DOI <https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2018-07.09>

THE EFFECT OF TASK ENVIRONMENT TOWARD THE COMMITMENT TO CHANGE: TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AS A MEDIATOR

Fajri Detha Alfrian*

Faculty of Administrative Science, University of Brawijaya, Indonesia

Rachmawati Riani

Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Indonesia, Indonesia

*E-mail: dethafajri@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the relationship between task environment and Commitment to Change of employees and the role of transformational leadership as a mediator. This study was conducted at PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek (PT. KCJ), a subsidiary of PT. Kereta Api Indonesia which organize the operation of urban railway services by electric train in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang (Serpong) and Bekasi. Total 101 questionnaires were distributed to all permanent employees (implementer level, staff 2 - senior supervisor) of PT. KCJ who are based at the head office in Juanda Station, and 68 questionnaires were returned. Results show that transformational leadership fully mediates indirect relationship between task environment and all dimension of Commitment to Change (Affective, continuance and Normative).

KEY WORDS

Task environment, transformational leadership, change management.

The increasing interest of the citizen of Jabodetabek in using Jabodetabek electric train is clearly seen when the passenger volume record reach 830.964 passengers per day for the first time in May 4th 2015. It is not surprising considering the statistic data issued by BPS as in the following Table 1.

Table 1 – The Number Of Railway Passenger, 2010-1025 (Thousand Persons)

Month/Year	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
January	19 244	14 963	10 089	9 779	10 354	10 541
February	17 640	14 552	10 281	9 840	9 270	9 641
March	21 290	16 909	11 240	11 285	10 733	10 759
April	-	16 055	11 529	11 271	10 188	10 394
May	-	16 781	11 767	11 872	10 513	10 476
June	-	17 848	11 817	12 034	10 147	10 312
July	-	16 583	15 407	12 391	10 749	10 466
August	-	17 091	14 321	11 471	9 678	10 438
September	-	18 253	15 113	11 556	9 692	9 685
October	-	19 079	15 531	11 501	10 152	10 796
November	-	18 605	15 487	10 650	9 852	10 106
December	-	20 080	15 901	10 438	9 777	10 694

Source: <http://www.bps.go.id> Re-processed by the writer.

From Table 1, it is seen that the number of KRL passenger is increasing from time to time. This significant increasing is pleasing enough according to the online news released by www.krl.co.id because it shows that PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek is already on the right track to reach the target of 1.2 million passengers per day in 2019.

Figure 1 shows how the volume of KRL PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek (PT. KCJ) passenger is increasing year per year. The increasing from 2011 until 2015 is recorded 139% (Source: Corporate Communication of PT. KCJ). With the increasing of the number of

passenger faced by PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek, it requires the company's ability to respond the environmental change. The ability to respond is not only by providing the best service to the consumer which number keeps increasing from time to time, but also the quality (effectiveness and efficiency) of the business process conducted to produce the best service. This ability of company to respond requires the company to keep make continuous improvement which is supported by the entire element of the company. Therefore, it is important for the company to have a strong commitment of its all employees in running the change planning which has been determined by the company.

Figure 1 – The Graphic of KRL Passenger Average Volume Per Day Per Year
(Source: Corporate Communication of PT. KCJ)

Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) in Gelaidan and Ahmad (2013) stated that commitment to change is a mindset owned by a person which is needed for the success of a company. Smith (1996) in Kling (2004) explained that when employees have a commitment to change they will have higher energy level and dedicate themselves more than them who do not have commitment. The factors that affect employee's commitment to change are: transformational leadership and alteration leadership (Herold, et al., 2008), transformational and transactional leadership (Gelaidan and Ahmad, 2013), task environment (Lestari, 2014), employee's participation (Jaffe & Scott, 1998) in Cree (2000), working motivation (Parish, et al., 2008), appreciation and acknowledgement (Vroom, 1995) in Kling (2004), communication, participation, and empowerment (Armenakis and Harris, 2002; Goodman & Truss, 1982; Kotter, 1995) in Pitts (2006), trust toward organization (Peter & Waterman, 1982) in Kling (2004), personal factor, internal factor, external factor, and political factor (Nasir, et al., 2014). This research will discuss about the effect of task environment toward the employee's commitment to change and also aimed to know the mediation role of transformational leadership toward the relationship of the two variables.

Kreitner and Kinicki (2010) described that the power of organization external factor has a global effect and becomes one of the reasons why and organization or company evaluate the product or service they propose to the costumer. This condition pushes the company to immediately adapt the environment which will be successful if the employee has a commitment to change and to adapt with the environmental change.

