Leadership Change and Cultural Planning: A Private University Case Study in Indonesia

Boedi Hartadi Kuslina[*]
Management Department, Faculty of Economics-Maranatha Christian University

Jahja Hamdani Widjaja
Management Department, Faculty of Economics-Maranatha Christian University

ABSTRACT

University is a unique organization because of its paradox nature. It is a non-profit oriented and a business institution at the same time. The paradox necessitates Chancellors and Deans in self-funded private universities including those in Indonesia to act as a leader and a manager. Very often, the periodic leadership leads to turbulent times in private universities. New leaders with their visions, styles, expectations, and working habit might create conflict within the organization that hurts performance. Cultural diagnosis and analysis will help leaders to manage and solve the conflict that would lead to a better performance of the organization. In most cases, organizational culture lives longer than leaders and incongruence might happen between new leaders and the culture that will raise problems. The gap between leadership changes and the culture could be solved if the culture is intentionally planned. This essay explores the relationship between leadership change and organizational culture in a private university. Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) was applied to mapping organizational culture and focus group discussions were conducted to validate and probe deeper information. Result of the study shows that not all leadership changes lead to the rising of different culture. In leadership change situation, leaders are the people who are responsible to intentionally plan the culture for the benefit of the organization.

Key words: Organizational culture, Leadership change, Planned culture, Private university

1. INTRODUCTION

University, by its nature, is a paradox; a business organization on one side and a non-profit oriented organization on the other side. This happens because of university's role in different social contexts along the history (Bridgman, 2007). University's role and function have evolved from a spirituality and knowledge institution into a research institution that also takes business into its consideration. University's business purpose can sometimes sacrifice authority of faculties to develop science and knowledge for the sake of its clients' needs which are usually companies (Murphy, 2005; Bridgman, 2007). This situation leads Chancellor and Dean to perform two roles, leader and

manager. As a leader, Chancellor and Dean have to set vision, ethical and moral standard, and symbol for university. As a manager, Chancellor and Dean have to allocate resources effectively and efficiently to create satisfying organizational performance (McLaughlin, 2004; Bridgman, 2007).

As a manager and leader, Chancellor and Dean practise managerial strategies and tools such as strategic planning, quality management, benchmarking, performance management and other managerial tools to gain good organizational as well as faculty performance. Cameron and Quinn (2006), however, show that many business entities fail to improve their performance through the application of those tools because of lack of consideration on organizational culture. The important role of organizational culture is further highlighted by Schein (2003), stating that managing the culture as part of organizational strategies will lead to good organizational and individual performance. In university setting, having the "right culture" is considered central in improving university and staff performance (Connolly et al., 2011). And, the paradox nature of university will affect how university operates as well as how staff and faculties assume, think, and behave as part of university's culture.

Leadership in university has an important role which includes defining goals and directing faculties to achieve them, being a role model for faculties and symbol for organization, providing empowerment to group members, and some other roles that can be summarized as radical change agent for the organization (Ekman et.al, 2017; Zulfqar et.al, 2016). As a change agent and goals setter of university, leadership is essential for university performance as well as individual performance. Leadership change thus becomes a crucial part for university, especially since leadership change has the potential to create conflict among organization that will suffer organizational performance.

The study of leadership and culture has long been a research topic in business (Schein, 2004). Conducting the study on university setting provides a challenge because of university's unique nature. Furthermore, leadership change study and its relationship to the dynamics of university culture, especially in private university, is rare. The essay is based on a study of organizational culture based on Competing Values Framework (CVF)/Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) developed by Cameron and Quinn (2006) which was applied in Maranatha Christian University. The study was conducted in 2015 and 2016 when there was a leadership change in the organization. The objective of the essay is to explore relationship among leadership change and organizational culture especially in organizational culture planning.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

High organizational performance is inherently the goal for every organization both profit and non-profit oriented, including university that has both orientations in nature. To have a high organizational performance is a very complicated process and it takes a great effort of the organization because of the many factors involved such as working process, member satisfaction, empowerment, governance, learning of members, organizational culture and other managerial and leadership factors. Above all, the two important factors are leadership and management of culture (Schein, 2004; Cameron and Quinn, 2006). For the purpose of this study, discussion of those two factors is limited in university setting.

