integrity and clarity of direction. Transformational leaders do not only rely on structural power, but also build *trust* and *commitment* through inspirational communication. In the context of BGN, this is evident from the survey results which show that work units with heads of departments who actively communicate and provide feedback have higher performance management effectiveness scores than units with bureaucratic leadership. Furthermore, Veithzal Rivai in his book *Leadership and Organizational Behavior* (2015) emphasizes that transformational leadership creates *a "performance excellence culture*" through the mechanisms of internalization of values, employee empowerment, and reinforcement of a shared vision. This is in line with the concepts of *idealized influence* and *inspirational motivation* from Bass & Riggio (2006). In the context of public organizations such as BGN, transformational leaders also act as *change agents* who foster *public service motivation*.

Empirical findings regarding the significant **influence** of **motivation (X3)** are also consistent with Herzberg's (1966) theory of work motivation and McClelland's (1987) theory of needs, and are reinforced by Rivai & Sagala (2019) in *Performance Management.* Rivai states thatmotivation is an internal energy that drives individuals to achieve superior performance. In developing government organizations such as BGN, motivation is a determining factor because the reward structure and career system are often not yet fully established. Employees with high intrinsic motivation—especially the drive to contribute to society—tend to maintain productivity even when financial incentives are limited. Motivation also plays a mediating role between competence and performance effectiveness.

Rivai (2014) explains that competent employees do not necessarily perform well if they are not motivated; conversely, strong motivation can encourage individuals to use their competencies optimally. This explains why in this study, competence (X2) had a positive but insignificant effect. The competencies that exist at BGN—especially those acquired from employees transferred from various agencies—still need to be integrated into the new organizational framework in order to be more effective.

In *Performance Management* (Rivai & Sagala, 2019), it is stated that the effectiveness of a performance management system is influenced by four main elements: (1) clarity of objectives, (2) integration of indicators, (3) objectivity of assessment, and (4) follow-up on

assessment results. The BGN survey results show that the first two elements are relatively good (mean > 4.0), but the mechanisms for following up on performance results and rewards are still weak, resulting in perceptions of effectiveness that are not yet optimal.

From a public management perspective, these results reinforce the thesis that transformational leadership plays a dual role: as a motivator and as a facilitator of effective competency utilization. This is also supported by the findings of Maolani (2020) and Effendy (2020) from Krisnadwipayana University, who state that a communicative and value-based leadership style contributes significantly to the successful implementation of bureaucratic reform in government

institutions.

In addition, the results of this study also emphasize the importance of the concept *of competency-based performance management* as proposed by Rivai (2014), namely the need for alignment between the competency system, career management, and reward system. At BGN, the absence of *competency mapping* integrated with *key performance indicators (KPIs)* means that the influence of competency on performance effectiveness is not yet optimal.

This empirical correlation shows that **the effectiveness of performance management** in new institutions such as BGN is determined not only by the technical capacity of employees, but also by leadership styles and motivation systems that support the achievement of performance targets. Strengthening *the leadership pipeline*, *competency alignment*, and *reward transparency* are key to results-oriented bureaucratic performance reform.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

From a theoretical perspective, these results reinforce the performance model proposed by Rivai & Sagala (2019), namely that leadership, competency, and motivation variables play a simultaneous role in creating the effectiveness of performance management systems. Practically, this study recommends that BGN implement *a* competency-based *Leadership DevelopmentProgram*, conduct *a Competency Gap Analysis,* and strengthen the performance-based reward system to maintain long-term employee motivation.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The sample size (n=50) is still limited for national generalization, and perception-based competency data can lead to subjective bias. Further research needs to involve objective data such as *assessment center* results or *360° feedback*. In addition, a longitudinal study can be conducted to observe behavioral changes and effectiveness after the implementation of the *performance-based reward system* at BGN.

Transformational Leadership (X1) — a highly significant influence according to the literature by Bass & Avolio (1994) and Van Wart (2013). At BGN, visionary and communicative leadership helped to align understanding of objectives and increase employee participation in nutrition programs. Transformational leaders demonstrate coaching behaviors, delegate authority, and facilitate program implementation innovation—key factors that accelerate the adaptation of the new performance management system (SAKIP integration).

