

UDC 35.08

**THE EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP STYLE AND SELF-EFFICACY
ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE HEADS OF REGIONAL AGENCIES:
EX POST FACTO STUDY IN SOUTH CENTRAL TIMOR REGENCY**

Boru Yon Yagar Sihaduta*, Gana Frans, Neolaka M.N.B.C.

Master's Program in Administrative Science, University of Nusa Cendana,
East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

*E-mail: on_boru@yahoo.co.id

ABSTRACT

This research aimed to determine the effect of the interaction between leadership style and self-efficacy on the performance of the heads of regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency. Specifically, the objective of this research was to find out and describe about: (1) Differences in performance between the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style; (2) Differences in performance between the heads of regional agencies that have high self-efficacy and the heads of regional agencies that have low self-efficacy; (3) The heads of regional agencies that have high self-efficacy have a higher performance if combined with transformational leadership style, compared to the heads of regional agencies that have transactional leadership style; (4) The heads of regional agencies that have low self-efficacy have a lower performance if combined with transactional leadership style, compared to the heads of regional agencies that have transformational leadership style; (5) The effect of the interaction between leadership style and self-efficacy on the performance of the heads of regional agencies. This research has been carried out on the heads of regional agencies within the Government of South Central Timor Regency. This research was conducted using the ex post facto method with a 2 x 2 factorial design. In this research, there were 3 (three) variables, namely: Performance as a dependent variable (Y), while the independent variables (X) were: 1) Leadership Style (A), which consisted of the Transformational Leadership style (A) and the Transactional Leadership style (A); 2) Self-efficacy (B), which consisted of high Self-efficacy (B) and low Self-efficacy (B). The target population in this research was all 34 heads of regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency. The results showed that the transformational leadership style was not always more effective in influencing the performance of the heads of regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency compared to the transactional leadership style, but was highly dependent on the level of (high or low) self-efficacy possessed by the heads of the regional agencies. For this reason, the heads of regional agencies can implement both transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style, however, self-efficacy needs to be improved.

KEY WORDS

Leadership, leadership style, self-efficacy, performance.

The South Central Timor Regency whose Government structure is led by the Regent is assisted by the Regional Agencies in accordance with the Regional Regulation of the South Central Timor Regency Number 5 Year 2016 concerning the Formation and Composition of the Regional Agencies of the South Central Timor Regency. The number of regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency is 69 Regional Agencies, which are divided into 22 Offices, 9 Agencies, 3 Secretariat, 1 Inspectorate, 1 Civil Service Police Unit and Regional Public Hospital (RSUD) plus 32 Sub-districts. Out of 69 Regional Agencies, only 32 Regional Agencies are led by Echelon II Officials, the rest are led by Echelon III Officials.

As a line element in an organization, the role of the leader or head of the regional agencies is very important, where there is a clear difference between leaders and implementers in the division of tasks and authority. The role of leadership in this case is very dominant, where all power is in the hands of the leadership. Therefore in the implementation

of activities, the main focus are the authority and orders. The Regional Agencies are established to assist the Regent in carrying out Programs and Activities in various sectors in order to realize the Vision and Mission of the Government of South Central Timor Regency.

To find out the achievement of the implementation of programs and activities in each sector by the regional agencies in the South Central Timor Regency, an eappraisal of the implementation of programs and activities was carried out, and from the results of the eappraisal, it found various levels of achievement, including: 1) The implementation of programs and activities has not been maximized and is not in accordance with the planned time target so that it adds to the activities that must be launched in the following year, 2) There is a low budget absorption, and achievement of PAD (Local Own-Source Revenue) targets, 3) There is a lack of optimal planning and budgeting, leaving a large SILPA (budget surplus) at the end of fiscal year, 4) There is a weak internal control system that causes no sanctions or rewards towards the achievement of programs and activities.

Of course, there are many factors that cause the above conditions, but based on the knowledge and observations of the authors, there are a number of things that are of concern, including: 1) the reluctance of the Head of the Regional Agencies to act as a PA/PPK (Budget User/Commitment Making Official) in the procurement of goods/services, for reasons of fear of dealing with law, even though the procurement of goods/services is a very important component of direct expenditure, both for budget absorption and public services; 2) the preparation of Activities and Regional Agencies' Budget that does not involve all elements in the regional agencies; 3) there are still heads of regional agencies who have never held meetings with structural officials and staff, both for planning, controlling and evaluating activities; 4) management of the budget is not transparent, so that it appears that it is only managed by the Head of the Regional Agencies and Treasurer, this has created a situation that is not conducive to the regional agencies.