2.1 Organizational Culture

McShane and Glinow (2000, in Choi et.al, 2010) define organizational culture as a pattern, shared values and assumptions that set organizational members to think and behave towards problems and opportunities the organization faces. Similarly, Schein (2004) divides organizational culture into three levels; artifacts, values, and assumptions. Artifacts are visible organizational structures and process such as physical design/environment, language, technology and products, rituals and visible behaviour of members. Values consist of norm, trust, strategic goals and philosophies of organization that conduct members to behave. While assumptions are unconscious, taken from granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts and feelings of organization and these are the ultimate source of values and actions. Schein therefore maintains that organizational culture is similar to character of a person on an organizational level.

Characteristics of organizational culture are transferable to new members through communication process, influence of other individuals, team and organization behavior (Schein, 2004). Culture can then be said to be formed from interaction among members and also leader- member exchange (Sepdiningtyas, 2017), with leaders playing a critical role in culture formation. Formal culture is formed through shared basic assumptions and learning the experience in solving problems of external adaptation and internal integration. Critical elements of assumptions, beliefs, and values could become a culture if they are stable in organization, deep for members and embedded in organization, cover all members of organization and penetrate in organization (Schein, 2004). Organizational culture is massive for organization as a whole, but organization has also sub-culture which lives in parts of organization such as in department, team and also non-formal groups (Siehl and Martin, 1984).

Organizational culture formation has some important steps and components (Schein, 2004). They first configure stable culture in teams and groups in order to establish sub-culture and later establish common culture in organization. The steps of culture formation are group formation, building, working, and maturity. Dominant assumptions and focus of group are developed in the steps. First, individuals are dependent and focus on self-orientation, and then they create fusion among members who focus on group as ideal object. After that they become working group that will perform effectively among the members and become stable within the group. Everyone knows each other and feels comfortable in the group and sees differences and creativity of members as a threat to preserving the culture.

Culture formation, based on Schein's theory (2004), is divided into two components. The first component is external adaptation that is how system in organization maintains relationship among people to adapt to the dynamics of external environment. Schein (2004) identifies five steps in external adaptation: (1) mission and strategy sharing, (2) developing consensus goals, (3) developing means that are implemented in structure, reward system and authority system, (4) measurement system development, and (5) correction system development. The second component is internal integration issue that is how members of group relate among them. Schein (2004) identifies six issues in internal integration: (1) creating a common language and concept, (2) defining boundaries and criteria for groups, (3) distributing power and status among members, (4) developing norms, intimacy, friendship and love, (5)

defining and allocating rewards and punishment, and (6) explaining the unexplainable such as ideology and religion.

Managing organizational culture, a leader or manager should look carefully at the culture formation process and components because culture is a dynamic process. Besides process and components, time (long and short term aspect of management) and space, and nature of individual and group relation should be considered important factors for the dynamics of organizational culture and cultural management.

2.2 Leadership in University

Leadership and management are topics that have recently attracted scholars, especially in university setting (Blaschke et.al, 2014). The topic is appealing because of the paradox of university that is a non-profit institution with business like management. Moreover, culture in university is unique because of its academic freedom and the barrier it has to face for the sake of management (Blaschke et.al, 2014; Bridgman, 2007). The contradicting nature of university creates a dilemma for Chancellor and Deans, whether to prioritize leadership or management role.

Bolman and Deal (2013 in Libby, 2016) propose a framework to cope with this contradiction between leadership and management role of Rector and Dean. Dealing with university as an organization, Rector and Dean should consider four frames: (1) structural frames (roles, team, formal relationship, policies, procedures), (2) human resources frames (people and needs, skills, relationship, attitudes), (3) political frames (power and conflict, competition and coalition) and, (4) symbolic frames (purpose and meaning, institutional culture, rituals, and symbols). The framework is a holistic approach to answer the paradox of university function in society.