According to Daft (2010), external environment of an organization has two layers. The first layer is general environment, and the second layer is task environment. General environment has several dimensions, such as: international, technology, socio cultural, law-politic, and natural dimension. Besides, in the next layer there is company's environment factor which is closer to the company that is task environment including the sectors that conduct daily transactions with the company and directly affect its basic operational and performance (Daft, 2010). Furthermore, Daft (2010) also explained that task environment including customer, competitor, supplier, and manpower market.

Fai (2005) in Lestari (2014) stated that the difference between two layers of organization external environment (general environment and task environment) is not clear

enough. In the context of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek for example, political-law factor in the general environment of the organization (Daft, 2010) cannot be said as general environment of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek because PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek is a state-owned enterprises (Badan Usaha Milik Negara/BUMN) which provides public facility and belongs to BUMN ministry. The connection between PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek with government policy is also stated in Perpres Number 83 Year 2011 about the assignment to PT. Kereta Api Indonesia as a parent company of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek to provide the media and infrastructure for Soekarno-Hatta airport railway and the ring road of Jakarta-Bogor-Depok-Tangerang-Bekasi, so the government policy is clearly and directly affecting the company's operationalization. Appropriate with the consideration that has been mentioned before, the writer will add government policy factor as one of the four task environment factors (customer, competitor, supplier, and manpower market) as mentioned by Daft (2010).

Company's external environmental change which is very dynamic makes the organization need to be on the very high readiness level to face the change. The role of company or organization leader in this case has a quite significant influence in the changing process. Yukl (2010) stated that leading change is one of the most important and difficult leadership responsibilities. This is the main point of leadership that turns away other matters. It needs and effective leadership to revitalized an organization and to ease the adaptation toward the changing environment. Herold, et al. (2008) in his research found that transformational leadership has a stronger relationship than change leadership toward the employee's commitment to change. And so the study conducted by Gelaidan and Ahmad (2013) that transformational leadership affect the employee's commitment to change (normative).

Organization environment rapidly changes and becomes more uncertain that demands a new approach in planning and controlling strategy, more flexibility, learning, and improvisation (Bettis & Hitt, 1995; Brown & Eisenhardt, 1998; Vera & Crossan, 2004b, 2005 dalam Crossan, Vera, & Nanjad, 2008). Later, new types of organizations will be developed, the new network and cell will also be formed (Miles, Snow, Mathews, Miles, & Coleman, 1997 in Crossan, Vera, & Nanjad, 2008). Crossan, Vera, Nanjad (2008) mentioned that this kind of situation needs a leader role to prepare his organization to face the complex and changing situation of organization environment.

Through this research, the role of a leader in articulating external situation of an organization will be tested as a mediator variable. This research is hoped to find out whether transformational leadership plays role in the relationship between task environments with the employee's commitment to change. The situation and condition of the company's environment will be the reason for the company's leader to strengthen the change planning or initiative. Through the inspirational motivation dimension of transformational leadership, a leader will be able to form and to build team spirit by giving knowledge about the environment change which needs a commitment to change of the entire element of the company including its employees. With intellectual stimulation dimension, the leader will be able to stimulate innovative and creative ideas from the employee to take a part in facing the change happens in the company's business environment. Furthermore, in order to make the change planned by the management runs well, it is important for the leader to be a real example for the organization change (idealized influence dimension) for the employees in facing or running the change plan.

The planned change that has been run as a form of environment adaptation by the company probably cause resistance which possibly caused by many things such as the fear of power loss (Cummings and Worley, 2008) or the steadiness character that has been long accustomed because there is no change policy before. In this condition a transformational leader can do a personal approach to their employees (individual consideration dimension) by acting as a mentor (Bass and Avolio, 1994).

In their previous study, Beugre, et al. (2006) found that transformational leadership is not only personal character of a leader, but also stimulated by the environment faced by the organization. In a relative dynamic company environment, transformational leadership will be

more appropriate. A study by Waldman, et al. (2001) also found that the situation faced by the company has a strong effect on the company leadership and performance style. The study explained that charismatic behavior in idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership that belonged by the leader strongly influences the performance of the company on a high level of uncertainty. In other side, a study by Herold, et al. (2008) found that transformational leadership has direct influence toward the employee's commitment to change compared with change leadership. That is why from the two previous study can be concluded that transformational leadership becomes mediator variable between business environment and employee's commitment to change.

