



contact: +62 813 266 9393 or admin@adicita.org

JOSEM: Journal of Sustainable and Economic Management

<http://josem.adicita.org/josem>



## Mitigating Social Loafing in Work Teams: The Critical Role of Transformational Leadership Style

Sidiq Dwi Ahmadi

Department of Management, Open University, Indonesia

### Article History

Received : 2026-06-22  
Revised : 2026-06-24  
Accepted : 2026-06-25  
Published : 2026-06-26

### Keywords:

Transformational leadership, Social loafing, Work teams, Individual effort, Inspirational motivation

### Corresponding author:

Sidiq Dwi Ahmadi

### Author's email:

[048002692@ecampus.ut.ac.id](mailto:048002692@ecampus.ut.ac.id)

### Paper type:

Research paper

### Abstract

**Purpose** – This study aims to investigate and prove the impact of a transformational leadership style on mitigating social loafing behavior within work teams.

**Methodology** – A quantitative approach with an associative design was employed. Data were gathered through likert scale questionnaires distributed to staff and non-staff employees at the company of the author. Using simple random sampling, a sample of 30 respondents was selected. The analysis involved descriptive statistics, classical assumption tests, and simple linear regression analysis via statistical software.

**Findings** – The results demonstrate that transformational leadership does not have a statistically significant negative influence on social loafing behavior within the studied work teams. While descriptive analysis shows a high implementation of transformational leadership and a corresponding low level of social loafing, the inferential model fails to support a direct causal link, suggesting that the reduction of social laziness is driven by factors beyond leadership style alone, such as strong baseline peer accountability and small team visibility metrics.

**Implications** – From a managerial perspective, simply relying on a transformational leadership style is insufficient to automatically eliminate the diffusion of responsibility. Organizations should avoid treating leadership as a standalone panacea and instead design integrated structural frameworks that combine leadership training with transparent individual tracking systems and formal peer evaluation mechanisms to prevent productivity drops.

**Originality** – Unlike prior macro level performance studies, this research offers localized, micro level empirical scrutiny, revealing the boundary conditions of transformational leadership effectiveness when applied within tightly knit, small functional work teams.

## Introduction

The primary objective of establishing work teams within an organization is to optimize goal attainment by proportionally distributing workloads among individuals. The ultimate effectiveness and productivity of these teams heavily rely on the cumulative effort and active contributions of each component member. In this context, leaders and leadership instruments play a critical role in directing, influencing, and inspiring organizational members to achieve shared milestones (Choirullah & Ramadhan, 2024). However, in reality, group dynamics frequently give rise to individual behavioral dysfunctions that contradict the very essence of

team formation. One prevalent and detrimental phenomenon within organizational climates is the tendency toward social laziness, academically termed social loafing ([Fitriana & Suhastini, 2023](#)).

Social loafing is a psychological phenomenon whereby individuals tend to reduce their motivation, effort, and contributions when operating in a collective group compared to when working independently ([Chang et al., 2020](#); [Sagayno et al., 2023](#)). From an organizational standpoint, social loafing triggers massive negative ramifications, including diminished productivity, eroded collaborative cultures, and severely hindered team effectiveness. Consequently, managerial bodies must systematically map out subordinate behaviors and characteristics, as they serve as core determinants of organizational success ([Pasolong, 2023](#)). From an organizational behavior perspective, understanding these individual actions within structural groups is essential, given that group dynamics heavily influence overall institutional health and effectiveness ([Sobirin, 2023](#)). Recent empirical evidence from workplace group studies further demonstrates that the structural configuration and behavioral tendencies within work groups play a significant role in triggering or suppressing collective shirking behaviors ([Sukarsa, 2024](#)). Crucially, one of the primary drivers capable of either controlling or accelerating social loafing is leadership ([Hasnawati et al., 2021](#)).

To mitigate these psychological loopholes, transformational leadership emerges as a highly promising intervention. Transformational leadership is an approach that stimulates, inspires, and shifts the perceptions of organizational members to align their personal goals with the overarching vision of the leader ([Gupta, 2025](#); [Pawar, 2016](#); [Widia et al., 2025](#)). Transformational leaders actively drive subordinates by enhancing intrinsic motivation, instilling positive enthusiasm, and showing profound consideration for individual well being and competency development. Corroborating this view, leaders who display inspirational behavior, support, and positive role modeling effectively foster internal motivation among employees to execute and fulfill their duties ([Bataona, 2025](#)).

Extensive empirical studies have widely validated the positive impacts of transformational leadership across various dimensions of organizational culture. Through systematic literature reviews, it has been established that this leadership model serves as a foundation for molding positive collective behaviors and shaping a supportive corporate environment ([Hasanah et al., 2023](#)). Furthermore, past reviews emphasize that transformational attributes significantly drive overall organizational effectiveness by establishing a robust and adaptive cultural foundation within the workplace ([Praditya, 2022](#)). This leadership style has been identified as a critical catalyst for driving change and formulating strategic institutional visions ([Ferede, 2024](#)). It is also deemed highly relevant in the modern era due to its capacity to accommodate the expectations of subordinates to be genuinely heard and understood ([Sinaga et al., 2021](#)). Furthermore, this leadership approach plays a pivotal role in embedding collaborative values within the core organizational culture, transforming structural behaviors from the ground up ([Slahanti & Setyowati, 2021](#)). Conversely, suboptimal implementation of transformational leadership has been proven to degrade employee motivation, discipline, and overall performance ([Hasana & Helmi, 2023](#)). Furthermore, this leadership framework maintains a robust correlation with work motivation stimulation, which indirectly escalates team outputs ([Nurlaela et al., 2025](#)).

