



Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Performance at PT. Hevea Indonesia Works with Work Discipline as the Intervening Variable

Jopinus Ramli Saragih¹, Jumadiah Wardati²

^{1,2}Universitas Efarina, Indonesia

Email: jopinuss@gmail.com¹, jumz.can@gmail.com²

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Article history:

Received: Des 15, 2021
Revised: Jan 15, 2021
Accepted: Feb 22, 2022

Keywords:

Leadership Style,
Work Discipline,
Employee Performance

This research shows. (1) It can be seen that the magnitude of the adjusted R square value is 0.175 or 17.5%. This shows that Work Discipline (Z) and Leadership Style (X) can explain Employee Performance (Y) by 17.5%, the remaining 82.5% (100% - 17.5%) is explained by other variables outside the model. this research. (2) The results of the t-test (partial) can be seen that the obtained tcount (4,363) > ttable (2,048), as well as the significance value of 0.00 < 0.05, it can be concluded that the first hypothesis is accepted, meaning that the Leadership Style variable (X) positive and significant effect on Work Discipline (Z). (3) The results of the t-test (partial) can be seen that the value of tcount (1.917) < ttable (2.048), and the significance value of 0.367 > 0.05, it can be concluded that the second hypothesis is rejected, meaning that Leadership Style (X) has a significant effect on employee performance. (Y). (4) The results of the path analysis test show that the direct effect of variable X on variable Y is 0.200. Meanwhile, the indirect effect through the Z variable is $0.636 \times 0.329 = 0.2092$. From the calculation results obtained, the indirect effect through the Z variable is greater than the direct effect on the Y variable

Copyright © 2022 Jurnal Mantik.
All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In the era of increasingly fierce business competition, companies must be able to survive and be able to improve the quality of their human resources. Human resources are a very important element compared to other elements of the company. The role of employees is very important in the progress of the company because employees act as thinkers, planners and controllers of company activities. The leadership style generally assumes that the opinion of the crowd is better than his own opinion and that participation will lead to responsibility for its implementation. Another assumption is that participation provides opportunities for members to develop themselves for their employees so that employees can continue to be innovative and creative (Rivai, 2014). A democratic leader is a leader who has the characteristics of good responsibility and cooperation, strength in the active participation of members, respects every potential, and also utilizes each member according to his expertise. Democratic leaders are very good, especially when applied in organizations that have critical members.

However, we see in practice in the field, this type of democratic leadership also has weaknesses. Especially if an organization consists of members who think critically. The role of HR management itself is very influential on the performance of employees, because human resources are the most important and decisive resource in the survival of a company/organization. Basically everyone has tremendous potential and has not been fully utilized. In this affirmation, it is the manager's duty to utilize these resources in such a way for the benefit of achieving organizational goals, but still provide an appreciation and respect for the human resources concerned.

The objectives of this research are:

- a. To find out how the influence of Leadership Style on Employee Performance PT. The work of Hevea, Serdang Bedagai Regency.



- b. To find out how the influence of Leadership Style on Employee Performance of PT. The work of Hevea, Serdang Bedagai Regency with Work Discipline as the intervening variable.

2. Research Methods

2.1 Location and Time of Research

This research was conducted at PT. The work of Hevea, Serdang Bedagai Regency. The time of this research began in January 2020 to July 2020.

2.2 Sample

Sample According to (Sugiyono, 2016:81) that: "The sample is part of the number and characteristics possessed by the population. Sample measurement is a step to determine the size of the sample taken in carrying out research on an object. To determine the sample size can be done with statistics or based on research estimates. This sampling must be carried out in such a way that a sample is obtained that can truly function or can describe the actual state of the population, in other terms it must be representative. Because the target population is less than 100, the sampling technique used is the census method, where the entire population of 30 field employees of PT. The work of Hevea, Serdang Bedagai Regency, which will be used as a research sample.

3. Result and Analysis

3.1 Instrument Test

a. Validity Test

Testing the validity using SPSS version 25.00 with criteria based on the calculated r value as follows:

- 1) If $r \text{ count} > r \text{ table}$ or $- r \text{ count} < - r \text{ table}$ then the statement is declared valid.
- 2) If $r \text{ count} < r \text{ table}$ or $- r \text{ count} > - r \text{ table}$ then the statement is declared invalid.