Concerned with direct relationship between of the company toward the employee's commitment to change, a study by Nasir, et al. (2014) found that there are 4 factors that influence the employee's commitment to change which are: external, politic, personal, and internal factor. External factor consists of: technology, government pressure, business competition, and global trade. So it can be said that external environment of the company can directly influence the employee's commitment to change. Looking at the relationship between two relevant variables, that is how the condition of company environment can influence the perception or mindset of the employee's commitment to change, and so the vital role of a leader in building the character of the down liner or the employee in adapting the change, this research aims to know more about the relationship of task environment toward the commitment to change of the employees of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek and also to know what is the role of transformational leadership between those two variables.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Definition and Dimension of Commitment to Change. Herscovitch & Meyer (2002) defined that commitment to change is a mindset that is needed by someone to reach the targeted change. Kling (2004) explained that commitment to change can be definitively described as a certain act of an employee based on their conscious choice.

A research by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) results three components of commitment to change, that are: affective commitment to change, continuence commitment to change, dan normative commitment to change. Here are the explanations of each component:

- Affective commitment to change. That is a commitment to change based on the belief that there will be benefit of the change, so the employees *want to* change by their own willingness.
- Continuence commitment to change. That is a commitment to change that refers to a consciousness that there will be certain cost appears if they do not support the change of the organization, so the employees *needs to* do the change to avoid the cost.
- Normative commitment to change. That is the commitment to change based on the feeling of obligation for being a part of organization, so the employees *have to* support the change of the organization. Normative commitment to change is also implied on someone's performance behavior. They may do the same thing as the other employees with affective commitment to change, but they consider it as a part of organization task they carry out.

Definition and Dimension of Task Environment. External environment of an organization according to Daft (2010) can be divided into two, they are general environment and task environment. General environment consists of all dimensions that influence the company by the time, but not directly deal often with daily transaction. General environment includes international, technology, social and culture, economic, law-politic, and natural sectors. Meanwhile, task environment is the external environment which is closer to the company and includes the sectors that conducts daily transaction with the company and directly influences its basic operational and performance. Task environment generally includes competitor, supplier, customer, and manpower market (Daft, 2010). Task environment is the external environment which is closer to the company and includes the sectors that conducts daily transaction with the company and directly influences its basic

operational and performance (Daft, 2010). Dill (1958) and Thorelli (1967) in Osborn and Hunt (1974) explained that task environment is parts of organization environment which relevant or potential to influence the determination or achievement of organization's goal.

Dess & Beard (1984) mentioned that environment uncertainty can be formed from the three dimensions of task environment which are: munificence, complexity, and dynamism as explained below:

- Munificence (capacity). Munificence environment refers to the environment's ability to support the organization continuous growth (Starbuck's, 1976 in Dess & Beard, 1984). Dess & Beard (1984) explained that munificence is an environment that rich of resources and has enough ability to support organization's growth. That is why in the context of capacity, munificence is described as rare or abundant of important resource that is needed by one or more companies that operate in one environment (Castrogiovanni, 1991). The abundant of resource will make a company is possible to survive and grow in the environment, and also impacts toward the ability of a new company to come into the industry (Randolph & Dess, 1984 in Castrogiovanni, 1991).
- Complexity (homogeneity – heterogeneity, concentration – dispersion). Dess & Beard (1984) described complexity as heterogeneity and concentration of a series of company's activity. Child (1972) in Dess & Beard (1984) stated that environment complexity is about how heterogenic the coverage of organization activity is. A manager who faces a complex environment will experience a bigger uncertainty rather than the one who face a simple environment (Duncan, 1972; Pennings, 1975; Tung 1979; in Dess & Beard, 1984)
- Dynamism (stability – instability, turbulence). Dynamism can be described as uncertainty and instability of the environment which is unpredictable (Goll & Rashed, 2004). Dess and Beard (1984) stated that dynamism is related with instability of the environment and positively related with uncertainty. So it can be defined that the more unstable an environment's condition the organization will be more flexible to face it. This causes the organization will always be confronted to the need in the changing of strategy, structure, process, and culture.

Definition and Dimension of Transformational Leadership. Burns (1978) and Bass (1985;1996) in Boga & Ensari (2009) formulated the theory of leadership defined into two types in the matter of the way to influence the employee's behavior that is transformational and transactional leadership. Burns (1978) in Herold & Fedor, Caldwell, Liu (2008) transformational leadership attracts their employee's sympathy more with the values and makes them able to see the higher vision and also push them to make a bigger effort the reach the vision.