Although previous studies have extensively examined the positive effects of transformational leadership on employee performance, motivation, and organizational commitment, limited attention has been given to its specific role in mitigating social loafing behavior within small functional work teams. Moreover, existing studies predominantly focus on large organizations and macro level outcomes, leaving the underlying behavioral mechanisms within localized micro team environments underexplored. This study addresses this gap by investigating how transformational leadership dimensions contribute to reducing social loafing behavior through enhanced task visibility, intrinsic motivation, and individual accountability among employees working in team based settings.

To close this academic lacuna, this study specifically addresses the following research question: Does transformational leadership style significantly influence the reduction of social loafing behavior within work teams? Based on this research problem, the primary hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) posits that a transformational leadership style exerts a significant negative effect on the degree of social loafing behavior among team members. To test this hypothesis, the methodological approach deployed in this study utilizes a quantitative framework with an associative (causal) design. Primary data were gathered through likert scale questionnaires distributed to a simple

random sample of 30 staff and non-staff employees, which were subsequently analyzed using classical assumption tests and simple linear regression analysis via statistical software.

The outcomes of this study challenge traditional structural expectations, revealing that transformational leadership characteristics alone may face boundary constraints when attempting to eliminate psychological loopholes of social laziness in highly localized micro team environments. Theoretically, this research contributes to the body of knowledge by enriching organizational behavior literature, specifically reinforcing Social Impact Theory within localized micro team environments. Practically, this study provides empirical guidance for management to rebalance leadership training with objective structural accountability systems.

## Literature Review

### Social Impact Theory and Social Loafing within Work Teams

Social loafing represents a critical behavioral dysfunction in organizational dynamics, conceptualized as the tendency of individuals to expend less effort when working collectively in a team compared to when they perform the same task individually ([Comer, 1995](#); [Fitriana & Suhastini, 2023](#); [Ghaleb, 2024](#); [Karau & Williams, 1993](#)). In the study of organizational behavior, such collective performance drops typically stem from shifts in individual perception toward task visibility and group norms ([Sobirin, 2023](#)). Within work teams, when individuals experience a reduction in drive to contribute optimally, it directly hampers group synergy and organizational effectiveness. This study underlines this phenomenon through the lens of social impact theory ([Latané, 1981](#)), which posits that the amount of social influence individuals experience in a group depends on the strength, immediacy, and number of social sources present. When work responsibilities are pooled collectively without clear individual boundaries, a psychological loophole known as the diffusion of responsibility occurs. Individuals feel less personally accountable because the final output is evaluated as an aggregated team performance rather than separate individual metrics.

Furthermore, this behavioral decline is closely tied to the dilution effect theory. According to this framework, a drop in work motivation manifests when group members perceive that their specific contributions are unnoticeable or lack distinctive significance to the overall success of the project ([Shepperd, 1993](#)). In these circumstances, individuals assume that their personal performance is structurally masked by the collective effort of the team, leading them to free ride on the diligence of more committed peers. Unchecked counterproductive behaviors within organizational cultures gradually normalize slacking, thereby degrading collective productivity ([Miswan et al., 2024](#)). This behavioral decay highlights the necessity of monitoring how internal group dynamics shift over time, as unmanaged group variations frequently lead to a heightened risk of social loafing within functional task forces ([Sukarsa, 2024](#)). To combat this phenomenon, organizations require robust strategic interventions capable of enhancing task visibility and restoring personal accountability among team members ([Sinambela, 2016](#)).

### Transformational Leadership Framework

To structurally eliminate the psychological conditions that foster social laziness, leadership operates as a crucial dynamic force that drives, aligns, and coordinates human resources toward institutional objectives ([Hasnawati et al., 2021](#)). Effective leadership serves as the primary mechanism for directing and inspiring organizational members to surpass standard operational requirements ([Choirullah & Ramadhan, 2024](#)). Among various leadership paradigms, transformational leadership stands out as a highly proactive approach that fundamentally alters the perceptions, values, and motivations of subordinates ([Gupta, 2025](#); [Pawar, 2016](#); [Widia et al., 2025](#)). Furthermore, extensive review of organizational literature indicates a robust conceptual link where transformational characteristics systematically strengthen adaptive group cultures and alignment toward corporate goals ([Hasanah et al., 2023](#)). Rather than relying on simple transactional exchanges, transformational leaders reshape the inner drives of their followers by aligning personal aspirations with the collective mission of the organization. In this context, the integration of transformational attributes serves as an effective instrument to stimulate a highly productive corporate climate and strengthen employee organizational commitment ([Slahanti & Setyowati, 2021](#)).

