

The Influence Of Leadership Style On Employee Performance At The Aimas District Office, Sorong Regency

Zulkifli Warwey^{1*}, Nur Aisyah Rimosan², Vebby Anwar³, Amiruddin⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Ilmu Management, Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong, 98457, Indonesia

Corresponding Author Email: pahmi@unimudasorong.ac.id

Abstract

The results of the analysis of the Leadership Style variable on Employee Performance show a significance value of (0.000), which means that there is a significant influence between Leadership Style and the Performance variable. The correlation coefficient value of $r = 0.414$ indicates that Leadership Style has a strong relationship with Employee Performance at the Aimas District Office, Sorong Regency. The coefficient of determination $r^2 = 0.175$ shows that 17.2% of the Employee Performance at the Aimas District Office, Sorong Regency is influenced by Leadership Style, while the remaining 83.8% is influenced by other factors.

Keywords: Leadership_Style; Employee_Performance; Aimas_District.

1. Introduction

Human resources are one of the most important assets in an organization, as they make a substantial contribution to strategies aimed at achieving organizational goals. Efforts to improve employee performance therefore represent a critical management challenge, because the achievement of organizational objectives and long-term sustainability largely depend on the quality of human resource performance [1], [2].

Leadership style also plays a significant role in influencing employee performance. Effective leadership enables leaders to direct, motivate, and influence employees in achieving organizational objectives [3], [4]. Democratic leadership, when supported by competent human resources, can accommodate public needs and enhance satisfaction in public service delivery [5].

If problems arise in the quality of personnel—particularly among the State Civil Apparatus (ASN)—systematic efforts are required to improve and develop employee competencies through training and performance evaluation [6], [7]. Within bureaucratic organizations, human resources therefore constitute a vital factor in ensuring effective governance [8].

Improving employee performance is essential in enhancing the capacity of the civil service. Performance is generally defined as an individual's success in carrying out assigned tasks [9]. Employee performance reflects the results of work achieved in meeting predetermined targets [10]. High employee performance contributes positively to organizational effectiveness and determines an agency's success in achieving its goals [1], [11].

2. Methodology

Analysis Method

In research, data holds the highest position, because data is a representation of the variables being studied and serves as a tool for proving hypotheses [12]. Therefore, the accuracy of

the data greatly determines the quality of the research results. In this study, the following data analysis techniques were used:

Linearity Test

The linearity test in this study was conducted using SPSS V.20.0 for Windows software. Simple Linear Regression Analysis Analysis Method

$$\hat{Y} = a + bX$$

Description [12]:

\hat{Y} = Dependent variable subject

X = Independent variable subject

b = Regression coefficient indicating the increase or decrease in variable Y when it increases or decreases by 1 unit.

In addition to the F test, a t-test must also be conducted to determine the significant effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The test used in this study was a one-tailed right-tailed test with a confidence level of 0.05. To draw conclusions from the hypothesis and to strengthen the data analysis,

3. Result and Discussion

Validity Test

Leadership Style	Validity Coefficient	r-critical	Description
Indicator 1	0,629	0,300	Valid
Indicator 2	0,508	0,300	Valid
Indicator 3	0,738	0,300	Valid
Indicator 4	0,384	0,300	Valid
Indicator 5	0,669	0,300	Valid
Indicator 6	0,624	0,300	Valid

Employee Performance	Validity Coefficient	r- critical	Description
Indicator 1	0,506	0,300	Valid
Indicator 2	0,464	0,300	Valid
Indicator 3	0,695	0,300	Valid
Indicator 4	0,614	0,300	Valid
Indicator 5	0,508	0,300	Valid
Indicator 6	0,550	0,300	Valid
Indicator 7	0,437	0,300	Valid

Reliability Test

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,587	6

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,575	7

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	17,798	2,826		6,297	,000
Gaya_Kepemimpinan	,461	,112	,414	4,124	,000

a. Dependent Variable: KINERJA

Based on the results of processing and computerisation using SPSS version 24.0, the following simple regression equation was obtained:

$$Y = a + bx_1 + e$$

$$Y = 35,369 + 1,402X + e$$

Where:

- X₁ = independent variable (Leadership Style)
- Y = dependent variable (Employee Performance)
- a = constant, intersection of the line on the Y axis
- b = regression coefficient
- e = standard error

The above regression equation can be explained as follows:

a = 17.798 indicates that if Leadership Style is constant or X = 0, then Leadership Style is 17.798. b₁ = 1.461 indicates that each Leadership Style will encourage Employee Performance by 1.461.

Coefficient of Determination

The coefficient of determination (R²) essentially measures the extent to which the model explains the dependent variables. A coefficient of determination value close to one means that the independent variables explain almost all the information needed to predict the dependent variable (Ghozali, 2009). The results of the determination calculations for this study can be seen in the following table:

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,414a	,172	,162	2,629

a. Predictors: (Constant), Gaya_Kepemimpinan

From the results of computerised data processing using SPSS version 24.0, a coefficient of determination (R²) of 0.172 was obtained. This indicates that 17.2% of employee performance can be explained by the leadership style variable, while the remainder is explained by other factors that were not examined.