This test was carried out on 30 respondents, then $df = 30 - k = 28$, with $\alpha = 5\%$, the r table value was 0.361 (Ghozali, 2016), then the calculated r value will be compared with the r table value of all points of statements both variables Leadership Style (X), Employee Performance (Y) and Work Discipline (Z) have a higher r value than the value of r table, so that it can be concluded if all statements of each variable are declared valid.

b. Reliability Test

Reliability is an index that shows the extent to which a measuring instrument can be trusted or reliable. According to Sugiyono (2013) a factor is declared reliable if the Cronbach Alpha is greater than 0.6. Based on the results of data processing using SPSS 25.00, the following results were obtained: Based on the reliability test using Cronbach Alpha, all research variables were reliable/reliable because Cronbach Alpha was greater than 0.6, so the results of this study indicate that the measurement tool in this study has met the test. reliability (reliable and can be used as a measuring tool).

3.2 Classical Assumption

Test Equation 1 The tests of classical assumptions with the SPSS 25.00 program carried out in this study include:

a. Normality Test

Normality test aims to test whether in the regression model, the confounding or residual variables have a normal distribution (Ghozali, 2016). Testing the normality of the data can be done using two methods, graphs and statistics. The normality test of the graph method uses a normal probability plot, while the statistical method normality test uses the one sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test. Data that is normally distributed will form a straight diagonal line and plotting residual data will be compared with a diagonal line, if the distribution of residual data is normal, the line that describes the actual data will follow the diagonal line (Ghozali, 2016). The test results using SPSS 25.00 are as follows:

Table 1

test One Sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test		
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		30
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	.0000000



	Std. Deviation	1.42895377	
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.094	
	Positive	.077	
	Negative	-.094	
Test Statistic		.094	
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200 ^{c,d}	
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)	Sig.	.967 ^e	
	99% Confidence Interval	Lower Bound	.882
		Upper Bound	1.000

- a. Test distribution is Normal.
- b. Calculated from data.
- c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
- d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.
- e. Based on 30 sampled tables with starting seed 2000000.

From the output in table 1, it can be seen that the significance value (Monte Carlo Sig.) of all variables is 0.967. If the significance is more than 0.05, then the residual value is normal, so it can be concluded that all variables are normally distributed.

b. Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test aims to test whether from the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residuals of one observation to another observation. A good regression model is one with homoscedasticity or no heteroscedasticity. One way to detect the presence or absence of heteroscedasticity is the Glejser test, in the Glejser test, if the independent variable is statistically significant in influencing the dependent variable, then there is an indication of heteroscedasticity. On the other hand, if the independent variable is not statistically significant in influencing the dependent variable, then there is no indication of heteroscedasticity. This is observed from the significance probability above the 5% confidence level (Ghozali, 2016). The results of data processing using SPSS 25.00 show the results in the following table:

Table 2
Hasil Uji Glejser

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.851	1.396		.610	.547
Style_Leadership_X	.017	.089	.037	.195	.847

a. Dependent Variable: Abs_RES

3.3 Simple Linear Regression

Test Multiple linear regression testing explains the magnitude of the role of the Leadership Style variable (X) on the Work Discipline variable (Z). Data analysis in this study used multiple linear regression analysis using SPSS 25.0 for windows. The analysis of each variable is described in the following description:

Table 3
Result Regresi Linier Sederhana

Coefficients ^a							
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	5.471	2.322		2.356	.026		
Gaya_Kepemimpinan_X	.649	.149	.636	4.363	.000	1.000	1.000

a. Dependent Variable: Discipline_work_Z

3.4 Coefficient of Determination (R²)

The coefficient of determination is used to see how much the independent variable contributes to the dependent variable. The greater the value of the coefficient of determination, the better the ability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable. If the determination (R²) is getting bigger (closer to 1), it can be said that the influence of the Leadership Style variable (X) is large on the Work Discipline variable (Z). The value used to see the coefficient of determination in this study is in the adjusted R square

column. This is because the adjusted R square value is not susceptible to the addition of independent variables. The value of the coefficient of determination can be seen in Table 4.10 below:

Table 4
Koefisien Determinasi

Model Summary ^b					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.636 ^a	.405	.383	1.454	2.250

a. Predictors: (Constant), Gaya_Kepemimpinan_X

b. Dependent Variable: Disiplin_Kerja_Z

Based on table 4. it can be seen that the adjusted R square value is 0.383 or 38.3%. This shows that the Leadership Style variable (X) can explain the Work Discipline variable (Z) by 38.3%, the remaining 61.7% (100% - 38.3%) is explained by other variables outside this research model. Example: Motivation, Incentives and Salary.