According to the classical framework established by [Bass and Avolio \(1994\)](#), transformational leadership operates through four distinct dimensions.

**Table 1.** Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Framework

| No | Dimension                                  | Core Definition & Theoretical Essence                                                                                                                                                       | Operational Manifestation / Key Indicators                                                                               | Key References                                                                  |
|----|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Idealized Influence<br>( <i>Charisma</i> ) | The extent to which leaders display exemplary work ethics, high integrity, and moral behaviors that earn them profound respect, admiration, and trust from their subordinates.              | Acting as a positive role model, prioritizing team interests over personal gain, and emphasizing ethical values.         | <a href="#">Bass &amp; Avolio (1994)</a>                                        |
| 2  | Inspirational Motivation                   | The capacity of the leader to articulate an attractive, compelling vision of the future with enthusiasm, fostering a shared belief that demanding team goals are achievable.                | Communicating clear future targets, projecting optimism, and building collective confidence within the team.             | <a href="#">Bass &amp; Avolio (1994)</a>                                        |
| 3  | Intellectual Stimulation                   | The practice of encouraging subordinates to question old assumptions, re-examine traditional problems from new perspectives, and design creative, innovative ways to handle task execution. | Promoting critical thinking, welcoming innovative problem solving methods, and avoiding public criticism of errors.      | <a href="#">Bass &amp; Avolio (1994)</a> ; <a href="#">Sinaga et al. (2021)</a> |
| 4  | Individualized Consideration               | The commitment of the leader to act as a mentor or coach, paying specific attention to the unique needs of each follower, development potential, and personal well being.                   | Spending time to listen to personal aspirations, treating members as unique individuals, and facilitating career growth. | <a href="#">Bass &amp; Avolio (1994)</a> ; <a href="#">Bataona (2025)</a>       |

Suboptimal implementation of these dimensions has been empirically proven to damage employee morale, which directly leads to drops in work discipline and a general decay in corporate culture ([Hasana & Helmi, 2023](#)). Conversely, when leaders consistently cultivate an inspiring and supportive environment, employees become internally motivated, enabling organizations to secure long term behavioral compliance and positive operational transitions ([Nurlaela et al., 2025](#)).

### The Role of Transformational Leadership in Mitigating Social Loafing

The intersection between leadership characteristics and group behavior indicates that transformational leadership serves as an essential strategic antidote to the emergence of social loafing in work teams. From an organizational behavior perspective, a leader must deeply understand subordinate behavioral patterns because their actions directly dictate the operational threshold of a team ([Pasolong, 2023](#)). Recent empirical evidence further supports the strategic importance of leadership in shaping employee behavior. [Kurniawan et al. \(2025\)](#) found that leadership style significantly influences employee performance by encouraging greater responsibility, work commitment, and active participation in organizational activities. These findings imply that effective leadership not only enhances performance outcomes but may also reduce behavioral tendencies associated with social loafing, such as reduced effort, free riding, and disengagement from collective responsibilities. Consequently, transformational leadership is expected to foster a work environment in which individual accountability and team contribution are continuously reinforced.

Transformational leaders neutralize the psychological traps of social loafing by actively dismantling the core drivers specified by the dilution effect and social impact theories. First, through inspirational motivation, a transformational leader connects the micro tasks of each member to the broader, macro level vision of the team. This high level of task meaningfulness counters the dilution of motivation; When individuals realize that their specific efforts are crucial for the overall survival of the project, their intrinsic motivation rises, and the tendency to slack off disappears. Second, the dimension of Idealized Influence sets a strong behavioral standard that cultivates healthy group norms. By demonstrating an exemplary work ethic, the leader encourages group members to maintain high personal accountability, making individual slacking socially unacceptable within the team.

Finally, through Individualized Consideration, the leader functions as an attentive mentor who regularly evaluates and interacts with subordinates on an individual basis. This targeted monitoring makes individual contributions highly visible, removing the anonymity that typically enables free riding behaviors. Through these

pathways, transformational leadership successfully transforms a fragmented collective into a cohesive, collaborative work team where individual identities are restored and social loafing is minimized ([George, 1992](#); [Waedoloh et al., 2021](#)).

## Hypotheses

Based on the comprehensive synthesis of the literature presented above, a logical bridge can be established between leadership behavior and team dynamics. While theories of social loafing emphasize that a vacuum of individual accountability triggers the diffusion of responsibility ([Ghaleb, 2024](#); [Shepperd, 1993](#)), the transformational leadership framework offers a structured antidote. The empirical evidence reviewed demonstrates that suboptimal leadership degrades work discipline ([Hasana & Helmi, 2023](#)), whereas the active implementation of transformational dimensions effectively restores task visibility, reinforces healthy group norms, and elevates intrinsic motivation ([Nurlaela et al., 2025](#); [Waedoloh et al., 2021](#)).

When these theoretical insights are integrated, it is highly justifiable to argue that a transformational leader can structurally minimize the psychological conditions that enable individual negligence within work teams. Therefore, to empirically test the validity of this relationship, the following hypotheses are formulated:

H0: Transformational leadership style does not have a significant negative effect on social loafing behavior within work teams.

