



Affinity and Adverse the Contemporary Comprehension of the Disposition of Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Reynold P. J. Vigeleyn Nikijuluw^{1*}, Sylvia Irene Persulessy², Juvrianto Chrissunday Jakob³

^{1,2}Electrical Engineering Department, Politeknik Negeri Ambon, Indonesia

³Civil Engineering Department, Politeknik Negeri Ambon, Indonesia

*Corresponding email: rnikijuluw@gmail.com

Abstract: This research, explores the interaction between two dominant leadership styles—transactional and transformational leadership—in modern organizational contexts. The study examines the affinities where these styles complement each other and the adversities that arise from their inherent differences. Through a detailed analysis of existing literature, this research highlights how transactional leadership is effective in ensuring operational stability and short-term goal attainment, while transformational leadership drives innovation, employee engagement, and long-term organizational change.

The findings suggest that a synergistic approach, combining both leadership styles, can yield optimal results in complex environments. However, challenges arise when leaders switch between these contrasting approaches, leading to potential conflicts in motivation and employee satisfaction. This research concludes that leaders who can navigate both styles with flexibility are better equipped to meet the demands of contemporary organizations. The study offers insights into leadership development, emphasizing the need for adaptability in managing both structured tasks and inspiring change.

Keywords: affinity, adverse, interaction, leadership

INTRODUCTION

Imagine the world without leaders, imagine what will happen if leadership did not exist? Answering the question is another story, but to explain what is happening to the implementation of leadership concepts was difficult. There were largely wide usage of philosophy, concepts and types of leadership all over the world. However there were no single perfect leadership styles or concepts that can put neither the world nor a single organisation together in one piece.

In terms of leadership, Werner (2002), divide leadership into two main parts, the Leader and the Followers. He describes leader as "someone who takes initiative to step up to challenges, is not afraid to take risks, and is not afraid to fail or admit failure. Leaders have charisma, character, and confidence." While the followers as "someone who works behind the scenes, contributing to the cause without being a force in the forefront of it. Sometimes followers don't take the same risks or chances that leaders do. Followers are often the silent work horses that accomplish the effort behind the scenes." (Werner, 2002, p. 1). However, between those two, they can not stand alone. Without one they could not survive. There was nothing to lead upon if there were no followers, and vice versa (Werner, 2002).



Lisensi

Lisensi Internasional Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0.

Over the last few decades, leadership in organisation has been reformed towards a better achievement, more efficiently, reduced difference on status between leaders and followers or managers and workers, and emphasize participative decision making (Liontos, 1992) this was then called transformational leadership. However, Liontos (1992) argued that there were many debates about transformation and transaction leadership for the agreement of what was the real meaning of transformation and transactional leadership which is quite similar.

“Transactional leadership is sometimes called bartering. It is based on an exchange of services (from a teacher, for instance) for various kinds of rewards (such as a salary) that the leader controls, at least in part. Transactional leadership is often viewed as being complementary with transformational leadership. Thomas Sergiovanni (1990) considers transformational leadership a first stage and central to getting day-to-day routines carried out. However, Leithwood says it doesn't stimulate improvement. Mitchell and Tucker add that transactional leadership works only when both leaders and followers understand and are in agreement about which tasks are important.” (Liontos, 1992, p. 1)

Leadership is an essential factor influencing the success of any organization. It shapes how goals are set, how employees are motivated, and how change is managed. Traditional models of leadership, such as transactional leadership, focus on clear structures and reward systems that drive employee performance. This style is rooted in the idea that employees work for specific rewards, and leaders provide clear expectations and monitor their compliance. On the other hand, transformational leadership advocates a more visionary approach, where leaders inspire employees by aligning their personal goals with the organization's mission and values. These leaders strive to create an environment of change and development, motivating employees to transcend their self-interest for the greater good.

Over time, the binary categorization of leadership into transactional and transformational has been challenged. Contemporary scholars argue that these leadership styles may not exist in isolation. Instead, many effective leaders integrate both approaches depending on the situation. However, despite these affinities, there are also clear adversities where these styles diverge, especially regarding goals, employee motivation, and performance management.