Seeing the above conditions, it takes a leader who has confidence in his/her ability to carry out the task of organizing the regional agencies they lead in order to be able to bring the regional agencies to the achievement of targets for the implementation of programs and activities. Or in other words, the success or setback of the regional agencies is highly dependent on the leadership of the heads of the regional agencies in question.

The objective of this research was to determine the effect of the interaction between leadership style and self-efficacy on the performance of the heads of regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency. Specifically, the objective of this research was to find out and describe about; (1) Differences in performance between the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style; (2) Differences in performance between the heads of regional agencies that have high self-efficacy and the heads of regional agencies that have low self-efficacy; (3) The heads of regional agencies that have high self-efficacy have a higher performance if combined with transformational leadership style, compared to the heads of regional agencies that have transactional leadership style; (4) The heads of regional agencies that have low self-efficacy have a lower performance if combined with transactional leadership style, compared to the heads of regional agencies that have transformational leadership style; (5) The effect of the interaction between leadership style and self-efficacy on the performance of the heads of regional agencies.

In addition, the benefits of this research are: (1) For the writer, this research is expected to be able to broaden the writer's insight on the performance of the heads of regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency. (2) For the development of science, it is expected that this research can contribute conceptual thinking about self-efficacy and leadership style to improve the performance of the heads of the regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of Performance

Etymologically, *performance* is a word that comes from English, which means work

results or work accomplishment or appearance. For the definition of performance, some experts describe the definition of performance based on the context of specific views of each expert. Debra and Quick (2006) stated that “performance is most often thought of as task accomplishment”, which means that, performance can be seen with the results achieved. Then according to Cook and Hunsaker (2001), “performance is behavior that has been evaluated in terms of its contribution to the goals of the organization”. Furthermore, the definition of performance according to Colquit et al (2009), “Job performance is formally defined as the value of the set of employee behaviors that contribute, either positively or negatively, to organizational goal accomplishment.” The types of performance include work performance and task performance.

To be more focused in accordance with the context of this research, the intended performance is “The Performance of the Heads of the Regional Agencies in South Central Timor Regency”. So in that perspective, when the heads of the regional agencies have high performance, the heads of the regional agencies will be able to carry out the role well, and be able to work in an effort to achieve the goals of the organization they lead. Conversely, if the heads of the regional agencies have a low criteria, they certainly are not able to develop responsibilities as well as possible, so that the achievement of the organization's work targets will experience obstacles. The aspects which are highlighted in the performance appraisal in this research are the dimensions of: quality, quantity, timeliness, effectiveness, independence, and commitment of each of the head of regional agencies.

Regional Government Performance

The characteristics of Regional Government (PEMDA) performance measurement as a pure non profit organization places the Regional Agencies Organization (OPD) as having a very different uniqueness from private companies. Regional governments have a great responsibility in the economic and social fields simultaneously. Regional government performance measurement must consider economic and social indicators comprehensively. Regional government(PEMDA) performance measurement must include measurement of financial and non-financial performance. Indicators of regional government(PEMDA) performance measurement include: (1) Input indicators, such as: the amount of funds needed, the number of employees needed, the amount of infrastructure available, and the amount of time used. (2) Process indicators, such as: compliance with laws and regulations, and average production or service delivery. (3) Output indicators, such as: the number of products or services produced; and accuracy in producing goods or services. (4) Outcome indicators, such as the level of quality of products and services produced, and employee work productivity. (5) Benefit indicators, such as: the level of community satisfaction, and the level of community participation. (6) Impact indicators, such as: community welfare improvement, and community income (economy) improvement.