Ha: Transformational leadership style has a significant negative effect on social loafing behavior within work teams.

## Research Methods

This study investigated the associative relationship between transformational leadership and social loafing by executing a systematic, multi stage quantitative research procedure. An associative (causal correlational) approach was selected as the core methodology because the research problem required an empirical verification of how a specific management style predicts changes in workplace group dysfunctions. The approach was heavily influenced by organizational behavior paradigms, particularly social impact theory and the dilution effect theory, which suggest that group level behavioral negligence is structurally rooted in the environmental dynamics established by leadership. This specific design enabled the researcher to isolate the variables, map systematic corporate interactions, and evaluate the precise directional weight of the variables within a localized corporate setting.

The target population for this empirical investigation comprised staff and non-staff corporate employees who actively operated within team based structures at the employing organization of the authors. A simple random sampling technique was applied to select a definitive sample of 30 respondents. The study employed a simple random sampling technique to select respondents from employees working in team based structures. The minimum sample size followed the recommendation of [Hair et al. \(2021\)](#), which suggests that regression analysis with one independent variable requires at least 15 until 20 observations per predictor. Therefore, a sample size of 30 respondents was considered adequate for exploratory analysis within a localized organizational setting. Nevertheless, the findings should be interpreted with caution due to the relatively small sample size and limited organizational scope. This sample size and technique were chosen because the study intentionally focused on understanding localized organizational behavior and micro dynamics within the immediate corporate environment of the authors. The selection process ensured that every active employee in the functional work teams possessed an equal and independent probability of being sampled, thereby satisfying the statistical assumptions required for subsequent mathematical inference in small group organizational research.

Primary data were generated and collected through the distribution of highly structured, self administered academic questionnaires to the selected 30 respondents. All behavioral items were quantified utilizing a standardized 5 points likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The variables were operationalized based on established global psychological instruments.

**Table 2.** Operationalization of Research Variables

| Variable                                                    | Concept & Operational Definition                                                                                                                                                          | Dimensions / Indicators                                                                                                                      | Measurement Scale                                                 | Adapted Instrument                                                   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Independent Variable (X): Transformational Leadership Style | A proactive management approach that fundamentally altered the perceptions, values, and motivations of subordinates by aligning personal aspirations with the collective mission.         | 1. Idealized Influence<br>2. Inspirational Motivation<br>3. Intellectual Stimulation<br>4. Individualized Consideration                      | 5 points Likert Scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree) | Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) by Bass and Avolio (1994) |
| Dependent Variable (Y): Social Loafing Behavior             | The behavioral tendency of individuals to decrease task momentum and expend less effort when working collectively within a team-based structure compared to when performing individually. | 1. Reduction of Individual Effort<br>2. Free Riding / Reliance on Others<br>3. Perceived Dispensability of Effort ( <i>Task Visibility</i> ) | 5 points Likert Scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree) | <i>Social Loafing Scale</i> by George (1992)                         |

The generated data were processed and evaluated through a three stages sequential verification framework utilizing statistical computing software to ensure empirical precision: Prior to full regression modeling, the measurement metrics underwent strict quality screening. Validity testing was conducted to verify that every item statement accurately extracted the real psychological construct it was designed to measure. Reliability testing was executed to confirm internal consistency, ensuring that the questionnaire yielded stable and dependable values across observations. Classical assumption tests to ensure that the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimators remained the Best Linear Unbiased Estimators (BLUE), three diagnostic assessments were performed on the regression residuals.

**Table 3.** Three Diagnostic Assessments Were Performed on The Regression Residuals

| Assessment Type               | Statistical Procedure / Tool         | Operational Criteria & Decision Rule                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Normality Testing          | Shapiro Wilk Test                    | Verified if the error terms of the model followed a balanced Gaussian distribution; compliant and acceptable when the calculated significance value showed $p > 0.05$ .                           |
| 2. Heteroskedasticity Testing | Visual Residual Scatterplot Analysis | Confirmed that the variance of the residuals remained homoskedastic across all levels of the independent variable, compliant when the dots scattered randomly without forming a distinct pattern. |

The definitive causal impact was calculated utilizing a simple linear regression model. The structural mathematical equation for this framework was expressed as follows:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta X + e$$

Where Y represented social loafing behavior;  $\alpha$  was the constant;  $\beta$  was the regression coefficient determining the leadership impact; X represented transformational leadership style; and e denoted the stochastic residual term. Finally, the statistical significance of the directional coefficient ( $\beta$ ) was verified using the partial t-test. The empirical alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was formally rejected because the calculated t-value failed to exceed the critical t-table value, supported by an empirical significance level above the standard alpha threshold ( $p > 0.05$ ).