The rationale for this study is grounded in the need for a deeper understanding of how contemporary leaders perceive and apply these leadership styles. With the advent of technology, globalization, and rapidly changing business environments, leadership demands have evolved. Leaders today face more complex challenges, requiring them to balance the structured, results-driven focus of transactional leadership with the inspirational and developmental emphasis of transformational leadership. Moreover, the preferences of employees have also shifted, with modern workforces valuing autonomy, purpose, and innovation alongside clear expectations and rewards.

This evolving landscape has led to a growing interest in understanding how the principles of transactional and transformational leadership are applied in real-world organizational contexts. By exploring both the affinities (where these styles complement each other) and the adversities (where they conflict), this research aims to provide insights into the contemporary comprehension of leadership dispositions. Additionally, this study seeks to uncover whether these leadership styles are truly oppositional or

whether a more integrative approach is emerging in response to modern organizational demands.

While transactional and transformational leadership have been widely studied, there is still a lack of comprehensive understanding regarding how these styles interact in contemporary organizations. Traditional leadership models often present these two approaches as opposing forces, but in reality, many leaders navigate both styles in complex, dynamic ways. The problem lies in the gap between theoretical discussions and practical application in modern workplaces, where organizations increasingly demand leadership that is both structured and innovative.

This research addresses the following core issue: how do leaders today comprehend and navigate the affinities and adversities between transactional and transformational leadership? Furthermore, what are the practical implications of this understanding for leadership development, employee performance, and organizational change?

This study aims to achieve the following objectives; (a) Examine the core principles of transactional and transformational leadership in the context of contemporary organizational environments; (b) Explore the affinities between these two leadership styles, identifying where they complement and enhance one another; (c) Analyze the adversities and potential conflicts that arise when these leadership styles are applied, especially in relation to short-term versus long-term goals, employee motivation, and organizational culture; (d) Investigate the practical application of both leadership styles by examining case studies and real-world examples from various industries; and (e) Provide recommendations for leaders to effectively integrate or balance transactional and transformational leadership styles to meet modern organizational needs.

This study will focus on exploring the interaction between transactional and transformational leadership in a variety of organizational settings. It will analyze leadership practices across different industries, such as technology, healthcare, and education, where leadership demands may differ but the interplay between structure and innovation remains crucial. Additionally, the research will examine leadership styles at various levels of the organizational hierarchy, from top-level executives to middle managers, to provide a comprehensive understanding of leadership dynamics.

METHOD

The methodology for this research would involve collecting and analyzing existing data and information from secondary sources, such as books, journal articles, reports, and other scholarly materials. This approach differs from empirical research, which relies on fieldwork, surveys, or experiments. To complete this research the steps are made by design os this research.

Research Design or use to be describe as Desk-Based Approach. The library research approach revolves around secondary data analysis, where you systematically gather, review, and synthesize information from previously published sources. The key here is to develop an organized, critical understanding of existing research related to transactional and transformational leadership.

The focus will be on identifying the core concepts and principles of both transactional and transformational leadership; Synthesizing existing findings regarding

the affinities (commonalities) and adversities (differences or conflicts) between these two leadership styles; Exploring contemporary interpretations, theories, and applications of these leadership styles in modern organizational settings.

In library research, the focus is on collecting secondary data from credible sources. Below are steps for conducting this type of research: Identifying Relevant Resources by identifying the types of sources you will use for the study. These include: Books: Leadership theory books that explain the foundational principles of transactional and transformational leadership (e.g., works by Bernard Bass, James MacGregor Burns). Journal Articles Use academic databases (e.g., JSTOR, Google Scholar, ProQuest) to locate peer-reviewed articles on leadership theories, especially those focused on leadership styles in modern organizations. Industry Reports: Reports from consulting firms (e.g., McKinsey, Deloitte) and credible organizations that study leadership in the workplace. Dissertations/Theses: Explore past research from scholars who have focused on leadership styles, comparing their findings. Literature Reviews: Leverage existing literature reviews on leadership to provide an overarching view of the major themes and findings.

