

The Influence of Leadership Style, Work Culture and Work Environment on the Performance of Parepare City Employees

Rustan Ali¹, Fahrudin Umar², Irawati Nur³

Andi Sapada Institute of Social Sciences and Business

Email: rustanali776@gmail.com

Keywords

Leadership Style,
Work Culture, Work
Environment and
Employee
Performance

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to find out and analyze how much influence Leadership Style, Work Culture and Work Environment have on the Performance of Parepare City Employees. The analytical method used in this research is the method of observation, interviews, questionnaires and documentation, the sample determination method used is the saturated sampling method of 83 samples. The analysis method used is the multiple linear analysis method (multi linear regression). The results of the research show that partially influences the performance of Parepare City Employees, Leadership Style (X1) with a calculated t value of $3.275 > t$ table 1.98896 , a significant value of $0.000 < 0.05$, as well as Work Culture (X2) partially influencing the value t count $4.005 > t$ -table 1.98896 , significant value $0.000 < 0.05$, but Work Environment (X3) has no effect and is not partially significant because the t count value is $0.605 < t$ table 1.98896 , significant value $0.605 > 0, 05$ on the Performance of Parepare City Employees.

1. Introduction

The development of the system, maintenance of state governance, and changes in national development strategies over the years have been implemented in the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. The guide for more effective, clean, and responsible government implementation is one of the considerations in issuing Presidential Instruction Number 7 of 1999 concerning Government Performance Accountability.

In the context of coaching regional government maintenance, the government prepares to give awards to areas that have the highest performance nationally, following the provisions of Government Regulation (PP) No. 35 of 2010 regarding the Implementation of Law No. 20 of 2009 concerning Service Degrees and Marks of Respect. From the results of data evaluation and performance ranking carried out in 2010 for 474 autonomous regions based on the Regional Government Maintenance Report (LPPD) in 2009, it is recorded that 354 regencies/cities are ranked high, with 242 currently ranked, 94 ranked medium, 15 ranked low, and 3 not given a mark. This shows that the performance of regional governments still

needs improvement, including the performance of Parepare City.

One of the factors influencing employee performance in organizational management functions is leadership. A person appointed as a leader in managing subordinates must carry out the functions of the organization, which is an indicator of the organization's success. Leadership abilities should be an inseparable part of a leader's nature, regardless of the responsibilities they have to carry out. Without the ability to lead and manage human resources well, a leader cannot effectively fulfill responsibilities.

In addition to leadership, as one of the factors supporting employee performance, the work environment and work culture are parts that impact employee performance. A comfortable and conducive work environment encourages employees to work productively (Rodi Ahmad Ginanjar, 2013:2). Providing a comfortable work environment will give employees satisfaction with their work and leave a lasting impression, ultimately resulting in good performance. Unhealthy working conditions can cause employees to become easily stressed, lose enthusiasm for work, arrive



late, and vice versa. If the working environment is healthy, employees will be enthusiastic about working, less likely to get sick, and able to concentrate, leading to the quick completion of work and achievement of targets. Meanwhile, work culture is an integral part of the overall organizational system, binding all its members in a joint effort to achieve common goals. Culture also influences the behavior and performance of both organizations and employees in the organizational environment.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Understanding Human Resources Management

Management Human Resources is the science and art of governing relationships and roles power work to be effective and efficient help realization objective organization. Managing management element man This often called management staffing or personnel management applied to a company For reach desired goal . Edy Sutrisno (2014:3).

2.2 Style Leadership

Leadership style is the way it is done a leader in influence behavior nor thought his subordinates so that capable operate his task in effort For reach objective organization (Gibson, 1998). Sumidjo (2000:63) states that style leadership in essence means how leader That relate with subordinates .

2.3 Culture Work

Peter F. Drucker in Tika (2006:4) Culture Work is principal solution problems external and internal implementation held in a way consistent by a later group inherited to members new as method appropriate For understand, think, and feel to related problems as it has been displayed.

2.4 Environment Work

Mardiana (2005:15), Environment Work is environment Where employee do his job daily. Environment conducive work will provide a sense of security and enable employees For Work optimally.

2.5 Employee Performance

Philip Moon in Titin Maryati (2011) says that performance employee determined by skills and knowledge , sources available power, quality and style existing management, as well motivation. Employee performance can made sizes is suggestions and goals has in accordance with plan organizations / institutions, apart from that can also be done become base reject measuring extent of success something organization / institution .