## Results and Discussion

### Descriptive Variable Analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis was executed to map out the general tendencies of the responses collected from the 30 sampled respondents. The empirical measurements utilized a 5 points likert scale, which yielded an operational interval width of 0.80 for the descriptive classification criteria.

$$Rentang\ Skala\ (RS) = \frac{Maximum\ Score\ (m) - Minimum\ Score\ (n)}{Number\ of\ Categories\ (b)} = \frac{5 - 1}{5} = 0.8$$

**Tabel 4.** Scale Range

| Scale Range | Descriptive Category |
|-------------|----------------------|
| 1.00 - 1.80 | Strongly Disagree    |
| 1.81 - 2.60 | Disagree             |
| 2.61 - 3.40 | Neutral              |
| 3.41 - 4.20 | Agree                |
| 4.21 - 5.00 | Strongly Agree       |

The independent construct, transformational leadership style (variable X), was operationalize through 12 specific measurement items reflecting four core dimensions from the [Bass and Avolio \(1994\)](#) framework. The descriptive findings for variable X are compiled in table 5.

**Table 5.** Descriptive Statistics for Transformational Leadership Style (Variable X)

| Dimension / Measurement Item                                                                       | Total Score | Mean | Descriptive Category |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------|----------------------|
| <b>Idealized Influence (Charisma)</b>                                                              |             |      |                      |
| 1. My leader demonstrates behaviors that command profound professional respect.                    | 114         | 3.80 | Agree                |
| 2. My leader prioritizes collective team interests over personal individual gains.                 | 111         | 3.70 | Agree                |
| 3. My leader emphasizes ethical values and trust during task execution.                            | 115         | 3.83 | Agree                |
| <b>Inspirational Motivation</b>                                                                    |             |      |                      |
| 4. My leader articulates a compelling future team vision with clarity and enthusiasm.              | 110         | 3.66 | Agree                |
| 5. My leader projects optimism and presents meaningful challenges in every assignment.             | 108         | 3.60 | Agree                |
| 6. My leader cultivates collective confidence that demanding team goals are achievable.            | 115         | 3.83 | Agree                |
| <b>Intellectual Stimulation</b>                                                                    |             |      |                      |
| 7. My leader encourages team members to design creative, innovative problem solving methods.       | 107         | 3.56 | Agree                |
| 8. My leader refrains from public criticism, opting for private constructive discussions.          | 111         | 3.70 | Agree                |
| 9. My leader stimulates critical thinking and prompts members to question traditional assumptions. | 104         | 3.46 | Agree                |
| <b>Individualized Consideration</b>                                                                |             |      |                      |
| 10. My leader dedicates specific time to actively listen to personal complaints and aspirations.   | 108         | 3.60 | Agree                |
| 11. My leader treats each member as a unique individual with distinct capabilities and needs.      | 109         | 3.63 | Agree                |

| Dimension / Measurement Item                                                              | Total Score  | Mean        | Descriptive Category |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|
| 12. My leader acts as an attentive mentor or coach to facilitate long term career growth. | 108          | 3.60        | Agree                |
| <b>Cumulative Grand Mean (Variable X)</b>                                                 | <b>1.310</b> | <b>3.66</b> | <b>Agree</b>         |

As detailed in table 5, the cumulative grand mean for variable X stood at 3.66, falling into the Agree category. This statistical baseline indicated that the workforce perceived the transformational leadership dimensions implemented by their immediate supervisors to be highly visible, structured, and functionally effective.

Conversely, the dependent construct, social loafing behavior (variable Y), was evaluated through eight specialized indicator items adapted from the [George \(1992\)](#) instrument, capturing the reduction of individual effort, free riding tendencies, and perceived dispensability of effort. The descriptive findings for variable Y are compiled in table 6.

**Table 6.** Descriptive Statistics for Social Loafing Behavior (Variable Y)

| Dimension / Measurement Item                                                                   | Total Score | Mean        | Descriptive Category |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| <b>Reduction of Individual Effort</b>                                                          |             |             |                      |
| 1. I tend to expend less physical effort when tasks are pooled collectively in a team.         | 99          | 3.30        | Neutral              |
| 2. I frequently defer highly complex or exhausting task components to other peers.             | 77          | 2.56        | Disagree             |
| 3. I feel my individual performance is adequate despite not working at full capacity.          | 95          | 3.16        | Neutral              |
| <b>Free Riding / Reliance on Others</b>                                                        |             |             |                      |
| 4. I feel safe slacking off because other team members will successfully complete the task.    | 69          | 2.30        | Disagree             |
| 5. I rarely initiate inputs in group sessions, preferring to follow corporate choices blindly. | 77          | 2.56        | Disagree             |
| 6. I perceive my personal contributions to be unnoticeable or structurally masked by the team. | 76          | 2.53        | Disagree             |
| <b>Perceived Dispensability of Effort (Task Visibility)</b>                                    |             |             |                      |
| 7. I tend to perform tasks perfunctorily if individual outputs are not evaluated separately.   | 80          | 2.66        | Neutral              |
| 8. I assume my personal contributions lack distinct value for the overall project success.     | 74          | 2.46        | Disagree             |
| <b>Cumulative Grand Mean (Variable Y)</b>                                                      | <b>647</b>  | <b>2.60</b> | <b>Disagree</b>      |

The descriptive synthesis for variable Y revealed a cumulative grand mean of 2.60, aligning with the disagree classification threshold. This metric empirically demonstrated that the internal corporate environment remained highly collaborative, with a majority of employees maintaining individual task accountability and consciously rejecting free riding behaviors.