Nadler & Trushman (1990) in Boga & Ensari (2009) added that transformational leadership is more about the fulfillment psychological needs that strengthen the motivation and dedication of the people they lead. Transformational leadership aims to wider and increase attention of the people they lead, to stimulate consciousness and support of their follower to reach the mutual or organization goal, and also to motivate them to not only consider their self interest (Bass, 1985, 1997; Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; House 1976 in Boga & Ensari, 2009). Meanwhile, transactional leadership is more involving an exchange process and leader request but not resulting enthusiasm and commitment to toward the task target (Bass, dalam Yukl, 2010).

As it is mentioned before that transformational leadership is more focused on leading a change. Transformational leadership is defined as a set of ability that makes a leader to be able to comprehend the need of change, to create the vision which convoys and brings the change, and to run the change effectively (Ebert & Griffin, 2013). Boal & Byrson (1988) in Boga & Ensari (2009) stated that, especially during the time of change, transformational leadership tends to be more effective in coping the crisis and to adapt the change that has to be run by the organization.

Furthermore, there are four characteristics of transformational leadership, which are: Charisma or idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and

inspiration/motivation (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Fuller, Patterson, Hester, & Stringer, 1996 in Boga & Ensari, 2009).

METHODS OF RESEARCH

Descriptive statistic is statistic used to analyze the data by describing or depicting collected data as what it is without aiming to make general conclusion or generalization (Sugiyono, 2014). This analysis used by counting the mean value on every construct or latent variable interpreted in 3 categories according to Levine, et al. (2011).

The categorization could be explained through Table 2.

Table 2 – Mean Category Interpretation

Mean Value	Explanation
1,00 – 2,66	Low
2,67 – 4,33	Medium
4,34 – 6,00	High

Source: Levine et al (2011).

In this research, descriptive analysis would be used in interpreting the result of every research construct or latent variable that are: Task Environment, Transformational Leadership, Affective commitment to change, continuance commitment to change dan normative commitment to change.

Multivariate analysis in this research aimed to confirm, that was the analysis used to test the hypothesis developed based on the existed theory (Hair et al., 2013). SEM-PLS analysis was more effective to test the connection among the complex variables. SEM-PLS was appropriate to use if the researcher aimed to wider the existed theory (Solihin, et al., 2014). In this research, SEM-PLS was used with WarpPLS application because WarpPLS was able to directly give coefficient result and p value for moderation model (Solihin, et al. 2014). In this research, transformational leadership would be tested its role as a mediator.

The first hypothesis of this research was developed based on the study by Nasir, et al. (2014) that revealed that external factor could influence the commitment to change of the employees. That was why external environment which in this research was explained by task environment was considered directly affected toward every type of commitment to change.

Therefore, H1 was described as follows:

- H1a: Task environment (munificence, complexity and dynamism) variable directly affected toward affective commitment to change;
- H1b: Task environment (munificence, complexity and dynamism) variable directly affected toward continuance commitment to change;
- H1c: Task environment (munificence, complexity and dynamism) variable directly affected toward normative commitment to change.

The next hypothesis was developed from a study by Beugre, et al. (2006) that transformational leadership style was not only a leader's personal character but also stimulated by business environment. That was why the hypothesis about the connection among business environments which in this research was explained by task environment with transformational leadership was considered to have positive influence and connection. Therefore, H2 was described as follows:

H2: Task environment positively influence transformational leadership.

The next hypothesis was developed from a study by Herold, et al. (2008) who found that transformational leadership had a bigger influence toward the commitment to change of the employees. That was why this third hypothesis (H3) considered that transformational leadership affected every types of the employee's commitment to change. Therefore, H3 was described as follows:

H3a: Transformational leadership variable affected toward the employee's affective commitment to change.

H3b: Transformational leadership variable affected toward the employee's continuance commitment to change.

H3c: Transformational leadership variable affected toward the employee's normative commitment to change.

The population of this research was the settled employee of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek (PT.KCJ) in the executor lever (staff 2 – senior supervisor) who were located in the Juanda Station head office per May 2015 as many as 101 persons.

The number of sample in this research was referred on the approach by Cohen (1992) who considered statistical power and effect size while deciding sample minimum size. Cohen (1992) in Sholihin (2013) gave the guidelines about deciding sample size for SEM-PLS model with table 1.5 (Sholihin, 2013 pp. 13) by determining how many arrows directed toward a construct, and then looking at the wanted significant level. In this research the most arrows directed toward the construct was 4 and the researcher wanted 0.05 for significance level (Hair, 2013). So it was got 42 for the number of minimum sample. The number of sample that was relatively small was not a problem in the research that used SEM-PLS because it was able to estimate the model with a quite high statistical power although the sample was small (Sholihin, 2013). In this research, the researcher distributed 101 questionnaires. However, because of the high mobility of the employee especially in the commercial and service division, the questionnaires returned by the respondents were only 68 (67.3%)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Perception Descriptive Analysis of Task Environment of the Respondent. The following Table 3 explains the average or mean value of each dimension of the respondent's perception about task environment.