Performance appraisal

There are approximately two main requirements needed to conduct an effective performance appraisal, namely (1) the existence of performance criteria that can be measured objectively; and (2) there is objectivity in the appraisal process (Gomes, 2003). While from the standpoint of the usefulness of performance itself, Siagian (2008) explained that for individuals, performance appraisal acts as feedback about various things such as abilities, fatigue, weaknesses and potential, which in turn is useful for determining goals, pathways, plans and career development. As for organizations, the results of performance appraisal are very important in relation to decision making on various matters such as identifying the needs of education and training programs, recruitment, selection, program introduction, placement, promotion, remuneration systems, as well as various other aspects in the process of human resource management . Based on these uses, a good appraisal must be done formally based on a set of criteria that are rationally determined and applied objectively and documented systematically.

In evaluating work performance, there must be positive and continuous interaction between leaders and staffing. There are several methods for measuring work performance,

as revealed by Gomes (2003), namely:

1. Traditional Method

The traditional method is the oldest and simplest method for assessing work performance and is applied both non-systematically and systematically. Aspects included in traditional methods, namely: (a) Rating scale; The rating scale method is the oldest and most widely used appraisal method, where the appraisal is carried out by superiors or supervisors to measure characteristics, for example regarding initiative, dependence, maturity, and contribution to the work objectives. (b) Employee comparison; Employee comparison method is an appraisal method that is done by comparing an employee with other employees. This method consists of: (i) Alternation ranking: i.e. a method of ranking by sorting the rankings of employees starting from the lowest to the highest based on their abilities. (ii) Paired comparison: the method of appraisal by means of an employee compared to all other employees, so that there are various alternative decisions to be taken. This method can be used for relatively small numbers of employees. (iii) Forced comparison (grading): this method is the same as paired comparison, but is used for a relatively large number of employees. (c) Check list; The check list method only provides input/information for appraisals conducted by the personnel department. (d) Freeform essay; When using the freeform essay method, an appraiser is required to make essays relating to the person/employee/worker being appraised. (e) Critical incident. With this method, the appraiser must record all events regarding the behavior of his/her subordinates on a daily basis which are then entered into a special notebook that consists of various categories of the subordinates' behavior.

2. Modern method

This modern method is a development of the traditional method of evaluating work performance. Modern methods include: (a) Assessment Centre method; The assessment centre method is usually carried out by forming a special appraisal team. This special appraisal team can be from outside of the company, from inside of the company, or a combination from outside and from inside of the company. (b) Management by objective (MBO) method; In this Management by objective (MBO) method, employees are directly involved in the formulation and termination of problems by taking into account the ability of subordinates to determine their respective goals which are emphasized on achieving the company's goals. (c) Human asset accounting method; In this Human Asset Accounting method, employee factors are appraised as long-term capital individuals so that the source of labor is appraised by comparing them to variables that can affect the success of the company.

Concept of Leadership

Definition of Leadership

The definition of leadership, as explained by Moorhead and Griffin (2010), leadership is "both a process and a property". The process and property intended by Moorhead and Griffin (2010), is a process of influencing owned by a leader, and is an asset owned by the leader to direct others (subordinates or followers) to achieve organizational goals. The influence of a leader can be the ability to influence the perceptions, beliefs, motivations and behavior of people in the organization. Moorhead and Griffin (2010) further stated that, strategic leadership "as the capability to understand the complexities of both the organization and its environment and to lead change in the organization so as to achieve and maintain a superior alignment between the organization and its environment".

Meanwhile, according to Robbins and Judge (2009), that "leadership is a leader who inspires to transcend their own self-interests and who is capable of having a profound extra ordinary effect of followers". The definition of leadership according to Robbins and Judge's version (2009) illustrates that a leader is more concerned with achieving organizational goals than the interests of his/her leadership.

Leadership Function

The ability to make decisions is the main criterion in assessing the effectiveness of one's leadership. In this connection, it is necessary to stress that what is meant by the ability to make decisions is not only measured quantitatively, in the sense of the number of decisions taken. As for the leadership functions, as follows: (1) Planning; Planning contains the formulation of actions deemed necessary to achieve the desired results in accordance with the aims and objectives set and as a decision on what will be done in the future. (2) Organizing; Organizing is an arrangement after there is a plan. (3) Actuating (Leadership); Each company consists of individuals, it is the duty of the leadership to direct and move these individuals. (4) Controlling (Supervision); With supervision that is intended is an effort to be able to prevent the possibilities of plans/instructions that have been determined and create discipline for employees in a company. Robbins and Judge (2009).