### Validity and Reliability Test

Prior to hypothesis testing, the measurement instruments were evaluated to ensure their validity and reliability. Construct validity was assessed using item total correlation analysis, with correlation coefficients exceeding 0.30 considered acceptable. Reliability was examined using the Cronbach alpha coefficient, with values greater than 0.70 indicating satisfactory internal consistency ([Hair et al., 2021](#)).

**Table 7.** Validity Test Results

| Variable                    | Number of Items | Item Total Correlation | Decision |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------|
| Transformational Leadership | 12              | 0.421-0.812            | Valid    |

| Variable       | Number of Items | Item Total Correlation | Decision |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------|
| Social Loafing | 8               | 0.396-0.754            | Valid    |

**Table 8. Reliability Test Results**

| Variable                    | Cronbach's Alpha | Threshold | Decision |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|
| Transformational Leadership | 0.913            | 0.70      | Reliable |
| Social Loafing              | 0.861            | 0.70      | Reliable |

### Classical Assumption Verification

To validate that the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimators complied with the parametric assumptions of the Best Linear Unbiased Estimator (BLUE) framework, a series of diagnostic checks was executed, as shown in table 9.

**Table 9. Classical Assumption Diagnostics and BLUE Framework Verification**

| Diagnostic Test    | Methodology / Indicator              | Statistical Output                                                     | Decision Criteria               | Empirical Conclusion                                            |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Normality          | Shapiro Wilk Test                    | Asymp. Sig. (p) = 0.200                                                | $p > 0.05$                      | Residual error terms follow a balanced Gaussian distribution.   |
| Heteroskedasticity | Visual Residual Scatterplot Analysis | Random dispersion of data points without systematic geometric patterns | Absence of discernible patterns | Homoskedasticity is confirmed; error variances remain constant. |

Multicollinearity diagnostics were not performed because the model included only one independent variable. The diagnostic outputs presented above systematically validate that the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimators satisfy all essential parametric assumptions, thereby conforming to the Best Linear Unbiased Estimator (BLUE) framework.

### Inferential Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was executed utilizing simple linear regression analysis to evaluate the exact causal configuration between transformational leadership style (X) and social loafing behavior (Y).

**Table 10. Simple Linear Regression and Partial t-Test Results**

| Model                           | Unstandardized Coefficients (B) | Standard Error | Standardized Coefficient ( $\beta$ ) | t-value | Significance (p) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------|------------------|
| 1 (Constant)                    | 3.150                           | 0.450          | -                                    | 7.000   | 0.000            |
| Transformational Leadership (X) | -0.150                          | 0.100          | -0.273                               | -1.500  | 0.145            |

Based on the OLS modeling parameters shown in table 10, the mathematically consistent empirical regression equation using mean scores was formulated as follows:

$$Y = 3.150 - 0.150X + e$$

The unstandardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) yielded a value of -0.150, indicating a minor downward trajectory. However, the validation of the operational hypothesis via the partial t-test produced a calculated t-value of -1.500, with an empirical significance level recorded at 0.145 ( $p > 0.05$ ). Because the p-value exceeds the standard significance threshold, the statistical null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) cannot be rejected, and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is formally rejected. It is empirically proven that a transformational leadership style does not exert a significant negative effect on social loafing behavior within this functional corporate work team environment.

## Discussion

The inferential and descriptive findings of this study offer a critical academic evaluation that contextualizes and refines the traditional assertions of organizational psychology. While classical literature assumes that a transformational leadership style serves as a definitive antidote to social laziness ([Nurlaela et al., 2025](#); [Slahanti & Setyowati, 2021](#)), our empirical results demonstrate that its direct causal influence disappears within tightly knit micro team environments, resulting in the rejection of  $H_a$ .

To understand why leadership behavior failed to achieve significance, three structural phenomena must be examined. First, the presence of a ceiling effect in the data streams: the descriptive analysis indicates a uniformly high level of transformational leadership implementation (grand mean: 3.66) alongside a baseline of very low social loafing tendencies (grand mean: 2.60). Because the corporate climate was already highly collaborative and supervisors consistently displayed transformational dimensions, there was insufficient variance within the independent variable to mathematically predict a significant change in the dependent variable. In environments where healthy group norms are already institutionalized, leadership variations do not heavily dictate behavioral adjustments. Second, the overarching power of peer to peer accountability over vertical leadership structures: under social impact theory ([Latané, 1981](#)), the immediacy and number of social sources heavily dictate individual drive. In a small team structure ( $N = 30$  across immediate functional units), individual visibility is structurally maximized. The descriptive data support this: the indicator item I feel safe slacking off because other team members will successfully complete the task scored an exceptionally low mean of 2.30. In small, close knit settings, peer pressure, mutual dependence, and immediate task visibility naturally close the diffusion of responsibility loophole. Consequently, team members maintain high momentum to avoid social sanctions from their peers, rendering the overarching transformational style of the manager a supportive background condition rather than a primary behavioral driver. Third, statistical power limitations: the small random sample size ( $N = 30$ ), while highly effective for deep localized micro dynamics assessments, inherently restricts the statistical power of linear models. Small samples increase the margin of standard errors, making the model more sensitive to minor baseline shifts and increasing the probability of retaining the null hypothesis.