3. Research Methods

The research will be conducted at the Parepare City Regional Secretariat Office due to its suitability for obtaining relevant data to address the study's focal problems. The study population comprises 105 employees with diverse characteristics, and a sample of 83 respondents was determined using the Slovin formula, considering limitations such as funds and time. The study incorporates both qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data, involving words, sentences, and images, will capture information from relevant parties. Quantitative data, represented by numerical values, will be collected through questionnaires utilizing Likert scales. Data collection involves various methods, including observation, documentation, questionnaires, and interviews.

These methods focus on specific areas, such as administration and personnel, to gather pertinent data and provide a comprehensive understanding of the Parepare City Secretariat. Primary data obtained directly from respondents through observation, interviews, and questionnaires will be complemented by secondary data from existing sources. Secondary data, already published, includes information from internet sites and other relevant sources related directly to the study's subject. The study revolves around three main variables: Leadership Style (X_1), Work Culture (X_2), and Work Environment (X_3), impacting Employee Performance (Y). These variables are operationally defined and measured through indicators and Likert scales.

For data analysis, the study employs a comprehensive approach, including descriptive analysis, validity tests, reliability tests, multiple linear regression analysis, partial tests (t-test), simultaneous tests (F-test), and coefficient determination (R^2). These analyses aim to explore the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable, i.e., Employee Performance. In conclusion, the study adopts a holistic methodology, combining qualitative and quantitative data, utilizing diverse data collection techniques, and applying various statistical analyses to derive meaningful insights into the factors influencing employee performance at the Parepare City Regional Secretariat.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Research Result

a. Data Description

Study This elaborate Influence of Leadership Style, Culture Work and Environment Work Regarding Employee Performance at the Parepare City Regional Secretariat Office. In study This taken as many as 83 employees as sample .

b. Analysis Descriptive

Characteristics the respondent That elaborate description identity respondents according to sample research that has been set . One of objective with description characteristics respondents is give the image that becomes sample in study This . In study This sample characteristics respondents are grouped according to:

Table 4.1
Characteristics Respondent Based

No	Type	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1	Man	35	42.17%
2	Woman	48	57.83
Total		83	100%

Source: Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Based on table above , yes explained that distribution employee according to type The

most common gender was 48 women (57.83%), and men as many as 35 people (42.17%). This matter means more Lots employee Woman compared to men at the Secretariat Parepare City area

Table 4.2
Characteristics Respondent Based on Age

No	Type	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1	20 – 29 Years	10	12.05%
2	30 – 39 Years	39	46.99%
3	40 – 49 Years	29	34.94%
4	50 – 60 Years	5	6.02%
Total		83	100%

Source : Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Based on table above , shows that age employee almost evenly across all level age , however Most are aged 30 – 39 years that is as many as 39 people (46.99%), then followed level 40 – 49 years as many as 29 people (34.94%), and level aged 20 – 29 years as many as 10 people (12.05%), while 50 – 60 years old as many as 5 people (6.02%). This matter show part big employee own age Enough so that can support achievement more optimal performance .

Table 4.3
Characteristics Respondent Based on Education Level

No	Level of education	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1.	SMA/SMK/MA	3	3.61 %
2.	Strata I (S1)	60	72,29 %
3.	Strata II (S2)	20	24.1%
Total		83	100%

Source : Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Based on table above , level data education respondents who occupy proportion highest were Strata I (S1) as many as 60 people (72.29%), then followed by 20 people at Strata

II (S2) level (24.1%) and 3 high school students (3.61%).

Table 4.4
Characteristics Respondent Based on Work Period

No	Years of service	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1.	0 – 5 Years	10	12.05 %
2.	6 – 10 Years	21	25.30 %
3.	11 – 15 Years	23	27.71 %
4.	16 – 20 Years	20	24.10%
5.	21 – 25 Years	9	10.84%
6.	26 – 30 Years	0	0%
Total		83	100%

Source : Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Based on table above , respondent according to Work Period namely , 0 – 5 years as much 10 people (12.05%), 6 – 10 years as many as 21 people (25.30%), 11 – 15 years as many as 23 people (27.71%), 16 – 20 years old as many as 20 people (24.10%), 21 – 25 years as many as 9 people (10.84%) and 26 – 30 years old as many as 0 people (0%).

c. Validity test

Validity test is the test used For show extent of tools measure used in measure what is measured. Validity test used For measure valid or or not something questionnaire , the other side of understanding validity is aspect thoroughness measurement. Rule validity testing is with compare r_{table} with the calculated r_{counts} obtained from SPSS analysis. If $r_{counts} > r_{table}$ then can said questionnaire used _ has been valid, however if $r_{count} < r_{table}$ so questionnaire used stated invalid.