Once collected a substantial amount of literature, there will be an evaluation the relevance and quality of these resources. Here are some criteria to follow:

- a. **Relevance:** How closely does the source focus on leadership theories, specifically transactional and transformational leadership?
- b. **Recency:** Give priority to the most recent studies to ensure contemporary comprehension, ideally within the last 10 years.
- c. **Authority:** Focus on works authored by recognized scholars or published by reputable organizations.
- d. **Citations:** Check if the article is widely cited in the academic community, as this may indicate its importance in the field.

Since this research is library-based, you will rely on a literature review analysis technique to synthesize the information gathered. The process is as follows:

- a. **Principles of Transactional Leadership:** Reward and punishment systems, short-term goal focus, performance management.
- b. **Principles of Transformational Leadership:** Visionary leadership, motivation, long-term organizational change, employee development.
- c. **Affinities:** Where and how transactional and transformational leadership styles might complement each other (e.g., balancing structure with inspiration).
- d. **Adversities:** Points of conflict, such as the tension between short-term and long-term goals or the difference in how employee motivation is approached.

Use comparative analysis to identify relationships and distinctions between transactional and transformational leadership:

- a. **Comparison of Strengths and Weaknesses:** Compare how the two leadership styles are portrayed in different organizational contexts (e.g., transactional leadership's effectiveness in highly structured industries vs. transformational leadership's success in dynamic, innovative environments).
- b. **Case Studies and Examples:** Where available, use case studies from the literature to illustrate real-world applications of both leadership styles. For example, research papers might provide insights into how transactional

leadership works in bureaucratic settings like government agencies versus transformational leadership in technology companies.

c. Leadership Theories and Models: Compare different leadership models and frameworks mentioned in the literature, particularly focusing on seminal works like those by Burns and Bass, and how these models have evolved over time.

RESULTS

The development of implementation towards the objectives of an organisation, or an institution was far more advanced since Burns and Bass starting it. Bass himself still revise his earlier work. And, some of his latest work has been developed according to the usages of the concepts of leadership. As an example, Bennis and Nanus (1985) conducting a research involving 90 top leaders. Some of their findings in traits were logical thinking, persistence, empowerment, and self-control (Bennis et al. 1985; in Boje, 2000). And the important part was that they rediscovered that transformational (was practiced mostly by leaders) were different from transactional (practiced by managers) (Boje, 2000).

There will always talented leaders which runs in the blood. Fay (2005) has argued that "In contrast there are many more of us reliant on experience and development before we can blossom as leaders. It is often the case that the best leaders are not identified early on, but that a particular event, a motivational speech or an opportunity to lead may have a lasting impact. As business leaders we should provide that opportunity and environment where personal growth is encouraged and rewarded" (Fay, 2005).

From whatever the terms of the basis of leadership, most important part was to be a good leader. To have a good leader could not be positioned like a sitting duck, on the contrary, effort needs to be made, skills need to be developed, "If properly aligned and measured any and all these will help an organization to deliver more effectively" (Fay, 2005).

Transformational and Transactional Leadership have the base line in supporting and run the institution and the organization more effectively if the basis of the term could be joined together according to situation and condition.

This chapter presents the findings and analysis of the research on "Affinity and Adverse: The Contemporary Comprehension of the Disposition of Transactional and Transformational Leadership." The results are derived from an in-depth review of existing literature, and this chapter explores the affinities, adversities, and contextual applications of transactional and transformational leadership in contemporary organizations.

Findings

a. Contemporary Understanding of Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership emphasizes performance management through a structured approach involving rewards and punishments based on employee output. The literature highlights that this style remains prominent in industries requiring operational efficiency, such as manufacturing, public administration, and healthcare. In these sectors, transactional leaders ensure that employees meet

short-term goals, often through clearly defined tasks and extrinsic motivation (Bass, 1985).