Leadership Style

The definition of Leadership Style according to Nawawi (2003) is the behavior or method chosen and used by leaders in influencing the thoughts, feelings, attitudes and behavior of members of the organization or subordinates. A person who occupies a leadership position has the capacity to read the situation he/she is facing properly and adjust his/her leadership style to suit the demands of the situation he/she is facing even though the adjustment is only temporary.

Yukl (2010) stated that the leadership style is concerned with various types of organizations, namely the transformational leadership style and the transactional leadership style.

Transformational Leadership Style, Burns (1978) said that "transformational leadership appeals to the moral value of followers in an attempt to raise their consciousness about ethical issues and to mobilize their energy and resources to reform institutions". Meanwhile, according to Bass in (Yukl, 2010), a person who has transformational leadership style will motivate his/her subordinates by making his/her subordinates more aware of the importance of the results of the task, influencing them to exceed their own interests for organizational or team goals, and activating their needs.

Characteristics of transformational leadership by Greenberg (2010), he stated that the key characteristics of transformational leadership are: 1) Charisma; transformational leadership has a mission and inspires others to follow it, often in a very emotional way; 2) self confidence; transformational leadership is very confident in his/her abilities and judgments; 3) Vision; transformational leadership has ideas about how to improve the status quo and do what is necessary to change things for the better, even if it means sacrificing oneself; 4) Environmental sensitivity; transformational leadership is very realistic about the boundaries that exist and the resources needed to change circumstances; 5) Intellectual Stimulation; transformational leadership provides assistance to subordinates to identify problems and identify ways to solve those problems; 6) Interpersonal consideration; transformational leadership provides the support, encouragement, and attention needed for subordinates to do their jobs well; 7) Inspiration; transformational leadership clearly communicates the importance of the company's mission by creating symbols or slogans to help subordinates to be more focused; 8) Morality; Transformational leadership tends to make decisions with high moral reasoning.

The essence of the various concepts of transformational leadership above is that transformational leadership is a perspective that explains how a leader changes the team or organization by creating, communicating, modeling vision for the organization, inspiring employees to achieve the vision and goals of the organization, and building employee commitment to achieve the goals of the organization. For that, a transformational leader will be able to exert influence in moving other people or institutions to achieve the stated goals, the transformational leader must have an ideal influence, have strong individual considerations, provide inspirational motivation, and provide high intellectual stimulation, to encourage the enthusiasm of employees or subordinates to achieve organizational goals.

Transactional Leadership Style, as has been explained above, the transactional leadership style puts more positions on the hierarchy of lower subordinate needs, such as the need for a sense of security and affiliation, for that, the concept of transactional leadership has been further developed in various ways by experts. As McShane and Glinow (2010) stated, that transactional leadership is “leadership that helps organizations achieve their current objectives more efficiently, such as linking job performances to valued rewards and ensuring that employees have the resources needed to get the job done”.

Robbins and Judge (2008) further argued that transactional leadership is “a leader who guides or motivates their followers in the direction of established goals by clarifying the role and task requirements”.

According to George and Jones (2012), transactional leadership is “leadership that motivates followers by exchanging rewards for high performance and noticing and reprimanding subordinates for mistakes and substandard performance”. Then according to Gibson et al., transactional leadership; “The leader identifies what followers want or prefer and helps them achieve a level of performance that results in rewards that satisfy them”, which means that transactional leadership is a leader who can identify what followers want and help them to achieve performance with satisfactory reward results.

Referring to the various concepts of transactional leadership above, it can be synthesized that transactional leadership is a leadership style that is oriented to the mutual interests between leaders and subordinates, with a focus on interpersonal transactions between leaders and subordinates involving exchange relations in the form of; 1) appreciation from the leadership as a reward for work done by subordinates; 2) the supervision of the leadership of subordinate irregularities in the regulations or standards set; 3) passive leadership, which only interferes when subordinates do not meet established standards; 4) the leader relinquishes responsibility and avoids making decisions.

Concept of Self-efficacy

Definition of Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to the belief in the extent to which an individual estimates his/her ability to carry out a task or perform a task that is needed to achieve a certain result. According to Bandura (in Ormrod, 2008), it is a confidence in all abilities including self-confidence, ability to adapt, cognitive capacity, intelligence and capacity to act in a stressful situation. Self-efficacy will gradually develop along with increasing ability and increasing experiences that can support the development of self-efficacy.