Table 4.5
Validity test Influence of Leadership Style , Culture Work and Environment Work On Employee Performance

No. Items	Person Correlation r_{count}	r_{table}	Information
Questionnaire Leadership Style Variable (X₁)			
1.	0.836	0.213	Valid
2.	0.891	0.213	Valid
3.	0.920	0.213	Valid
4.	0.925	0.213	Valid
Questionnaire Variable Culture Work (X₂)			
1.	0.843	0.213	Valid
2.	0.931	0.213	Valid
3.	0.872	0.213	Valid
4.	0.927	0.213	Valid
5.	0.924	0.213	Valid
Questionnaire Variable Environment Work (X₃)			
1.	0.824	0.213	Valid
2.	0.819	0.213	Valid
3.	0.719	0.213	Valid
4.	0.848	0.213	Valid
5.	0.931	0.213	Valid

6.	0.911	0.213	Valid
Questionnaire Employee Performance Variable (Y)			
1	0.858	0.213	Valid
2	0.821	0.213	Valid
3	0.900	0.213	Valid
4	0.779	0.213	Valid

Based on the results of the validity test shown in Table 4.5, the calculated r-values for the 19 statement items range from 0.719 to 0.927. Here, the calculated r-values are greater than the critical r-table value. For a sample size (n) of 83 at a significance level (α) of 0.05, the critical r-table value is 0.213. Therefore, it can be stated that all statements in the questionnaire are valid. The Corrected Item Total Correlation (r-count) values for the Leadership Style variable range from 0.836 to 0.925, for Culture Work, it ranges from 0.843 to 0.924, and for Environment Work, it ranges from 0.824 to 0.911. Similarly, for Employee Performance, the values range from 0.779 to 0.858. These results indicate that the r-count values are significantly larger than the required

0.5 threshold. Hence, it can be concluded that all the item statements from the research instrument used in this study are valid.

1) Reliability Test

To ensure the reliability of an instrument or measuring tool, the researcher conducted reliability tests. The instruments declared valid underwent reliability testing, while instruments deemed invalid did not undergo reliability testing. The reliability of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha formula with the assistance of SPSS 25 for Windows. A construct or variable is considered reliable if the Cronbach Alpha value is greater than 0.60.

Table 4.6
Reliability Test Influence of Leadership Style , Culture Work and Environment Work On Employee Performance

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha
Leadership Style (X ₁)	0.837	0.60
Culture Work (X ₂)	0.857	0.60
Environment Work (X ₃)	0.859	0.60
Employee Performance (Y)	0.873	0.60

Based on the reliability statistics table above, the Cronbach's alpha (r count) values for the 19 statement items range from 0.837 to 0.873. These calculated values exceed the required threshold of 0.60. Specifically, the Cronbach's alpha values for each variable are as follows: Leadership Style (X₁) is 0.837, Culture Work (X₂) is 0.857, Environment Work (X₃) is 0.859, and for Employee Performance (Y), it is

0.873. This indicates that all the statement items used in this study are reliable.

d. Analysis Results Multiple linear regression

Analysis regression multiple used For know influence between variable independent/ free to variable dependent/ bound .

Table 4.7
Analysis Results Multiple linear regression

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	1,385	,402		,3,444	,001
	LEADERSHIP_STYLE	,359	,110	,442	,3,275	,002
	WORK_CULTURE	,427	.107	,426	,4,005	,000
	WORK ENVIRONMENT	,079	,130	-.077	-.605	,547

a. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANCE_PERFORMANCE

Source : Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

From the results analysis multiple linear regression above , yes seen equality multiple linear regression about influence of Leadership Style (X_1) Culture Work (X_2) and Environment Work (X_3) on Employee Performance (Y), can written down in equality as following :

$$Y = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_3$$

$$Y = 1.385 + 0.359 X_1 + 0.427 X_2 + -0.079 X_3$$

From Eq regression above , yes explained as following :

1. The constant (α) is 1.385 which means if Leadership Style , Culture Work and Environment Work value is 0, then Employee Performance Value is 1.385
2. The Leadership Style variable (X_1) of 0.359 means that if Leadership Style influential or have enhancement One unit , then , performance employees will too experience increase or enhancement with assumption variable others still or constant .