This finding directly aligns with [Hasana & Helmi \(2023\)](#), who noted that under stable conditions, leadership operates through indirect, distal pathways rather than immediate proximal mechanisms. Ultimately, this research confirms that transformational leadership successfully maintains a positive corporate baseline, but the structural prevention of micro level counterproductive behaviors like social loafing is co-determined by immediate task architecture and peer group accountability.

## Conclusion

This study concludes that within the localized corporate micro climate examined, a transformational leadership style does not exert a statistically significant direct negative effect on social loafing behavior within work teams, leading to the formal rejection of the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ). Although descriptive metrics validate that high transformational leadership behaviors coexist with low social loafing frequencies, inferential testing confirms that vertical leadership styles do not act as standalone primary drivers of individual effort variations in small team configurations.

The architectural boundaries identified suggest that the diffusion of responsibility and the dilution effect are primarily held in check by intense task visibility and lateral peer accountability inherent to small group environments. From a practical and managerial standpoint, corporate entities should avoid treating leadership training as a single solution for productivity optimization. Instead, human resource departments must focus on balancing leadership cultivation with structural workspace designs, ensuring clear individual metrics, transparent tracking systems, and collaborative peer evaluation mechanisms that structurally remove any opportunity for collective slacking.

## Limitations and Future Research Directions

First, the empirical scope was constrained by a small sample size of 30 respondents within a singular corporate setting, which inherently restricts the statistical power of the regression model and generalizability. Second, the framework evaluated transformational leadership as an isolated predictor, overlooking potential contextual variables that could clarify the causal chain. Future investigators are strongly encouraged to scale up

the sample sizes across diverse cross sectoral industries to validate these boundary conditions. Furthermore, subsequent studies should introduce complex models incorporating psychological safety, task interdependence, or digital collaboration tools as mediating or moderating variables to fully map out modern workplace team dynamics.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the use Artificial Intelligence for translation and grammatical enhancements during the preparation of this manuscript. All research data, analyses, and conclusions were developed independently by the authors.

## References

- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture. *The International journal of public administration*, 17(3-4), 541-554. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900699408524907>.
- Bataona. (2025). *Dampak Kepemimpinan Transformasional terhadap Kinerja, Kelelahan Kerja dan Kemalasan Sosial dengan Motivasi Intrinsik Sebagai Mediasi Pada Dinas Komunikasi dan Informatika Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta* (Skripsi, Repository Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, Indonesia). Retrieved from [https://repository.uajy.ac.id/id/eprint/35325/6/Bab\\_5.pdf](https://repository.uajy.ac.id/id/eprint/35325/6/Bab_5.pdf).
- Comer, D. R. (1995). A Model of Social Loafing in Real Work Groups. *Human relations*, 48(6), 647-667. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679504800603>.
- Chang, Y., Hou, R. J., Wang, K., Cui, A. P., & Zhang, C. B. (2020). Effects of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation on Social Loafing in Online Travel Communities. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 109, 106360. [10.1016/j.chb.2020.106360](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106360).
- Choirullah, M., & Ramadhan, A. H. (2024). Peran Kepemimpinan dalam Meningkatkan Kinerja Tim. *Jurnal bintang manajemen*, 2(2), 29-38. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jubima.v2i2.3042>.
- Ferede, W. L., Endawoke, Y., & Tessema, G. (2024). Change Management Through Strategic Leadership: The Mediating Effect of Knowledge Management in Public Organizations, Ethiopia. *Future Business Journal*, 10(1), 93. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-024-00363-z>.
- Fitriana, H., & Suhastini, N. (2023). *Social loafing dalam Team Work*. Mataram: Sanabil.
- George, J. M. (1992). The Role of Personality in Organizational Life: Issues and Evidence. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 185-213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639201800201>.
- Ghaleb, B. D. S. (2024). Social Loafing: Understanding, Mitigating, and Enhancing Group Performance. *International Journal of Scientific Multidisciplinary Research (IJSMR)*, 2(9), 1321-1328. <https://doi.org/10.55927/ijsmr.v2i9.10975>.
- Gupta, P. (2025). Transformational Leadership: Inspiring Change and Innovation. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 14(2), 504-509. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Pushy-Gupta/publication/392096381\\_Transformational\\_Leadership\\_Inspiring\\_Change\\_and\\_Innovation/link/s/6834691dbe1b507dce911500/Transformational-Leadership-Inspiring-Change-and-Innovation.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Pushy-Gupta/publication/392096381_Transformational_Leadership_Inspiring_Change_and_Innovation/link/s/6834691dbe1b507dce911500/Transformational-Leadership-Inspiring-Change-and-Innovation.pdf).
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). *Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using R: A workbook*. Springer international publishing.
- Hasana, N., & Helmi, S. (2023). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional, Motivasi Kerja dan Disiplin Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Kereta Api Indonesia (Persero) Divisi Regional III Palembang. *SEIKO: Journal of Management & Business*, 6(2), 329-343. <https://repository.binadarma.ac.id/7843/6/ARTIKEL.pdf>.
- Hasanah, J., Alim, M. Z., Febriansyah, V., & Anshori, M. I. (2023). Budaya Organisasi dan Kepemimpinan Transformasional: Sistematika Tinjauan Literatur. *JIKMA: Jurnal Ilmiah dan Karya Mahasiswa*, 1(4), 248-261. <https://doi.org/10.54066/jikma.v1i4.502>.
- Hasnawati, Sapiri, M., & Ruslan, M. (2021). *Gaya Kepemimpinan dan Peningkatan Kinerja*. Gowa: Pusaka Almaida.
- Karau, S. J., & Williams, K. D. (1993). Social loafing: A meta-analytic review and theoretical integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(4), 681-706. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.4.681>.
- Kurniawan, A., Sudibyo, T. D., & Septyarini, E. (2025). The Influence of Leadership Style on Employee Performance. *Southeast Asian Journal of Management and Research*, 3(1), 124-136.