Table 3 – Respondent's Perception Regarding Task Environment

Dimension	Mean Value	Explanation
Munificence	5,57	High
Complexity	4,91	High
Dynamism	3,56	Medium

From Table 3 it can be known that the munificence and complexity dimension has a high mean value that is 5.57 and 4.91. The high mean value of munificence describes that the respondents consider the company environment of PT. KCJ is in the situation with the resource that supports the company to grow and develop. Then, a high mean value is also seen on the complexity dimension. It can be meant that the respondents consider that PT. KCJ is in a relatively complex task environment with the mean value of 4.91. In other side, the respondents also consider that dynamism dimension in the company environment is not too high but also not too low or in other word is medium. The mean value of dynamism dimension is 3.56. It means that the respondents consider the task environment of the company does not have significant dynamic.

Descriptive Analysis of Commitment to Change of the Respondents. The following descriptive analysis will describe the condition of commitment to change of the employee. The mean value of each commitment to change dimension can be seen in the following Table 4.

Table 4 – The Condition of the Respondent's Commitment to Change in PT. KCJ

Dimension	Mean Value	Explanation
Affective Commitment to Change	5,17	High
Continuance Commitment to Change	3,39	Medium
Normative Commitment to Change	4,88	High

From Table 4, it is known that the higher mean value of the respondent is on the Affective Commitment to Change and Normative Commitment to Change dimension with the value of each is 5.17 and 4.88. Meanwhile, the mean value of Continuance Commitment to Change is in medium category with the value of 3.46. The high mean value of Affective Commitment to Change as mentioned by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) that Affective Commitment to Change is a commitment to change which based on the belief that there will be benefits they can get from the change. The second higher value is Normative Commitment to Change with the mean value of 4.88. Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) stated that the employee with normative commitment to change defines that they have a responsibility to support the change of the company because they feel that they are a part of the organization.

The next commitment to change dimension with mean value in medium category is Continuance Commitment to Change with the mean value of 3.39. The employee who has continuance commitment to change, according to Herscovitch and Meyer (2002), tends to support the change of the company because they consider that they will face certain loss if they do not support the change of the company.

Descriptive Analysis of Transformational Leadership of the Respondent. Here is the explanation about the result of mean value of transformational leadership variable. The mean value of transformational leadership can be seen in the following Table 5.

Table 5 – The Value of Respondent's Perception About "Transformational Leadership" Leadership Style

Variable	Mean Value	Explanation
Transformational Leadership	5,01	High

The mean value of transformational leadership is considered high with the value of 5.01. It means that the respondent considers the leadership style of the higher leader in their working unit has transformational leadership style which is relatively high. In the process of company transformation it needs an effective leadership to run the company transformation program and to ease the adaptation process toward a changing environment. Ebert and Griffin (2013) stated that transformational leadership focuses on the importance of leading a change (the opposite of leadership in a stable period). The high assessment of the respondent toward the style of their leader which is reflected in mean value of transformational leadership which is considered high proves that according to the respondent, leadership style of PT. KCJ leader is able to guide the transformation of the company.

Relationship Analysis of Task Environment (Munificence, Complexity, Dynamic), Transformational Leadership and Affective Commitment to Change. The following analysis is aimed to find out how is the relationship between Munificence, Complexity and Dynamism simultaneously (Task Environment) toward Normative Commitment to Change mediated by oleh Transformational Leadership.

The result of the relationship analysis can be seen in the following Figure 2.

Figure 2 – The Role of Transformational Leadership Mediation Toward the Relationship Between Task Environment (Munificence-Complexity-Dynamism) and Affective Commitment to Change

Figure 2 explains the relationship between task environment and affective commitment to change mediated by transformational leadership. From Figure 1.2 it can be described that direct relationship between task environment and affective commitment to change is not significant because the value of $P=0.31$. A relationship between two variables can be said as significant if the value of $P<0.05$. Therefore, H1a cannot be supported. The non-significant direct relationship between task environment and affective commitment to change in this research is not appropriate with the result of a study by Nasir, et al. (2014) who stated that external factors influence the commitment to change of a company's employee so the relationship can be tested by representing a mediator variable that is transformational leadership. This is in accordance with the study by Beugre, et al. (2006) that transformational leadership styled can be stimulated by external environment and also a study by Herold, et al. (2006) which stated that transformational leadership has a stronger influence toward the employee's commitment to change compared to change leadership, so with the argumentations it can be said that transformational leadership can be a mediator variable and can be tested. The role of transformational leadership in the relationship between task environment and affective commitment to change can be seen from the significance of P value between task environment and transformational leadership and the significance of P value between transformational leadership and affective commitment to change. Figure 2 explains that P value is significant ($P<0.01$) on the relationship between task environment and transformational leadership. The R squared value of transformational leadership is 0.30. It explains that 30% of transformational leadership variable can be described by task environment variable. Therefore H2 can be supported. It is appropriate with the study by Beugre, et al. (2006) that company environment significantly influence transformational leadership style.