According to Bandura (in Ormrod, 2008), self-efficacy is a person's appraisal of the ability that exists within oneself to carry out certain behaviors or achieve certain goals. For this reason, self-efficacy is a person's belief that he or she is capable of doing certain tasks well. Self-efficacy has the effectiveness that the individual is able to judge himself/herself who has the power to produce something desired.

According to Bandura (1997), there are 4 (four) aspects of psychological processes in self-efficacy that also play a role in human beings, namely cognitive, motivational, affection and selection (the selection process). Cognitive processes are thought processes, including the acquisition, organization and use of information. Most human actions start with something that is thought in advance.

Self-efficacy or positive self-efficacy is the belief and determination of individuals to believe in themselves who are able to perform a behavior in a variety of situations. Whereas the opposite self situation is negative self-efficacy. Without self-efficacy (certain beliefs that are very situational), people are even reluctant to engage in a behavior. Therefore, self-efficacy is an individual's belief in his/her ability to achieve the desired goals. The opposite is negative self-efficacy.

Source of Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy will allow the growth of confidence from within oneself that can help carry out one's activities so that there are no obstacles. Self-efficacy can be obtained, modified, enhanced and reduced, through one or several combinations of four sources. According to

Bandura (in Friedman and Schustack, 2006), there are 4 (four) important sources used by individuals in shaping self-efficacy, namely: (1) Mastery Experience (experience of success); The success that is obtained will increase the self-efficacy of a person while failure will decrease the efficacy of a person. If the success obtained by someone more due to factors outside of himself/herself, usually it will not have an effect on increasing self-efficacy. However, if success is obtained through great obstacles and is the result of one's own struggle, then it will have an effect on increasing self-efficacy; (2) Vicarious Experience or modeling (imitating); The experience of the success of others who have similarities with individuals in doing a task will usually increase one's self-efficacy in doing the same task. The efficacy is obtained through social models that usually occur in someone who lacks knowledge of their abilities, therefore, they do modeling. But the self-efficacy obtained will not have an effect if the observed model does not have a similarity or different from the model; (3) Social Persuasion; Information about the abilities delivered verbally by someone influential is usually used to convince someone that he/she is capable enough to do a task; (4) Physiological & Emotion State; Anxiety and stress that occurs in a person when doing a task often means a failure. In general, someone tends to expect success in conditions that are not colored by tension and do not feel any complaints or other somatic disorders. Self-efficacy is usually characterized by low level of stress and anxiety while low self-efficacy is characterized by high level of stress and anxiety.

Aspects of Self-efficacy

Individuals who succeed in completing a task can increase self-efficacy. The level of self-efficacy owned by individuals can be seen from aspects of self-efficacy. Where Self-efficacy owned by someone is different, it can be seen based on aspects that have important implications for behavior. Bandura (1997) stated that there are 3 (three) aspects of self-efficacy, namely: (1) Magnitude; This aspect is related to the difficulty of the task; (2) Generality; This aspect relates broadly to the field of duty or behavior; (3) Strength; This aspect is related to the level of strength or stability of a person against his/her beliefs.

Individuals who have a high form of self-efficacy have an optimistic attitude, a positive mood, can improve the ability to process information more efficiently, have the idea that failure is not harmful but instead motivates themselves to do better. Low self-efficacy individuals have a pessimistic attitude, negative moods that increase the likelihood of someone becoming angry, easily guilty, and exaggerate their mistakes, Bandura (in Santrock, 2007). Therefore, the aspect of self-efficacy is always related to the level of difficulty of the tasks given, which also relates to the behavior of individuals in various fields of mastery of the task and the level of ability or capability that exists inside the individual.

Based on various concepts of self-efficacy above, it can be synthesized that self-efficacy is the ability to realize, accept, and account for all potential skills or expertise appropriately in every human being. There are two types of self-efficacy, namely high or positive self-efficacy and low or negative self-efficacy. Where individuals who have high self-efficacy (positive) are individuals who are full of optimism in working to achieve success. On the contrary, individuals who have low self-efficacy or negative self-efficacy are individuals who are always pessimistic, which can hamper or interfere with their performance in an effort to achieve success.