3. Variable Culture Work (X_2) of 0.427 means that if Culture Work have enhancement One unit so performance employees will too experience increase or enhancement with assumption variable others still or constant .
4. Variable Environment Work (X_3) of -0.079 means that if Environment Work have enhancement One unit so performance employees will too experience increase or enhancement with assumption variable others still or constant.

e. Hypothesis testing

1) Partial Test Results (t Test)

A t test was performed For know is variables independent in a way Partial influential significant or No to variable dependent . Degrees trust used _ which is 0.05 then variable independent in a way Partial influential significant to variable dependant .

Table 4.8
Partial Test Results (t Test)

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,385	,402		,444	,001
	LEADERSHIP_STYLE	359	,110	,442	,275	,002
	WORK_CULTURE	,427	.107	,426	,005	,000
	WORK ENVIRONMENT	-.079	,130	-.077	,605	,547

a. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANCE_PERFORMANCE

Source : Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Based on partial test results (t test) above seen in table explained that :
Variable X_1 (Leadership Style) is obtained Sig value . 0.002 < of 0.05, value t_{count} 3,227 > of t_{table} 1.98896 shows that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted means there is influence in a way Partial between Leadership Style (X_1) on Employee Performance (Y) Variable X_2 (Culture Work) earned Sig value . 0.000 < of 0.05, value t_{count} 4,011 > of t_{table} 1.98896 shows that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted means there is

influence in a way Partial between Culture Work (X_2) on Employee Performance (Y). Variable Environment Work (X_3) is obtained Sig value. 0.605 > of 0.547 value t_{count} - 0.605 < of t_{table} 1.98896 shows that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected means No there is influence in a way Partial between Environment Work (X_3) on Employee Performance (Y).

2) F Test (Simultaneous Test)

Table 4.9
Simultaneous Test Results (F Test)

ANOVA ^a						
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Fv Sig.	
Regression	10,663	3	3,554	31,645	,000 ^b	
Residual	8,873	79	112			
Total	19,535	82				

a. Dependent Variable: PERFORMANCE_PERFORMANCE
b. Predictors: (Constant), WORK_ENVIRONMENT, WORK_CULTURE, LEADERSHIP_STYLE

Source : Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

From Eq on results F_{table} of 3.11. Sig value. 0.000 < 0.05, value F_{count} 31.645 > F_{table} 3.11 which means H_3 accepted meaning there is influence of Leadership Style (X_1), Culture Work (X_2) and Environment Work (X_3) is significant in a way simultaneous on Employee Performance (Y).

3) Analysis Coefficient Determination (R²)

Coefficient determination This used For know How many percent influence variable independent to variable dependent . For the analysis from SPSS 25 output can be seen from table following:

Table 4.10
Analysis Results Coefficient Determination (R²)

Model Summary									
Mmodel	R	Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	f1	f2	Sig. F Change
1	.739 ^a	.546	.529	.335	.546	31,645		9	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), WORK_ENVIRONMENT, WORK_CULTURE, LEADERSHIP_STYLE

Source : Primary Data (Questionnaire), processed 2023

Based on table above , value of R Square of 0.546 which shows that Leadership Style (X_1) Culture Work (X_2) and Environment Work (X_3) has an effect in a way simultaneous on Employee Performance (Y) at the Parepare City Regional Secretariat Office amounted to 0.546 or (54.6%) whereas the rest amounting to 0.454

or (45.4%) influenced by other factors that are not researched by researchers .