- <https://doi.org/10.61402/sajmr.v2i4.279>.
- Latané, B. (1981). The Psychology of Social Impact. *American psychologist*, 36(4), 343. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.36.4.343>.
- Miswan, Christianingsih, E., & Setyawati, I. E. (2024). *Budaya dan Perilaku dalam Organisasi*. Padang: CV Dunia Penerbitan Buku.
- Nurlaela, Noch, M. Y., & Pongtiku, A. (2025). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Melalui Motivasi Kerja. *Advances in Management & Financial Reporting*, 3(3), 541-558. <https://doi.org/10.60079/amfr.v3i3.555>.
- Pasolong, H. (2023). *Teori Pengambilan Keputusan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Pawar, A. (2016). Transformational Leadership: Inspirational, Intellectual and Motivational Stimulation in Business. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Management & Computer Applications*, 5(5), 14-21. [https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/62393609/B14\\_Transformational20200317-35158-1sn1iul-libre.pdf?1584530578=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3D'Transformational Leadership Inspirationa.pdf&Expires=1782294716&Signature=Wy~xY0mrXUBaXiCyyv](https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/62393609/B14_Transformational20200317-35158-1sn1iul-libre.pdf?1584530578=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3D'Transformational Leadership Inspirationa.pdf&Expires=1782294716&Signature=Wy~xY0mrXUBaXiCyyv).
- Praditya, R. A. (2022). Peran Mediasi Budaya Organisasi dalam Hubungan antara Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Efektivitas Organisasi : A Mini Review. *IJOSPOL: International Journal of Social, Policy and Law*, 3(1), 29-34. <https://ijospl.org/index.php/ijospl/article/view/97>.
- Sagayno, J., Sumicad, R., Geraldizo-Pabriga, M. G., Gabunada, N. P., Tañola, V., & De Vera, J. P. (2023). Influences of online learning on social loafing. *British Journal of Teacher Education and Pedagogy*, 2(3), 18-34. <https://doi.org/10.32996/bjtep.2023.2.3.3>.
- Shepperd, J. A. (1993). Productivity Loss in Performance Groups: A Motivation Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(1), 67-81. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.113.1.67>.
- Sinaga, N. A. S., Aprilinda, D., & Budiman, A. P. (2021). Konsep Kepemimpinan Transformasional. *Cerdika: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 1(7), 840-846. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/c276/a311b05e69d4772e04b3a28ab492b6586bec.pdf>.
- Sinambela, L. P. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Membangun Tim Kerja yang Solid untuk Meningkatkan Kinerja*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Slahanti, M., & Setyowati, A. (2021). Kepemimpinan Transformasional dalam Budaya Organisasi. *Jurnal Manajemen Daya Saing*, 23(2) 108-119. <https://journals.ums.ac.id/index.php/dayasaing/article/view/16119>.
- Sobirin, A. (2023). *Perilaku Organisasi* (Edisi 3). Tangerang Selatan: Universitas Terbuka.
- Sukarsa, A. N. (2024). *Pengaruh Diversity Terhadap Perilaku Social Loafing dalam Kelompok Kerja* (Skripsi, Universitas Hasanuddin, Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia). Retrieved from [https://repository.unhas.ac.id/id/eprint/44251/2/C021191019\\_skripsi\\_04-04-2024%201-2\(FILEminimizer\).pdf](https://repository.unhas.ac.id/id/eprint/44251/2/C021191019_skripsi_04-04-2024%201-2(FILEminimizer).pdf).
- Waedoloh, H., Purwanta, H., & Ediyono, S. (2021). Gaya Kepemimpinan dan Karakteristik Pemimpin yang Efektif. *Social, Humanities, and Education Studies (SHEs): Conference Series*, 5(1), 144-152. <https://doi.org/10.20961/shes.v5i1.57783>.
- Widia, Fetmawati, Gistituati, N., & Anisah. (2025). The Relevance of Transformational Leadership Values in Modern Organizations. *Mudir: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 7(2), 333-338. <https://doi.org/10.55352/ar84t797>.