Leadership in university can be summarized as follows. Leadership's role in university is to set academic vision and function of university in society, set an ethical and moral standard, and become a symbol of university in social context (McLaughlin, 2004; Bridgman, 2007). The purpose of leadership in university is a change agent to define university agenda to meet the need of citizen and market externally and to create enthusiasm and values in the organization (Ekman et.al, 2017). Similarly important is the image of leadership as a positive and inspiring phenomenon, adding moral, aesthetic and spiritual qualities to the exercise of functionalist managerial techniques (Currie and Lockett, 2007 in Ekman et.al, 2017).

Leadership styles in organizational theory are generally divided into transactional, transformational and leader-member exchange (Sepdiningtyas, 2017). The predominant leadership style in university is transformational leadership (Lai, 2014 in Zulfqar, 2016). Podsakoff et al. (1990 in Zulfqar et.al, 2016) distinguishes six types of behaviour in transformational leadership: (1) articulating vision, (2) providing appropriate model, (3) fostering the acceptance of group goals, (4) high performance expectations, (5) providing individualized support, (6) intellectual stimulation. According to Schuster (1994 in Zulfqar et.al, 2016), transformational leaders transfer decision-making authority to their subordinates, empower staff, and collaborate with staff to define goals. The result of transformational leadership is assisting faculties in organization transformation especially in leadership change.

2.3 Competing Values Framework (CVF)

Competing Values Framework (CVF) (formulated by Quinn and Rohrbaugh in 1983) is a tool to identify effectiveness of organization through competing focus of organization-internal versus external and control versus flexibility (Yu and Wu, 2009). Cameron and Quinn (2006) in their research assert that the tool is to measure effectiveness and success criteria of organization and the model is now called Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI). In the model, there are four types of culture/organizational model: (1) Clan/ Human Resources Model, (2) Adhocracy/Open System Model, (3) Hierarchy/Internal Process Model, and (4) Market/Market Relational Goal Model. Picture 1 shows the CVF/OCAI model and the characteristics of each model.

Flexibility and Discretion

Culture type: Clan **Orientation**: Collaborative **Leader type**: Facilitator, mentor, team builder **Leadership role**: Motivator **Value drivers**: Commitment, communication, development **Theory of effectiveness**: Human development and participation produce effectiveness	**Culture type**: Adhocracy **Orientation**: Creative **Leader type**: Innovator, entrepreneur, visionary **Leadership role**: Vision setter **Value driver**: Innovative output, transformation, agility **Theory of effectiveness**: Innovation, vision, and new resources produce effectiveness
Culture type: Hierarchy **Orientation**: Controlling **Leader type**: Coordinator, monitor, organizer **Leadership role**: Analyzer **Value drivers**: Efficiency, timeliness, consistency and uniformity **Theory of effectiveness**: Control and efficiency with capable process produce effectiveness	**Culture type**: Market **Orientation**: Competing **Leader type**: producer, director **Leadership role**: Task master **Value drivers**: Market share, goal achievement, profitability **Theory of effectiveness**: Aggressively competing and customer focus produce effectiveness

Internal — External

Stability and Control

Picture 1. Competing Values Framework (CVF)
Source: Cameron and Quinn, 2006; Smart, 2003

The CVF /OCAI model enables an organization to have more than one culture, known as sub-culture in teams, department or groups. Still, the organization should have a dominant culture as a common/general culture (Cameron and Quinn (2006). There will be sub-cultures that enhance the dominant culture and those that oppose it. It is the role of leaders and managers to manage the dynamics of differences and congruence of culture among members (Schein, 2004).

Yu and Wu (2009) compare CVF/OCAI with other culture models such as Multidimensional Model of Organizational Culture (Hofstede et.al, 1990), Organizational Profile (O Reilly et.al, 1991) and Organizational Culture Inventory (Cooke and Rousseau, 1988) and conclude that CVF/OCAI has some advantages: (1) simple dimensional variable with wide implication, (2) high validity and reliability in many different cultures, (3) suitability in China and Asia, (4) extreme simplicity, clarity and comprehensiveness. Furthermore, Cameron and Quinn (2006) claim that

CVF/OCAI has been widely used in many industries and countries and also shows high validity and reliability. Learning the above facts, the instrument is also applicable in higher education institution like university.