The same condition happens in the relationship between transformational leadership and affective commitment to change which is significant with the value of $P<0.01$. The squared R value of affective commitment to change is 0.14. It means that 14% of affective commitment to change variable is explained by transformational leadership so H3 can be supported. Therefore from Figure 4 it can be concluded that transformational leadership variable fully mediates the relationship between task environment and affective commitment to change. The following Table 6 shows that the value of indirect effect of task environment toward affective commitment to change mediated by transformational leadership is 0.165.

Table 6 – The Counting of Indirect Effect Value of Task Environment toward Affective Commitment to Change

Path	Counting	Indirect Effect Value
TaskEnv-TrnsLead-ACC	0.55×0.30	0.165

This indirect effect value is relatively lower than indirect effect value of indirect relationship between task environments with normative commitment to change (0.214). It means that although indirect effect value of this relationship is not higher than indirect effect value of normative commitment to change but leadership approach conducted by the leaders in the management of PT. KCJ is relatively successful to make their employee to have commitment to change which comes from themselves that is by making them feel as a part of the organization and they can see the benefit they will get if they support the company change.

Relationship Analysis of Task Environment (Munificence, Complexity, Dynamic), Transformational Leadership and Continuance Commitment to Change. The following analysis is aimed to find out how is the relationship between Munificence, Complexity and Dynamism simultaneously (Task Environment) toward Continuance Commitment to Change mediated by oleh Transformational Leadership.

The result of the relationship analysis can be seen in the following Figure 3.

Figure 3 – The Role of Transformational Leadership Mediation toward the Relationship Between Task Environment (Munificence-Complexity-Dynamism) and Continuance Commitment to Change

Figure 3 explains the relationship between task environment and continuance commitment to change mediated transformational leadership. From Figure 1.3 it can be described that direct relationship between task environment and continuance commitment to change is not significant with the value of $P=0.29$. Therefore H1b cannot be supported. Continuance commitment to change can be more described through mediator variable that is transformational leadership. Figure 3 explains that the significant P value ($P<0.01$) in the relationship between task environment and transformational leadership and then the relationship between transformational leadership and continuance commitment to change is significant with the value of $P=0.03$ but with negative relationship (beta value) that is -0.27 . Therefore, from Figure 3 it can be concluded that transformational leadership variable fully mediates the relationship between task environment and continuance commitment to change. With this result hypothesis H3b can be supported. The following Table 7 shows that the value of indirect effect of task environment toward continuance commitment to change mediated by transformational leadership is -0.149 .

Table 7 – The Counting of Indirect Effect Value of Task Environment toward Continuance Commitment to Change

Path	Counting	Indirect Effect Value
TaskEnv-TrnsLead-ACC	0.55×-0.27	-0.149

The significant and negative indirect relationship between task environment and continuance commitment to change is actually bring benefits for PT. KCJ. It is appropriate with the study by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) that the lower continuance commitment to change of the employee, the bigger support toward the change of the company. The value of negative indirect effect can also be described that transformational leadership is inversely related with continuance to change. Continuance type of commitment to change which is relatively transactional is not appropriate enough with transformational leadership which tends to motivate the follower from inside themselves and not a provocation which is transactional.

Figure 4 – The Role of Transformational Leadership Mediation toward the Relationship Between Task Environment (Munificence-Complexity-Dynamism) and Normative Commitment to Change

Relationship Analysis of Task Environment (Munificence, Complexity, Dynamic), Transformational Leadership and Normative Commitment to Change. The following analysis is aimed to find out how is the relationship between Munificence, Complexity and Dynamism simultaneously (Task Environment) toward Normative Commitment to Change mediated by oleh Transformational Leadership. The result of the relationship analysis can be seen in the following Figure 4.