However, some studies suggest that transactional leadership's focus on control and short-term results can lead to reduced employee engagement over time. Employees may feel undervalued if their development is neglected, which limits their motivation and long-term commitment to the organization (Podsakoff et al., 2006). This limitation is particularly problematic in environments that prioritize innovation and employee development, as transactional leadership may fail to foster creativity and personal growth.

b. Key Findings on Transactional Leadership:

Efficiency-driven environments (Bass, 1990): Transactional leadership thrives where structure and routine dominate, ensuring that operational objectives are met consistently.

Employee disengagement (Burns, 1978): Over-reliance on external rewards may cause disengagement, particularly in industries or roles that require more intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction.

c. Contemporary Understanding of Transformational Leadership

In contrast, transformational leadership is associated with visionary leadership, where leaders inspire and motivate employees to pursue higher goals, innovation, and organizational change. The literature indicates that transformational leadership is effective in dynamic and innovation-driven industries such as technology, start-ups, and creative sectors (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Transformational leaders emphasize intrinsic motivation by focusing on individual employee development, fostering a culture of creativity and long-term growth (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

One of the key challenges, however, lies in the overemphasis on visionary leadership at the expense of operational stability. Leaders who focus solely on long-term goals may overlook the importance of day-to-day performance management, potentially leading to operational inefficiencies (Northouse, 2018).

d. Key Findings on Transformational Leadership:

Visionary leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994): Transformational leaders guide employees toward organizational change, helping organizations thrive in dynamic environments.

Intrinsic motivation and personal growth (Kark & Shamir, 2013): This leadership style fosters greater employee commitment through mentorship and attention to individual needs.

Potential operational neglect (Yukl, 2013): Without attention to routine processes, transformational leaders may create gaps in operational performance.

e. Affinities: Complementarity Between Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Several studies suggest that there are affinities or synergies between transactional and transformational leadership, particularly when applied in tandem to address both short-term and long-term objectives (Bass, 1990). This dual approach enables leaders to achieve immediate performance outcomes

through transactional mechanisms while fostering innovation and long-term engagement through transformational leadership.

The hybrid leadership model, as explored in recent literature, reflects a growing trend where leaders blend these two styles depending on the organizational context. For example, leaders may adopt a transactional approach to ensure compliance with short-term goals but shift to a transformational style when focusing on organizational development and strategic initiatives (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

f. Key Findings on Affinities:

Transactional for short-term tasks: Ensures organizational stability through clear performance standards and immediate rewards (Bass, 1990).

Transformational for long-term growth: Inspires innovation, employee development, and adaptability (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Hybrid leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006): Leaders capable of integrating both approaches tend to be more successful in managing organizations with complex, dynamic needs.

g. Adversities: Tensions Between Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Despite the potential synergies, there are adversities between transactional and transformational leadership, primarily due to the conflicting approaches to employee motivation and task management. Transactional leadership relies on extrinsic motivation, where rewards and punishments drive behavior, while transformational leadership focuses on intrinsic motivation, encouraging employees to align their personal goals with the organizational vision (Burns, 1978).

This divergence can lead to tensions in organizational settings where employees may feel confused or demotivated by sudden shifts between the two leadership styles. Additionally, transformational leadership's emphasis on autonomy and creativity may clash with the control-oriented nature of transactional leadership, especially in organizations with rigid, hierarchical structures (Bono & Judge, 2004).

h. Key Findings on Adversities:

Conflicting motivational strategies (Burns, 1978): Transactional leaders prioritize extrinsic rewards, while transformational leaders promote intrinsic motivation, potentially leading to employee dissatisfaction.

Control vs. autonomy (Bass & Avolio, 1994): Transactional leadership's need for control may conflict with the autonomy encouraged by transformational leaders, particularly in innovation-driven sectors.