2.4 Organizational Culture and Organizational Leadership and Management

Organizational culture has always been related to leadership, organizational management, capability to adapt to environment, performance and effectiveness (Choi et.al, 2010). Cameron and Quinn (2006) emphasize the importance of creating and managing organizational culture to develop organizational effectiveness. Colyer (2000, in Choi et.al, 2010) explains that organizational culture analysis is the first step in measuring performance and effectiveness and enhancing organizational values, goals and objectives in organization that has become the standard for performance measurement. In conclusion, organizational culture analysis is very important to develop organizational performance and promote organizational effectiveness in the long run (Choi et.al, 2010)

Papadimitriou and Taylor (2000, in Choi et.al, 2010) claim that analysis and diagnosis of organizational culture can help in conflict resolution in the organization both horizontally and vertically. Leaders can use the result to align different perceptions of organization members regarding objectives, means, and direction of the business. Managing organizational culture is important and has a positive role in the development of organizational performance. As Cameron and Quinn (2006) argue that congruence of members towards organizational culture will impact on the effectiveness. On the opposite, incongruence of members towards organizational culture will produce conflict and ineffectiveness. One role and task of leaders is to manage and create the right culture for the organization, as Schein (2004) contends that culture is created by leaders and should be managed to become more effective. Leaders should have the ability to understand and work with the culture. The ultimate act of leadership is to destroy culture when it is dysfunctional.

Based on his research in a university in the US, Suderman (2012) concludes that leaders can use the CVF /OCAI to manage perception in organization through comparison of recent perception and ideal perception of the members. Gap between leaders and members should be managed in order to have the right culture for organization. Schein (2004) proposes the model for culture formation that should consider process and components of culture formation. Considering CVF /OCAI as a tool, leadership role in the four types of culture differs. For instance, the role of leader in clan culture is to become motivator while in hierarchy is to organize and monitor. Smart (2003) recommends that leaders should be flexible to foster the four types of culture dynamics.

Mintzberg et.al (2003) argue that managing people who are experts and professionals such as those in university, a leader should have collegial-political culture (emphasizing on common goals without neglecting individual goals) and at the same time be bureaucratic without becoming centralistic. University has also been seen as a stable and mature organization with a complex situation. Bridgman (2007) maintains that university is post bureaucratic, meaning that university has freedom but at the same time has standard that demands accountability from society. The issue is also mentioned by Mintzberg et.al (2003) stating that university should coordinate thinking standard and professionalism standard of the professionals' (lecturers) which both are

lecturers' high autonomy. Blaschke et.al (2014) describe university as collegialism with new managerialism. It has autonomy and individual academic freedom and collective professionalism but at the same time shows bureaucratic dominance in market-like competition.

　　　Related to organizational life cycle, Cameron and Quinn (2006 in Yu and Wu, 2009) conclude CVF/OCAI as the following: (1) the first cycle - entrepreneurial stage whose characters are innovation, creativity in managing resources, adhocracy as the dominant culture, (2) the second cycle - collectivity stage when informal structure is developed and individual leadership emerges and high demand of commitment arises, clan culture is the dominant culture, (3) the third cycle - formalization stage whose characteristics are stable, focus on productivity, conservative. Procedure is very important and hierarchy culture is dominant and followed by market culture as market and profitability demand become higher, (4) the fourth cycle - elaboration stage where organization should be aware of and monitor external environment and also create newness and development in the internal organization, adhocracy becomes the dominant culture of this stage.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

The research is a case study in Maranatha Christian University, which experienced leadership change in 2016. Object of analysis was the university while unit of observation was the selected faculties which had completed the data collection and also university level. The main data resources were board of management of faculty and university level in two different leadership periods, board of management in 2015 and board of management in 2016. CVF/OCAI questionnaire developed by Cameron and Quinn (2006) was exercised and after data were collected, they were tabulated and analyzed into a meaningful result. The result was then confirmed with focus group discussion with the board to validate all the analysis until there was saturation of the answer. Unfortunately, there are three faculties that failed to complete the focus group discussion in 2016 and data of university board in 2015 could not be collected. Following this, six out of nine faculties were selected, while university still became the unit of analysis since comparison of university to faculties was needed for the analysis.