Figure 4 explains the relationship between task environment and normative commitment to change mediated by transformational leadership. From Figure 1.4 it can be described that direct relationship between task environment and normative commitment to change is not significant with the value of $P=0.21$. Therefore H1c cannot be supported. This result can be defined that the employee's commitment to change does not immediately change because of the business environment but there is company's internal factor that stimulates the commitment to change of the employee. This research proves that condition through mediator variable that comes from the company's internal that is transformational leadership. Figure 4 explains that P value ($P<0.01$) is significant in the relationship between task environment and transformational leadership. The relationship between transformational leadership and normative commitment to change is also significant with the value of $P<0.01$. And then R squared value of normative commitment to change is 0.28. It means that normative commitment to change variable can be 28% explained by transformational leadership variable.

Therefore from Figure 4 it can be concluded that transformational leadership variable fully mediates the relationship between task environment and normative commitment to change. It means that hypothesis H3c can be supported. The following Table 8 shows that indirect effect value of task environment toward normative commitment to change mediated by transformational leadership is 0.214.

Table 8 – The Counting of Indirect Effect Value of Task Environment toward Normative Commitment to Change

Path	Counting	Indirect Effect Value
TaskEnv-TrnsLead-NCC	0.55×0.39	0.214

The value of indirect effect of indirect relationship of task environment toward normative commitment to change is 0.214. This value is bigger than the value of indirect effect between task environment and affective commitment to change.

Table 9 – Recapitulation of the Hypothesis Test Result

H	Variable Relationship	Hypothesis Description	Result
H1a	TaskEnv- ACC	Task Environment directly affects Affective commitment to change of the employee of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek	REJECTED
H1b	TaskEnv-CCC	Task Environment directly affects Continuance commitment to change of the employee of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek	REJECTED
H1c	TaskEnv- NCC	Task Environment directly affects Normative commitment to change of the employee of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek	REJECTED
H2	TaskEnv-TrnsLead	Task environment (munificence, complexity and dynamism) variable affects Transformational leadership	ACCEPTED
H3a	TrnsLead – ACC	Transformational leadership variable affects Affective commitment to change of the employee of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek	ACCEPTED
H3b	TrnsLead – CCC	Transformational leadership variable affects Continuance commitment to change of the employee of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek	ACCEPTED
H3c	TrnsLead – NCC	Transformational leadership variable affects Normative commitment to change of the employee of PT. KAI Commuter Jabodetabek	ACCEPTED

It agrees with the study by Gelaidan and Ahmad (2013) that transformational leadership has a significant relationship with normative commitment to change. R squared value in normative commitment to change which is bigger that in affective commitment to change that is 0.28 can be defined that transformational leadership approach of the leaders

(VP) in the management of PT. KCJ is able to stimulate the sense of belonging of the employee toward the company as a basis in supporting the change of the company.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the analysis that has been previously discussed about the effect of task environment toward commitment to change mediated by transformational leadership, the writer enclose the conclusion into 2 following points as the answer of the problem of the study, they are:

- Task environment does not have significant relationship toward all dimensions of commitment to change (affective, continuance, normative).
- The dimensions of task environment simultaneously have indirect relationship with all dimension of commitment to change (affective, continuance, normative) through transformational leadership. There is one indirect relationship which is negative that is indirect relationship between task environment and continuance commitment to change.

Here are the suggestions from the writer for further researcher:

- For further researcher who wants to conduct a research about this topic they can do their research in a company with a high industry attractiveness so there will be a comparison of commitment to change between the employees in the industry with high level competition and those in the industry with relatively low level competition. So it will be known how much task environment and leadership in affect the employee's commitment to change in the different types of industry.
- This research is a beginning to find out how company environment affects the employee's commitment to change through the leadership style of the company. So the further researcher can enrich the discussion of this topic by adding other variables such as reward and recognition, empowerment, or other types of leadership style.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, D., Anderson, L. A. (2009). How to Increase Employee Commitment to Change. Article. Oak Drive: Being First, Inc.
2. Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2006). Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktis. Edisi revisi VI. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
3. Ayoko B. Oluremi & Victor J. Callan. (2010). Teams reaction to conflict and teams task and social outcomes: The moderating role of transformational leadership and emotional leadership .European management journal 28, 220-235.
4. Beugre D., (2006). Transformational Leadership in organizations: an Environment-induced model. International Journal of Man Power.
5. Vol 27. No. 1, 2006.
6. Boga, I., (2009). The Role of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Change on Perceived Organizational Success. The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 12: 235–25.
7. Castrogiovanni, G. J. (1991). Environmental munificence: A theoritical assessment. Academy of Management Review, 16 (3), 542-565.
8. Chiun Lo, May., Ramayah T., Ernest Cyril de Run. (2010). Does transformational leadership style foster commitment to change? The Case of Higher education in Malaysia.. Procedia Social and Behavioral Science 2 (2010) 5384-5388.
9. Crossan, Marry., Dusya V., Len Nanjad. (2008). Transcendent leadership: Strategic leadership in dynamic environments. The Leadership Quarterly 19 (2008) 569–581.
10. Cummings, T. G. & Worley, C. G. (2008). Organizational development and Change. 9th Ed. Canada: South-Western Cengage Learning.
11. Daft, R. L. (2010). Era Baru Manajemen. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
12. Dess, G. G. & Beard, D. W. (1984). Dimensions of organizational task environment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 29 (1). 52-73.
13. Ebert, R. J. (2013). Business Essentials. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Limited.