4.2 Discussion

Study This aim For testing Leadership Style , Culture Work and Environment Work on

Employee Performance at the Parepare City Regional Secretariat Office.

a. Influence of Leadership Style on Employee Performance

The research results support the notion that the Leadership Style variable has a partial influence on employee performance. This suggests a unidirectional relationship between leadership style and employee performance. The regression coefficient (X1) of 3.275 indicates that if the leadership style improves by one unit, the employee performance will also experience enhancement. The low probability value of 0.02 (< 0.05) signifies that Leadership Style significantly influences employee performance.

b. Influence Culture Work on Employee Performance

The research results support the idea that the Work Culture variable has a partial influence on employee performance. This indicates that Work Culture significantly influences employee performance, with a coefficient (X2) of 4.005. The low probability value of 0.00 (< 0.05) confirms that Work Culture is a determining factor in employee performance.

c. Influence Environment Work on Employee Performance

The research results provide less support for the idea that the Work Environment variable (X3) has an effect on employee performance (Y), as indicated by the results of the t-test (partial test). The coefficient of Regression X3 is -0.605, and the probability value is greater than 5% ($-0.605 > 0.05$), suggesting that the Work Environment does not significantly influence Employee Performance.

d. Influence of Leadership Style, Culture Work and Environment Work on Employee Performance

The research results support the notion that Leadership Style (X1), Culture Work (X2), and Environment Work (X3) collectively have a

significant effect on Employee Performance (Y). This is evidenced by a significance value (sig) of 0.000, which is less than 0.05, and an F count value of 31.275, surpassing the F table value of 3.11, indicating the acceptance of Hypothesis 3. When comparing the influence of Environment Work, Leadership Style, and Culture Work, it is observed that Leadership Style and Culture Work play a more dominant and crucial role in influencing Employee Performance.

The proper application of leadership styles allows leaders to positively influence employee performance, and a strong work culture supports more effective task execution. Furthermore, a conducive work environment contributes to creating enthusiasm, making tasks more manageable for employees. In conclusion, Leadership Style, Culture Work, and Environment Work are interconnected with Employee Performance.

5. Closing

5.1 Conclusion

Based on results research and discussions that have been carried out explained, yes concluded that:

1. Leadership Style (X1) demonstrates a partial influence with a calculated t-value of 3.275, surpassing the t-table value of 1.98896, and a significant value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05. Similarly, Culture Work (X2) exhibits a partial influence with a calculated t-value of 4.005, exceeding the t-table value of 1.98896, and a significant value of 0.000, indicating an impact on Employee Performance. However, Environment Work (X3) shows no partial influence, given its calculated t-value of -0.605, which is less than the t-table value of 1.98896, and a significant value of 0.605, greater than 0.05, at the Parepare City Regional Secretariat Office.
2. Leadership Style (X1), Culture Work (X2), and Environment Work (X3) collectively have a simultaneous effect, supported by a significant value of 0.000, less than 0.05, and a calculated F-value of 31.275, exceeding the F-table value of 3.11, indicating their joint

impact on Employee Performance at the Parepare City Regional Secretariat Office.

5.2 Suggestion

From the results conclusion the above , then writer give advice as following :

- a. It is essential for leaders to maintain the implemented leadership style and enhance moderate leadership practices. Strengthening the connection between leaders and subordinates is crucial to generating higher productivity and improving overall employee performance.
- b. To enhance employee performance, there should be a concerted effort to improve the work culture. This involves implementing direct and effective supervision, applying appropriate consequences for violations, and carefully evaluating subordinates based on the urgency and validity of their reasons for permissions granted.
- c. Leaders are encouraged to contribute to a positive work environment by improving the overall atmosphere. This can be achieved by providing on-site facilities that contribute to a conducive work setting. Attention to factors such as air temperature, security, and lighting is crucial. Supervision is necessary to ensure that employees feel safe, comfortable, and undisturbed while using work equipment.
- d. The analysis results reveal that the R-squared value (R^2) is 0.546, signifying that the independent variables, namely Leadership Style and Work Culture, can explain 54.6% of the variation in the dependent variable, which is employee performance. The remaining 45.4% is attributed to other factors not considered in the research model. Future researchers are encouraged to explore these additional factors to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics influencing employee performance.