4. RESULT

4.1 Unit Analysis Profile

Maranatha Christian University is a private university in Bandung, Indonesia, which like other private universities are self-funded. Maranatha Christian University was established in 1965 by a Christian background foundation. The first faculty is Faculty of Medicine in 1965 followed by Faculty of Psychology, Faculty of Letter and Faculty of Engineering as the initial faculties. In 1985, Faculty of Economics was founded. In 2005 two more faculties were added, Faculty of Information Technology and Faculty of Art and Design followed by Faculty of Law and Faculty of Dentistry in 2008.

　　　Leadership in Maranatha Christian University is set traditionally by election system. About three to four months before the election, a committee is set up to arrange election for Rector. The committee will look for candidates from internal university and external resources that meet the requirements. After selected, candidates have to

present their visions and programs in front of Senate and Foundation members. After the presentation, Senate will decide the best three candidates and send the result to Foundation for final decision. Foundation members are the sole decision maker. The same process is also executed on faculty level with some differences on the presentation, election and decision. Dean candidates present their program to all faculty members who will afterwards elect the candidates on the same day. The newly elected Rector and Foundation members will then make the final decision on the faculty leaders.

In 2016, there was a minor change. A permanent department was set up to create leadership program to look for new leaders in the university. Recruitment system was made more professional by adding some selection processes and assessment. Faculty members still had a portion to elect Deans and the staff in faculty level. The difference is that Rector was the only decision maker for faculty level. For university level, the recruitment for Rector was almost the same with the traditional election system. Leadership period was four years and the same leader was not eligible for the same position for the second time.

The result of 2016 election is that Maranatha Christian University has new Rector and Vice Rectors. In this research, six faculties were chosen to represent organizational life cycle of the university; three of mature faculties (Medicine, Psychology, and Letter), one of growth or stabilize stage (Economics), and two faculties representing first cycle of organization (Law and Dentistry). All chosen faculties have new Deans except Faculty of Law and Faculty of Dentistry.

.

4.2 Findings

Data gathered from the six faculties and university (Rectorate) is presented in Table 1. The presentation is based on the two different periods of leadership. 2015 data was taken from the final year of the leadership period and 2016 data was from the initial year of the new leadership. Six faculties were selected because they represented organizational life cycle and provided complete data. Data of Rectorate of 2015 period was not available nonetheless Rectorate unit is still included in the table for the purpose of comparison.

Table 1. Organizational Culture Map of Selected Faculties and University

			2015				2016			
			Clan	Adho cracy	Market	Hierar chy	Clan	Adho cracy	Market	Hierar chy
Faculty of Medicine	Recent	Total	19	18	27	**37**	30	18	22	**31**
		Dean	0	5	30	**65**	30	20	17	**33**
		Others	22	19	26	**33**	29	17	23	**31**
	Expected	Total	**33**	23	23	22	**30**	20	22	28
		Dean	**50**	22	18	10	**30**	18	27	25
		Others	**29**	23	24	25	**30**	20	21	29
Faculty of Psychology	Recent	Total	26	19	22	**33**	**29**	20	23	28
		Dean	29	21	12	**38**	24	18	23	**35**
		Others	25	17	22	**36**	**29**	20	23	27
	Expected	Total	26	21	24	**29**	**30**	23	23	24
		Dean	28	18	19	**35**	**33**	24	23	20
		Others	26	21	24	**29**	**29**	23	24	24
Faculty of	Recent	Total	28	20	22	**31**	26	21	**28**	25