Research Hypotheses

Based on the frame of reference above, the authors formulate the hypotheses as follows:

1. There is a difference in performance between the heads of the regional agencies with transformational leadership style and the heads of the regional agencies with transactional leadership style.
2. There is a difference in performance between the the heads of regional agencies that have high self-efficacy and the the heads of regional agencies that have low self-efficacy.

3. For the heads of regional agencies who have high self-efficacy, they have higher performance when combined with transformational leadership style compared to the heads of regional agencies who have transactional leadership style.
4. For the heads of regional agencies with low self-efficacy, they have lower performance when combined with transactional leadership style compared to the heads of regional agencies who have transformational leadership style.
5. There is an interaction effect between the leadership style and self-efficacy on the performance of the heads of the regional agencies.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

This research has been carried out on the heads of regional agencies within the Government of South Central Timor Regency. This research was conducted using the ex post facto method with a 2 x 2 factorial design. In this research, there were 3 (three) variables, namely: Performance as a dependent variable (Y), while the independent variables (X) were: 1) Leadership Style (A), which consisted of the Transformational Leadership style (A) and the Transactional Leadership style (A); 2) Self-efficacy (B), which consisted of high Self-efficacy (B) and low Self-efficacy (B). The target population in this research was all 34 heads of regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency, based on Regional Regulation (PERDA) of South Central Timor Regency Number 5 Year 2016 concerning the Formation and Composition of Regional Agencies of South Central Timor Regency. 1 (one) instrument was given to each head of the regional agencies, namely the instrument about self-efficacy to be filled. Data collection techniques in this research used 3 (three) instruments, namely Performance instrument, leadership instrument, and self-efficacy instrument. Data analysis techniques used in this research, namely: Descriptive statistics; in the form of average score, median, mode, standard deviation, and cumulative frequency distribution. Data was presented in the form of frequency distributions and histograms. Analysis requirement testing was also conducted; in the form of a normality test using the Liliefors test and a variance homogeneity test using the Barlett test. Hypothesis testing; performed after the prerequisite tests were met or if the data was declared normal and homogeneous, then hypothesis testing used the two-way Anova and Tukey test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research aimed to examine the effect of Leadership Style and self-efficacy on the Performance of the heads of regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency, then the discussion regarding the results of this research is as follows:

The effect of leadership style on the performance of the heads of regional agencies

The results of this research supported the first hypothesis, namely: There is a difference in performance between the heads of the regional agencies with transformational leadership style and the heads of the regional agencies with transactional leadership style. This is evidenced by the value of $F_{\text{count}} = 9.068 > F_{\text{Table}} = 6.879$ at $\alpha = 0.01$ which indicates that there are significant differences in the performance between the heads of the regional agencies with transformational leadership style and the heads of the regional agencies with transactional leadership style.

Furthermore, the results of the descriptive analysis showed that the average value of the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style was higher than the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style. This shows that the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership styles is better than the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style.

The performance of the heads of regional agencies with a transformational leadership style is also supported by the results of research conducted by Harjono et al. (2015). In his research, he found that transformational leadership style significantly influenced employee

performance. Better performance was also due to transformational leadership that was more than just charisma, because transformational leaders try to instill in their followers the ability to ask not only an established view, but also a view that is believed by the leader. According to Robbins and Coulter (2007) transformational leadership includes efforts to change subordinates to do more positively or better than what is usually done that affects the performance improvement.

The effect of self-efficacy on the performance of the heads of regional agencies

The results showed the second hypothesis proposed in this research, namely: There is a difference in performance between the the heads of regional agencies that have high self-efficacy and the the heads of regional agencies that have low self-efficacy as accepted at a significance level of 5 percent. This can be seen from the F_{count} value of $4.194 > F_{\text{Table}} = 3.567$ at $\alpha = 0.05$. Thus it indicates that there is a significant difference in the performance between the the heads of regional agencies that have high self-efficacy and the the heads of regional agencies that have low self-efficacy.

In addition, based on the results of the calculation of descriptive analysis, it showed that the average value of the performance of heads of regional agencies with high self-efficacy was greater than the performance of heads of regional agencies with low self-efficacy. This means that there was a difference in the performance between the the heads of regional agencies that have high self-efficacy and the the heads of regional agencies that have low self-efficacy.