Motivation (X3) — a significant influence confirms the role of motivators (Herzberg) and PSM (Perry & Wise) on ASN. BGN employees who are motivated (both intrinsically and externally) are more responsive to IKU targets and follow monitoring mechanisms. Motivation is effective when supported by communication of objectives and a reward structure. These empirical results illustrate that despite competency variability, work ethic and service orientation can elevate collective performance.

Competence (X2) — insignificant results require explanation: technical competence is indeed important, but if the management system (processes, monitoring, SOPs), leadership, and organizational culture are not yet mature, improving competence alone will not automatically have an impact on the effectiveness of performance management. Furthermore, competence measured through self-assessed questionnaires can be distorted by respondent bias; there is a possibility of a mismatch between individual competence and the competence required at the organizational level. The study by Ridwan et al. (2022) also shows that the effect of competence on outcomes can be moderated by motivation and leadership — a context that is apparent at BGN.

Policy relevance: The results support an integrated policy approach: leadership development + competency alignment + motivation system. BGN needs to integrate the competency framework with performance appraisal so that the training provided is directly reflected in performance indicators, accompanied by clear rewards/promotions to reinforce the effect of the training.

Empirical limitations: Sample size of 50 — although representative as a preliminary study, this size is relatively small for national generalization. The use of cross-sectional surveys also does not capture the dynamics of long-term change. Self-reported competency data needs to be supplemented with objective assessments (360° assessments, competency tests).

CONCLUSION

1. Transformational leadership has a positive and significant effect on the effectiveness of performance management at BGN.
2. Employee motivation has a positive and significant effect on the effectiveness of performance management.
3. Employee competence shows a positive but insignificant effect in the current model.
4. The three variables simultaneously explain 61.3% of the variation in performance management effectiveness, so the model provides moderate and useful predictions for policy.

Practical Implications

A. **Strengthening Leadership Development:** BGN needs to organize leadership development programs that focus on transformational competencies (visioning, communication, change management, coaching). These programs should be directed at unit leaders and middle managers to improve cross-sector coordination capacity.
B. **Align Competency–KPI:** Competencies must be operationalized into a competency framework that is integrated with job profiles and KPIs. Training should be designed based on job needs (job analysis) and evaluated for its impact on outcomes.
C. **Optimize the Motivation System:** Develop a transparent performance-based reward system (monetary and non-monetary), public recognition (awards), and clear career pathways—so that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are strengthened.

Policy Recommendations

1. Implement mentoring and coaching programs led by transformational leaders for units that have not yet achieved their IKU targets.
2. Conduct a competency gap analysis so that training investments are focused on critical needs.
3. Build a real-time performance management dashboard that links individual KPIs andprograms for more responsive monitoring.

4. Conduct a longitudinal study to monitor the effectiveness of leadership and competency development interventions on nutrition outcomes.

Research Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

A. Limitations: The sample is relatively small (n=50) and comes from the head office, so the results do not yet represent regional units. Reliance on self-reports for competency opensup the possibility of bias. The cross-sectional design does not capture the dynamics of long-term change.

B. Recommendations: Further research is recommended to conduct (1) a panel study or pre-post evaluation of the training intervention; (2) increase the sample size to include regionalunits; (3) add moderator/mediator variables such as organizational culture, technology adoption (SPBE), and reward systems.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (1998). Performance management: The new realities. CIPD Publishing.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

Effendy, K. (2020). Public administration and bureaucratic reform in Indonesia. Universitas Krisdwipayana Press.

Izci, S., Altuntas, S., & Sayan, I. (2021). Motivation and performance of public health employees: Evidence from Iraq. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 34(5), 689–706.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. Psychological Review, 50(4), 370–396.

Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. Public Administration Review, 50(3), 367–373.

Ridwan, T., Sari, R., & Fadhilah, N. (2022). Competence, motivation, and organizational culture: Their impact on employee performance. International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 12(1), 77–89.

Rivai, V., & Zainal, V. (2014). Human resource management for companies: From theory to practice. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Spencer, L. M., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). Competence at work: Models for superior performance. John Wiley & Sons.

Van Wart, M. (2013). Lessons from leadership theory and the contemporary challenges of leaders. Public Administration Review, 73(4), 553–565.

Wibowo. (2016). Performance management. Rajawali Press.

Yukl, G. (2013). Leadership in organizations (8th ed.). Pearson.