Bibliography

- Afandi, P. (2018). *Management Human Resources (Theory, Concepts, and Indicators)*. Riau: Zanafa Publishing.
- Agus Aribowo (2018). *Management Human Resources, No Direct and Environmental Work Physical*. CV. Andi Offset.
- Abbas, A., Triani, N., Rayyani, WO, & Muchran, M. (2022). Earnings growth, marketability, and the role of Islamic financial literacy and inclusion in Indonesia. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*.
- Achsani, NA, Tambunan, M., & Mulyo, SA (2012). Impact of fiscal policy on the agricultural development in an emerging economy: Case study from South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 96, 101-112.
- Adiningrat, AA, Ruhayu, Y., Rustan, R., Wahyuni, S., & Fitrianti, AN (2022). The Effect of Financial Literature and Islamic Work Motivation on the Performance of Food Micro, Small and Business Enterprises (MSMEs) in Makassar City. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 5(4), 30836-30845.
- Aisyah, S. (2022). The Role of Financial Performance as a Mediator Between Good Corporate Governance and Firm Value. *Attestation: Journal Scientific Accounting*, 5(1), 255-268.
- Akhmad, A., Amir, A., Asdimuh, A., & Syukur, M. (2020). The Development Prospect of the Pinisi Vessel Industry in Bulukumba Regency, Indonesia. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 12(10), 183-194.
- Akhmad, A., Amir, A., Saleh, S., & Abidin, Z. (2022). Effectiveness of Regional Government Expenditure in Reducing Unemployment and Poverty Rate. *European Journal of Development Studies*, 2(4), 90-99.

- Akhmad, A., & Amir, A. (2018). Study of fuel oil supply and consumption in Indonesia. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 8(4), 13.
- Akhmad, P. (2016). The impact of price subsidy policy of fertilizer on production, demand and supply of corn in Indonesia. *American-Eurasian Journal or Sustainable Agriculture*, 10(1), 29-37.
- Ali, MY (2022). The Process of Making a Pinisi Boat in Bantobahari District, Bulukumba Regency, Indonesia. *European Journal of Engineering and Technology Research*, 7(5), 70-75.
- Arman, A., & Mira, M. (2021). Does Tax Avoidance Make Earning Opacity? *Attestation: Journal Scientific Accounting*, 4(1), 88-95.
- Arsal, M. (2021). Impact of earnings per share and dividend per share on firm value. *ATTESTATION: Journal Scientific Accounting*, 4(1), 11-18.
- Arniati, A., Arsal, M., Akhmad, A., Asdar, A., & Adiningrat, AA (2020). Impression of Student Knowledge on Decisions Become a Customer of Islamic Banks. *International Journal of Business Economics (IJBE)*, 1(2), 145-152.
- Edi Sutrisno (2014). *Management Human Resources*. Bandung: CV. Faithful Library.
- Edward H. Schein (2005). *Management Human Resources for Companies from Theory to Practice*.
- Harun Samsuddin (2018). Review from Dimensions of Leadership Style, Culture Organization and Commitment Organization.
- Hersey and Blanchard (2013). *Management Human Resources Theory Leadership*.
- Keban, Yeremias T. (2004). *Six Dimensions Strategic Public Administration, Concepts, Theories and Issues*. Yogyakarta: Gava Medi.
- Meiliza Elisabeth Lumenta (2018). *The Influence of Leadership Style, Culture Organization, And Environment Work Regarding Employee Performance in the Employment Service General and Spatial Planning of Manado City*.
- Moch. Adea Abriansyah (2019). *Influence Environment Work, Culture Organization, and Style Leadership on Employee Performance*.
- Pasolong, Harbani (2004). *Urgency Quality Resource Man in Welcome Millennium III*.
- Peter F. Drucker (2006). *Introduction Management, success Pirusa Jakarta*.
- Robert E. Quinn (2014). *Management Human Resources*. Jakarta.
- Rodi Ahmad Ginanjar (2013). *Analysis The Influence of Leadership Style and Motivation Work On Employee Performance*. Thesis: Central Java.
- Ningsih Ayu Setiya (2017). *The Influence of Leadership Style, Culture Work, and Environment Work on Employee Performance at CV. Use Harsa*.
- Nunung Ayu Sofiati (2018). *Management Human Resources, No Direct and Environmental Work Physical*. CV. Andi Offset.
- Sedarmayanti 2015. *HR Planning and Development*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Sugiyono (2014). *Method Educational Research Approaches Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Vikri, Gagas Akhyar (2021). *Influence style leadership, culture organization, and environment Work to performance PT employees*. Petrochemical Gresik.
- Wahjosumidjo (2000). *Leadership and Motivation, PT Raja Grafindo homeland*.
- Yoyo Sudaryo, 2018. *Management Human Resources, Compensation. No Direct and Environmental Work Physique*.



Yukl, Gary (2013). Leadership in Organizations.
Publisher: Pearson.