The results of this research are the same as the findings of Harjono (2015) which showed that self-efficacy influenced performance. Furthermore, according to him, the higher the employee's self-efficacy, the performance would increase. Conversely, the lower the employee's self-efficacy, the employee's performance would also decrease. Good self-efficacy will facilitate employee performance.

The effect of the interaction between leadership style and self-efficacy on the performance of the heads of regional agencies

The results showed a third hypothesis proposed in this research, namely: There is an interaction effect between the leadership style and self-efficacy on the performance of the heads of the regional agencies at the accepted level in significance level of 5 percent. This can be seen from the F_{count} value of $4.356 > F_{\text{Table}} = 3.567$ at $\alpha = 0.05$. Thus, it indicates that there is an interaction effect between the leadership style and self-efficacy on the performance of the heads of regional agencies.

These results indicate that the performance of the heads of regional agencies is not only determined by one factor, namely the leadership style, but also is determined by the self-efficacy of each head of regional agencies.

Differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy

The results showed a fourth hypothesis proposed in this research, namely: there are differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy being accepted at a significance level of 5 percent. This can be seen from the F_{count} value of $8.712 > F_{\text{Table}} = 3.567$ at $\alpha = 0.05$. Thus, it indicates that there are differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy.

Furthermore, the results of the calculation of descriptive analysis showed that the average value of the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy was higher than the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy. This means that

from the difference in performance, the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy was better.

More performance that was shown in the transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy group was due to the interaction of these two factors. Transformational leadership style tends to work by changing the existing culture so that it is not fixated with the previous culture and is supported by high self-efficacy, therefore, the performance of the heads of the regional agencies is better.

Differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy

The results showed the fifth hypothesis proposed in this research, namely: There are differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy being accepted at a significance level of 5 percent. This can be seen from the F_{count} value of $8.712 > F_{\text{Table}} = 3.567$ at $\alpha = 0.05$. Thus, it indicates that there are differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy.

Furthermore, the results of the calculation of descriptive analysis showed that the average value of the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy was higher than the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy. This means that from the difference in performance, the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy was better.

The lower performance shown in the transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy group tends to be caused by the interaction of the two factors. Transactional leadership style tends to be rigid, namely working within the existing organizational culture and giving rewards to subordinates who work well.

Differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy

The results showed that the sixth hypothesis proposed in this research, namely: there are differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy being rejected at a significance level of 5 percent. This can be seen from the F_{count} value of $2.633 > F_{\text{Table}} = 3.567$ at $\alpha = 0.05$. Thus, it indicates that there are no differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy.

Furthermore, the results of the calculation of descriptive analysis showed that the average value of the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy of 162.75, while the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy of 156.67. This means that there are small differences in performance between the two groups. This small difference showed that there are no difference between the two groups.

Differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy

The results of the research show that the seventh hypothesis proposed in this research, namely: there are differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy being accepted at a

significance level of 5 percent. Thus, it indicates that there are differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy.

Furthermore, the results of the calculation of descriptive analysis showed that the average value of the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy was 156.67 while the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy was 148.67. The data showed that there are significant differences in the performance of the the heads of regional agencies in the two groups. This difference showed the differences in the two groups.

The higher performance was shown in the group of transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy because the characteristics of leaders with transformational style are able to motivate attention especially to subordinates with high self-efficacy. The existence of more attention is ultimately able to improve the performance of the heads of regional agencies.

Differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy

The results showed the eighth hypothesis proposed in this research, namely: there are differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy being accepted at a significance level of 5 percent. Thus it indicates that there are differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy.

Furthermore, the results of the calculation of descriptive analysis showed that the average value of the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy was 156.67, while the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy was 142.56. The data showed that there are significant differences in the performance of the the heads of regional agencies in the two groups. The difference showed that the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy was better than the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy.

The higher performance was shown in the group of transformational leadership style and low self-efficacy because the characteristics of leaders with transformational style are able to motivate attention especially to subordinates with high self-efficacy. The existence of more attention is ultimately able to improve the performance of the heads of regional agencies.

Differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy

The results showed the ninth hypothesis proposed in this research, namely: There are differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy being rejected at the 5 percent significance level. Thus, it indicates that there are no differences in the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy with the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy.

These results are supported by descriptive calculation analysis which showed the average value of the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy was 148.67, while the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy was 142.56. The

data showed that there is a small difference in the performance of the heads of regional agencies in the two groups. The small difference showed that the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and high self-efficacy was the same as the performance of the heads of regional agencies with transactional leadership style and low self-efficacy.

The absence of differences in the two groups is due to the transactional leadership style that tends to rigidly follow the culture in the existing organization which ultimately affects the subordinate's self-efficacy. A rigid transactional leadership style ultimately lowers subordinates' high self-efficacy. Thus, this decrease affects the performance of the heads of regional agencies.

CONCLUSION

The results of research on the Effect of Leadership Style and Self-efficacy on the Performance of the Heads of Regional Agencies of South Central Timor Regency, found that:

1. There was a difference in performance between the heads of the regional agencies with transformational leadership style and the heads of the regional agencies with transactional leadership style.
2. There was a difference in performance between the the heads of regional agencies that have high self-efficacy and the the heads of regional agencies that have low self-efficacy.
3. For the heads of regional agencies who have high self-efficacy, they had higher performance when combined with transformational leadership style compared to the heads of regional agencies who had transactional leadership style.
4. For the heads of regional agencies with low self-efficacy, they had lower performance when combined with transactional leadership style compared to the heads of regional agencies who had transformational leadership style.
5. There was an interaction effect between the leadership style and self-efficacy on the performance of the heads of the regional agencies.

Based on the five findings above, the conclusions of this research: transformational leadership style is not always more effective in influencing the performance of the heads of regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency compared to the transactional leadership style, but highly dependent on the level (high or low) of self-efficacy owned by the heads of regional agencies. For this reason, the heads of regional agencies can implement both transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style, however, self-efficacy needs to be improved.

Suggestions

In connection with the implications above, a number of suggestions can be given, as follows:

1. For the heads of regional agencies in South Central Timor Regency, to be able to pay attention to leadership style and structuring self-efficacy in order to improve individual performance and the performance of institutions led (institutional performance).
2. For the heads of regional agencies who have low self-efficacy, in order to continually strive to improve self-efficacy, which subsequently can improve performance, which ultimately leads to an increase in the performance of regional agencies (institutional performance) led.
3. For further research development; that there are many factors that affect the performance of the heads of regional agencies. For this reason, further research needs to be carried out by examining other variables that affect the performance of the heads of regional agencies, such as work motivation, locus of control, self-estimation, and personality.

REFERENCES

1. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy – The Exercise of Control*. New York: W.H. Freeman & Company.
2. Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Row.
3. Colquit, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2009). *Organizational Behavior. Improving Performance and Commitment in The Workplace*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
4. Cook, C. W., & Hunsaker, P. L. (2001). *Evaluasi Kinerja Perusahaan*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
5. Debra, L. N., & Quick, J.C. (2006). *Organization Behavior: Foundations, Realities & Challenges, 5/E*. Mason OH: Thomson South-Western.
6. Friedman, H. S., & Schustack, M. W. (2006). *Kepribadian Teori Klasik dan Riset Modern*. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.
7. George, J., & Gareth, R. J. (2012). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
8. Gomes, F. C. (2003). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Andi Offset.
9. Greenberg, J. (2010). *Behaviour in Organization*. Sebastopol: Prentice hall.
10. McShane, S. L., & Glinow, V. M. (2010). *Organizational Behavior*. USA: McGrawHill.
11. Moerhead, G., & Ricky, W. G. (2010). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
12. Nawawi, H. (2003). *Kepemimpinan Mengefektifkan Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
13. Ormrod, J. E. (2008). *Psikologi Pendidikan Membantu Siswa Tumbuh Dan Berkembang*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
14. Robins, S. P., & Judge. (2008). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
15. Santrock, J. W. (2007). *Perkembangan Anak*. Jakarta: PT. Erlangga.
16. Schermerhorn, J. (2011). *Organizational Behaviour*. Hoboken: John Wiley.
17. Siagian, S. P. (2008). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
18. Yukl, G. (2010). *Kepemimpinan Dalam Organisasi*. Jakarta: PT. Indeks.