14. Fai, C. L. (2005). Perceive external environment and individual decision making in school. Dissertation. The Chinese University of Hong kong. Hongkong.
15. Gelaidan, H. M., (2014). The Factors Effecting Employee Commitment to Change in Public Sector: Evidence from Yemen. *International Business Research*; Vol. 6, No. 3.
16. Ghozali, I. (2005). Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program SPSS. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
17. Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R. & Black, W. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis*. 7th Ed. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
18. Hair, J., Black, J.W., Babin., Anderson R.E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. 4th Ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
19. Herold, D. M. & Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S., Liu, Y. (2008). The Effects of Transformational and Change Leadership on Employees' Commitment to a Change: A Multilevel Study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 93, No. 2, 346–357.
20. Herscovitch, L. & Meyer, C. G. (2002). Commitment to Organizational Change : Extension of a Three- Component Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 474-487.
21. Jansen, J.P. Justin., Gerard George., Frans A. J. Van den Bosch & Henk W. Volberda. (2008). Senior team attributes and organizational ambidexterity: The moderating role of transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Studies* 45:5 July.
22. Jun, Liu., Fu Pingping, Wu Weiku. (2008). Firm Environment, Leader Behaviors, And Leadership Effectiveness: An Interactive Model. *Front. Bus. Res. China* 2008, 2(1): 50-66
23. Kling, A. S. (2004). Commitment to Organizational Change: Assessing the Effect of Identifying Benefit to Change and Its Relationship With Organizational Trust .Dissertation. Copyright 2005 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
24. Kumako, K. Stephen & Maxwell A. Asumeng. (2013). Transformational leadership as a moderator of the relationship between psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams in Ghana. *AOSIS OpenJoernals*.
25. Kunze, F., (2010). Age-Based faultlines and perceived productive energy: The moderation of Transformational Leadership . *Small Group Research* 41(5) 593-620.
26. Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A. (2010). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: Mc.Graw-Hill.
27. Lestari, Dian. (2014). Pengaruh Task Environment dan Organizational Trust terhadap Commitment to Change. Thesis. Jakarta: University of Indonesia.
28. Levine, D.M., Stephan, D.F, Krehbiel, T.C, Berenson, M.L (2011). *Statistic for Managers: using microsoft excel*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
29. Meyer, J. P., Srinivas, E. S. Lal, J. B., & Topolnytsky, L. (2007). Employee Commitment and support for an organizational change: Test of the Three Component model in two cultures. *Journal of occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 80(2), 185-211.
30. Malhotra, N.K. (2010). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*. 6th Edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
31. Nasir, M. Hafiz., Ali Fazal Abbas., Fareega Zafar. (2014). Four factors to influence organization and & employee commitment to change within pakistan. *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, Vol. 6, No.4, 2014.
32. Osborn, N. Richard., James G. (1974). Environment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative science quarterly*, Vol. 19, No.2, June 1974.
33. Robbins, S. P. (2001). *Organizational Behavior*. 9th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
34. Sarwono, J. (2006). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif & Kualitatif*. Jogjakarta: Graha Ilmu.
35. Solihin, M. & Ratmono, D. (2014). Analisis SEM-PLS dengan WarpPLS 3.0 untuk hubungan non-linear untuk penelitian sosial dan bisnis. Jogjakarta: AndiPublisher.
36. Subramanian, R., Kumar, K. & Yauger, C. (1994). The scanning of Task Environments in Hospitals: An empirical study. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 10 (4), 104115.
37. Sugiyono (2014). *Metode penelitian bisnis*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
38. Waldman, David A., Gabriel G. Ramirez, Robert J. House, and Phanis Puranam. (2001). Does Leadership Matter? CEO Leadership attributes and Profitability Under Condition of Perceived Environmental Uncertainty. *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 1 (Feb., 2001), pp. 134 – 143.
39. Yukl, G. (2010). *Kepemimpinan Dalam Organisasi*. Jakarta: PT. Indeks.