Letter		Dean	32	18	15	**35**	**37**	11	23	29
		Others	29	18	22	**31**	25	22	**29**	24
	Expected	Total	**28**	24	22	26	**34**	20	21	26
		Dean	25	25	25	25	**31**	18	23	28
		Others	**29**	24	20	27	**35**	20	20	25
Faculty of Economics	Recent	Total	24	21	25	**30**	25	20	25	**30**
		Dean	**45**	14	18	23	**39**	20	19	22
		Others	23	21	26	**30**	24	19	26	**31**
	Expected	Total	**30**	23	22	25	**32**	22	23	23
		Dean	**45**	7	18	30	**38**	20	19	23
		Others	**29**	24	23	24	**31**	23	24	22
Faculty of Law	Recent	Total	**32**	20	20	28	**31**	23	21	25
		Dean	25	24	23	**28**	**32**	26	20	22
		Others	**38**	20	20	22	**31**	21	22	26
	Expected	Total	25	25	**28**	22	**26**	**26**	24	24
		Dean	**28**	23	27	22	26	24	22	**28**
		Others	23	27	**28**	22	26	**27**	24	23
Faculty of Dentistry	Recent	Total	**35**	23	21	21	24	27	**28**	21
		Dean	22	**28**	26	24	22	22	**30**	26
		Others	**45**	21	14	20	24	**29**	27	20
	Expected	Total	**34**	21	21	25	**31**	22	21	26
		Dean	25	25	**26**	24	**28**	22	26	24
		Others	**38**	20	16	26	**32**	22	20	26
Rectorate	Recent	Total	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	26	22	23	**30**
		Rector	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	18	18	28	**35**
		Others	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	27	23	22	**28**
	Expected	Total	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	24	25	25	**26**
		Rector	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	23	**28**	**28**	23
		Others	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	24	25	24	**27**

Notes: bold type is dominant culture

Table 1 shows the perception gap between leaders (Dean and Rector) and the staff in board of management (Head of Departments and Vice Rectors) for recent perception and expected perception. Total represents perception of Dean and staff in the faculty or university. Numbers represent perception of the leaders regarding six variables of CVF/OCAI questions divided into four culture categories (Clan, Adhocracy, Market and Hierarchy). Numbers in bold type show the dominant culture and gap numbers among the culture category show how big the dominant culture is to the other cultures and the total number. The greater the gap between the second number and the dominant culture is, the stronger the dominant culture becomes. Likewise, the lesser the gap between the second number and the dominant culture is, the weaker the dominant culture becomes.

Dominant culture data from Table 1 is summarized in table 2.

Table 2. Dominant Culture of Faculties and University

			2015	**2016**
Faculty of Medicine	Recent	Total	Hierarchy	Hierarchy
		Dean	Hierarchy	Hierarchy
		Others	Hierarchy	Hierarchy
	Expected	Total	Clan	Clan
		Dean	Clan	Clan
		Others	Clan	Clan
Faculty of Psychology	Recent	Total	Hierarchy	Clan
		Dean	Hierarchy	Hierarchy
		Others	Hierarchy	Clan

	Expected	Total	Hierarchy	Clan
		Dean	Hierarchy	Clan
		Others	Hierarchy	Clan
Faculty of Letter	Recent	Total	Hierarchy	Market
		Dean	Hierarchy	Clan
		Others	Hierarchy	Market
	Expected	Total	Clan	Clan
		Dean	No Dominant culture	Clan
		Others	Clan	Clan
Faculty of Economics	Recent	Total	Hierarchy	Hierarchy
		Dean	Clan	Clan
		Others	Hierarchy	Hierarchy
	Expected	Total	Clan	Clan
		Dean	Clan	Clan
		Others	Clan	Clan
Faculty of Law	Recent	Total	Clan	Clan
		Dean	Hierarchy	Clan
		Others	Clan	Clan
	Expected	Total	Market	Clan/Adhocracy
		Dean	Clan	Hierarchy
		Others	Market	Clan
Faculty of Dentistry	Recent	Total	Clan	Market
		Dean	Adhocracy	Market
		Others	Clan	Adhocracy
	Expected	Total	Clan	Clan
		Dean	Market	Clan
		Others	Clan	Clan
Rectorate	Recent	Total	n.a	Hierarchy
		Rector	n.a	Hierarchy
		Others	n.a	Hierarchy
	Expected	Total	n.a	Hierarchy
		Rector	n.a	Adhocracy/Market
		Others	n.a	Hierarchy

Some findings can be summarized from Table 2; dominant culture of university and faculties as sub-cultures, congruence and incongruence of culture among faculties and Rectorate and between faculties and Rectorate, life cycle of the organization and leader changes aspect in Maranatha Christian University.

The dominant organizational culture in 2015 were mostly hierarchy in recent perception but expected to become a clan culture. In 2016, however, there were more varied perceptions in recent perception. The Rectorate saw hierarchy culture as the recent dominant culture. Only Faculty of Medicine and Economics shared the same recent perception with that of the Rectorate. For expected perception, most faculties expected clan culture while the Rectorate hierarchy culture.