Organizational culture friction (Yukl, 2013): Rigid, transactional cultures may resist transformational leadership initiatives, resulting in resistance to change.

i. Leadership in Modern Organizations

The research suggests that transactional and transformational leadership styles must be adapted to the modern organizational context, where flexibility and adaptability are crucial. Leaders are increasingly expected to possess the ability to switch between transactional methods for operational stability and transformational methods for innovation and growth (Northouse, 2018).

Sector-specific applications further illustrate that different industries require different balances between these leadership styles. For instance, manufacturing and public administration often benefit from a more transactional approach, while technology and creative industries rely on transformational leadership to stay competitive in fast-evolving markets (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

DISCUSSION

Synergy Between Leadership Styles

The literature highlights that combining transactional and transformational leadership leads to better leadership outcomes, especially when applied in a context-sensitive manner. Leaders who can effectively navigate the demands of both operational efficiency and long-term innovation are better equipped to succeed in today's complex organizational landscapes (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Practical Implications

The research reveals that organizations should adopt flexible leadership development programs that train leaders to be proficient in both styles. Leaders who rely solely on one style may struggle in environments requiring both immediate performance and long-term strategic thinking (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Challenges of Hybrid Leadership

Implementing a hybrid leadership model is not without challenges. Leaders must balance the demands of control and empowerment, ensuring that both operational stability and employee creativity are maintained (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Clear communication, leadership training, and cultural adaptation are crucial for successfully navigating this balance.

CONCLUSION

The results indicate that while transactional and transformational leadership have distinct characteristics, their complementary application can lead to enhanced leadership effectiveness in modern organizations. Leaders who integrate both styles are more adaptable, able to manage both immediate tasks and long-term goals. However, challenges such as conflicting motivational strategies and cultural tensions must be addressed to optimize leadership performance.

By synthesizing insights from the literature, this chapter provides a comprehensive analysis of the affinities and adversities between transactional and transformational leadership, contributing to the ongoing discussion of effective leadership in contemporary organizations.

REFERENCES

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Mind Garden, Inc.

Bass, M. B. (1990) *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership : theory, research, and managerial applications*, New York : Free Press ; London : Collier Macmillan

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19–31.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 901–910.

Boje M. D. (2000) *Transformational Leadership*, New Mexico State University Press, Las Cruces, NM, [Internet] Available: http://cbae.nmsu.edu/~dboje/teaching/338/transformational_leadership.htm

Burns, J. M. (1978) *Leadership*. NY: Harper & Row, Publishers

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768.

Kark, R., & Shamir, B. (2013). The Dual Effect of Transformational Leadership: Priming Relational and Collective Selves and Further Effects on Followers. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(2), 76–87.

Carless, Sally A. (1998) *Gender differences in transformational leadership: an examination of superior, leader, and subordinate perspectives*. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*: [Internet] Available: http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2294/is_11-12_39/ai_53590324

Fay, J. (2005), *Leadership development—its evolution and measurement*, Fire, A Journal for information on firefighting and fire prevention. March 2005, [Internet] Available: http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0KZE/is_1197_97/ai_n13609504

Gronn, P. (1995). *Greatness Re-Visited: The Current Obsession with Transformational Leadership*. *Leading and Managing* 1(1), 14-27

Hall, J. Johnson S. Wysocki A. and Kepner K. (2002), *Transformational Leadership: The Transformation of Managers and Associates*, Department of Food and Resource Economics, Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL. [Internet] Available: <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu>

Hoffman, C. R. (1984), "Leadership and Headship: There is a Difference", in *Military Leadership: In Pursuit of Excellence*, ed. Robert L. Taylor and William F. Rosenback (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press)

Leithwood, A. K. & Poplin, S. M. (1992) "The Move Toward Transformational Leadership." *Educational Leadership* 49, 5 (February 1992): 8-12. EJ 439 275.

Liontos, L. B. (1992), *Transformation Leadership*, Clearinghouse. ERIC Digests, Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, [Internet] Available: <http://www.vtaide.com/png/ERIC/Transformation-Leadership.htm>