Hypothesis Testing

t-test (Partial)

Coefficients^a



Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
-------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---	------

		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	17,798	2,826		6,297	,000
	Gaya_Kepemimpinan	,461	,112	,414	4,124	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja

1
 Because the actual level (0.05) > Significance (0.000), Ho is rejected, meaning that there is a significant influence between Leadership Style and Employee Performance. Therefore, it can be concluded that Leadership Style has a significant influence on Employee Performance.

F Test (Simultaneous) 7

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	117,490	1	117,490	17,005	,000b
	Residual	566,546	82	6,909		
	Total	684,036	83			

a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja

b. Predictors: (Constant), Gaya_Kepemimpinan

Since the actual level (0.05) > Significance (0.000), Ho is rejected, meaning that there is a significant influence between Leadership Style and Employee Performance. Therefore, it can be concluded that Leadership Style has a significant influence on Employee Performance.

3.1. Result

Respondents' Perceptions of Leadership Style

Descriptive indicators of leadership style are: leaders need to act appropriately, always be willing to use their abilities to achieve organisational goals, maintain the ability or capacity to convey messages, ideas, or thoughts to others, need to evaluate themselves in using personal strength or positional power effectively and appropriately for long-term interests, increase responsibility to subordinates, and maintain emotional control.

Employee Perceptions of Performance

Descriptive indicators of leadership style are: Quality and attention to work need to be maintained, and be appreciative of individuals, know the goals the organisation wants to achieve in the future, skills and abilities, about their performance improving their performance for the organisation is already good, less desire to improve the effectiveness of the organisation and their own performance, need to know the plans and actions in their work, need to understand the context of the work, expectations of the role, and relationships within the organisation, need to improve working with teams consisting of a group of people with different cultural backgrounds and varying competencies.

3.2. Discussion

From the regression results, the constant of 17.798 indicates that if Leadership Style is constant or $X = 0$, then the Employee Performance constant is 17.798, while the regression coefficient value of 1.461 indicates that each Leadership Style will drive Employee Performance by 1.461.

The coefficient of determination (R^2) = 0.287. This indicates that 17.2% of Employee Performance can be explained by the Leadership Style variable, while the rest is influenced by other factors that were not examined. It can be concluded that Leadership Style has a significant effect on Employee Performance at the Biringkanaya Sub-District Office with a significance level of (0.000) and that this relationship is very strong.

4. Conclusion

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion presented above, the author draws the following conclusion from the overall analysis results: the variable of Leadership Style on Employee Performance obtained a value of (0.000), which means that there is a significant influence between Leadership Style and the variable of Employee Performance at the Aimas District Office in Sorong Regency.

Leaders need to improve the way they influence employees to follow their wishes by using personal strength or authority effectively and appropriately for the long-term benefit. There is a need to improve the effectiveness of the organisation and the performance of each employee, and they must be prepared to work with teams consisting of a group of people with different cultural backgrounds and varying levels of competence.

5. Acknowledgement

We would also like to express our gratitude to the Postgraduate Directorate of Muhammadiyah Sorong University for facilitating the research administration, as well as to the reviewers and readers who have provided constructive feedback for the improvement of this article. We would also like to thank our fellow students and lecturers who have assisted in this research so that we could publish it.

6. Reference

- [8] I. Hasan, *Analisis Data Penelitian dengan Statistik*. Jakarta, Indonesia: PT Bumi Aksara, 2004.
- [2] M. S. P. Hasibuan, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Revisi ed. Jakarta, Indonesia: PT Bumi Aksara, 2002.
- [3] K. Kartono, *Pemimpin dan Kepemimpinan*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2008.
- [4] M. Thoha, *Kepemimpinan Dalam Manajemen*. Jakarta, Indonesia: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada, 2003.
- [5] V. Rivai, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Untuk Perusahaan*, 1st ed. Jakarta, Indonesia: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada, 2004.
- [6] E. Sutrisno, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Prenada Media Group, 2009.
- [7] H. Simamora, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Bagian Penerbitan STIE YKPN, 1995.
- [8] S. P. Siagian, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, 7th ed. Jakarta, Indonesia: Radar Jaya Offset, 2001.
- [9] S. P. Robbins, *Perilaku Organisasi*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Indeks, 2003.
- [10] Wibowo, *Manajemen Kinerja*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Rajawali Pers, 2013.



- [11] S. B. Sastrohadiwiryono, *Manajemen Tenaga Kerja Indonesia*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Bumi Aksara, 2002.
- [12] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Bisnis (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D)*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2009.