There is a different perception between the old and the new leadership in treating their organization. The research shows that two faculties (Medicine and Economics) found that Rectorate of both leadership periods had hierarchy culture focusing on control through program and budget. Yet, four faculties showed a different perception towards the new leadership though the Rectorate saw themselves as hierarchy. Clan culture in expectation showed that faculties wanted to have more flexibility. There is incongruence between the Rectorate and the faculties which would probably raise a conflict between them especially in expected perception.

Most faculties had more congruence perception regarding the expected culture for both periods compared to perception of recent culture, except for the Rectorate and

Faculty of Law. However, it cannot be generalized that the expected perception is going to be more congruent compared to the recent culture.

Mature faculties such as Medicine and Letter had almost the same perception in expected culture for both leadership periods. It was the same case with Faculty of Economics. Nevertheless, the youngest two faculties, Law and Dentistry, showed more varied perceptions for both recent and expected perceptions. Mature faculties had more congruence compared to new faculties in both perceptions. This happened because the mature faculties were more stable internally compared to the new faculties.

Same leaders might have different perceptions regarding their perception about their organization. In the case of Faculty of Law and Dentistry, the same Dean showed different perception in 2015 and 2016 for both recent and expected culture. While in the faculties with new Deans, most Deans shared the same expectation with the old Deans.

5. DISCUSSION

Leadership and organizational culture cannot be separated as the function of leaders is to create and set up the culture. Concurrently, culture demands flexibility of leaders. Leadership changes sometimes need more time to adjust with the existing culture. In Maranatha Christian University case, changes in recruitment of leaders and leadership changes only bring a slight change towards the university recent culture, which is hierarchy culture. Only some faculties perceive different culture. The expected culture accentuates this. The majority expect a clan culture in the future. Expected culture seems more robust compared to recent dominant culture. This might happen because of different leaders and different external condition the leader has to face. The culture model of Maranatha Christian University is almost similar with collegial culture suggested by Mintzberg et.al (2003). When leaders deal with experts such as faculty members of a university, they should apply freedom (flexibility) and at the same time have bureaucracy and control which reflect hierarchy culture characteristics. The model will have high effectiveness in supporting organization performance, however, it still needs to be examined in order to find the 'right' culture for a university.

The problem occurs when the new Rector expects adhocracy and market oriented culture which is incongruent with his Vice Rectors and also most Deans. The incongruence might trigger conflict in the university and faculty level. A question has risen, should the Rector follow the subordinate culture or vice versa? Schein (2004) argues that the task of leader is to manage the culture and the ultimate act of leadership is to destroy the culture when it is dysfunctional. To plan the culture, a leader should consider process and elements of culture creation (external adaptation and internal integration) that Schein (2003) proposes. Smart (2003) also recommends that leader should blend the four cultures in balance to find the 'right' culture.

Organizational life cycle theory could show the 'right' culture through the stages that an organization experiences. A mature organization has a more stable and congruent culture. Based on the characteristics of culture stage, Maranatha Christian University is on formalization stage that has hierarchy or market culture (Yu and Wu, 2009). Maranatha Christian University should identify the exact position in the life cycle. If Maranatha Christian University is at the end of formalization stage, a new organizational culture will be needed to fit the organization to have a better performance.

External and internal condition will affect a leader to have a different perception regarding their culture organization. A leader should be flexible towards events in his/her environment. Schein (2003) maintains that culture has three levels. A leader should identify on which level the event could change the culture; artifact level, norm and values level, or assumption level. Interaction and communication are important vehicles in cultural planning and change. Transformational leadership is needed in the cultural change.

6. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER RESEARCH

As a mature organization, Maranatha Christian University has a stable organizational culture that is hierarchy culture in the recent perception and is expected to become clan culture in the future which Mintzberg et.al (2003) name collegial culture. Despite the Rector's different expectation, leadership change in the first year of leadership period does not change the culture yet. It is confirmed that in recent perception the Rector shares the same perception and impression regarding the organizational culture.

Incongruence in dominant culture should be treated as information for leaders in planning the organizational culture that creates and manages a new 'right' culture. Flexibility of leaders is prerequisite to find the new "right" culture through the right process of culture formation and the right leadership style.

Limitations of the research are (1) no availability of data of Rectorate of the preceding leadership period although the culture could be assumed as hierarchy culture, (2) time for data collection that could make the result reliability low as the preceding leadership is in its last year and the new leadership its first year, (3) qualitative approach of research that could not be generalized in different units of analysis.

Further research could be made on the same topic with better data collection method and timing. Also, planning organizational culture with intended specific culture is still a rare topic to examine.

REFERENCES
[1]   Ajzen, I. (2005), *Attitudes, personality and behavior*, Open University Press.McGraw-Hill, Berkshire, England.
[2]   Argote, L., McEvily B., Reagans, R. (2003), "Managing knowledge in organizations: An integrative framework and review of emerging themes", *Management Science*, 49, 571-582.
[3]   Blaschke, S., Frost, J., Hattke, F. (2014), "Towards a micro foundation of leadership, governance, and management in universities", *Higher Education*, 68, 711-732.
[4]   Bridgman, T. (2007), "Freedom and autonomy in the university enterprise", *Journal of Change Management*, 20, 478 – 490.

[5]   Cameron, K. S. & Quinn, R. E. (2006), *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on Competing Values Framework*, Jossey-Bass, San Fransisco.

[6]   Connolly, M, James, C., Beales, B. (2003), "Contrasting perspectives on organizational culture change in schools", *Journal of Educational Change*,.12, 421- 439.

[7]   Choi, S.Y., Seo, M., Scott, D., Martin, J. (2010), "Validation of the Organizational

[8]   Culture Assessment Instrument: An application of the Korean version", *Journal of Sport Management*, 24, 169 – 189.

[9]   Ekman, M. Lindgren, M., Packendorff, J., (2017), "Universities need leadership, academics need management: discursive tensions and voids in the deregulation of Swedish higher education legislation", *High Education* doi 10.1007/s10734-017-0140-2

[10]   Guerra, J.M. & Martinez, I. (2005), "A contingency perspective on the study of the consequences of conflict types: The role of organizational culture", *European Journal of Work And Organizational Psychology*, 14, 157-176.

[11]   Murphy,C. (2005), "The academy, spirituality, and the search for truth", *New Direction for Teaching and Learning*,104, Winter, 23 – 29.

[12]   McLaughlin, J. B. (2004), "Leadership, management, and governance", *New Direction for Teaching and Learning*, 128, Winter, 5 – 13.

[13]   Mintzberg, H., Lampel, J., Quinn, J.B., Ghoshal, S. (2003), *The strategy process: Concepts,   contexts, cases*, 4th edition, Pearson Education, Essex.

[14]   Morris, L. V. (2016), "Management and leadership in colleges and universities", *Innovative Higher Education*, 41, 1-3.

[15]   Schein, E. H.   (2004), *Organizational culture and leadership,* 3rd edition. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

[16]   Sepdiningtyas, R. & Santoso, C.B. (2017). "The influence of leader-member exchange on individual performance: The role of work engagement as a mediating variable and co-workers support as a moderating variable", *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 6, 285-305.

[17]   Smart, J.C. (2003), "Organizational effectiveness of 2 year colleges: The centrality of cultural and leadership complexity", *Research in Higher Education*, 44 (6), 673-703

[18]   Suderman, J. (2012), "Using the Organizational Cultural Assessment Instrument as a tool for new team development", *Journal of Practical Consulting*, 4 (1), Fall/Winter, 52-58.

[19]   Wu, J. Y.(2007). "A general behavior model and new definitions of organizational cultures", *Journal of Socio-Economics*, doi:10.1016/j.socec. 2007.10.002.

[20]   Yu, T. & Wu, N. (2009), "A review of study on Competing Values Framework", *International Journal of Business Management*, 14(7), 37 – 42.

[21]   Zulfqar, A., Valcke1, M., Devos, G., Tuytens, M., Shahzad, A. (2016), "Leadership and decision-making practices in public versus private universities in Pakistan", *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 17, 147–159.