3.5 Classical Assumption Test Equation 2

The tests of classical assumptions with the SPSS 25.00 program carried out in this study include:

a. Normality Test

Normality test aims to test whether in the regression model, the confounding or residual variables have a normal distribution (Ghozali, 2016). Testing the normality of the data can be done using two methods, graphs and statistics. The normality test of the graph method uses a normal probability plot, while the statistical method normality test uses the one sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test. Data that is normally distributed will form a straight diagonal line and plotting residual data will be compared with a diagonal line, if the distribution of residual data is normal, the line that describes the actual data will follow the diagonal line (Ghozali, 2016). The test results using SPSS 25.00 are as follows:

Table 5
Uji One Sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		30
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	1.15867280
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.086
	Positive	.071
	Negative	-.086
Test Statistic		.086
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200 ^{c,d}
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)	Sig.	.967 ^e
	99% Confidence Interval	Lower Bound .882 Upper Bound 1.000

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

e. Based on 30 sampled tables with starting seed 299883525.

From the output in table 5, it can be seen that the significance value (Monte Carlo Sig.) of all variables is 0.967. If the significance is more than 0.05, then the residual value is normal, so it can be concluded that all variables are normally distributed.

b. Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test aims to determine whether there is a correlation between the independent variables in the regression model. The multicollinearity test in this study is seen from the tolerance value or variance inflation factor (VIF). The calculation of the tolerance value or VIF with the SPSS 25.00 program for windows can be seen in Table 6 below:



Table 6
Result test Multikolinieritas

Coefficients ^a		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance VIF
1	(Constant)	6.190	2.099		2.950	.006	
	Gaya_Kepemimpinan_X	.146	.159	.200	1.917	.367	.595 1.680
	Disiplin_Kerja_Y1	.235	.156	.329	2.504	.144	.595 1.680

a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja_Karyawan_Y

Based on table 6 it can be seen that: The tolerance value for Leadership Style (X) is 0.595, Work Discipline (Z) is 0.595, all of which are greater than 0.10, while the VIF value for Leadership Style (X) is 1.680 and Work Discipline (Z) is 1.680, where all of them are higher. smaller than 10. Based on the calculation results above, it can be seen that the tolerance value of all independent variables is greater than 0.10 and the VIF value of all independent variables is also smaller than 5 so that there is no correlation symptom in the independent variables. So it can be concluded that there is no symptom of multicollinearity between independent variables in the regression model.

c. Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test aims to test whether from the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residuals of one observation to another observation. A good regression model is one with homoscedasticity or no heteroscedasticity. One way to detect the presence or absence of heteroscedasticity is the Glejser test, in the Glejser test, if the independent variable is statistically significant in influencing the dependent variable, then there is an indication of heteroscedasticity. On the other hand, if the independent variable is not statistically significant in influencing the dependent variable, then there is no indication of heteroscedasticity. This is observed from the significance probability above the 5% confidence level (Ghozali, 2016). The results of data processing using SPSS 25.00 show the results in the following table:

Table 7
Result test Glejser

Coefficients ^a		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	
1	(Constant)	.636	1.217		.523	.606	
	style_leadership_X	.107	.092	.282	1.160	.256	
	discipline_work_Y1	-.089	.090	-.239	-.982	.335	

a. Dependent Variable: Abs_RES

3.6

Multiple Linear Regression

Test Multiple linear regression testing explains the magnitude of the role of Leadership Style (X) and Work Discipline (Z) on Employee Performance (Y2). Data analysis in this study used multiple linear regression analysis using SPSS 25.0 for windows. The analysis of each variable is described in the following description:

Table 8
result Regresi Linier Berganda

Coefficients ^a		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance VIF
1	(Constant)	6.190	2.099		2.950	.006	
	style_leadership_X	.146	.159	.200	1.917	.367	.595 1.680
	Discipline_work_Y1	.235	.156	.329	2.504	.144	.595 1.680

a. Dependent Variable: performance_employee_Y

Based on these results, the multiple linear regression equation has the formulation: $Y = a + b_1X + b_2Z + b_3Z + \dots$, so that the equation is obtained: $Y = 6.190 + 0.146 X + 0.235 Z + \dots$ The description of the multiple linear regression equation above is as follows:

- 1) The constant value (a) of 6.190 indicates the magnitude of Employee Performance (Y) if the Leadership Style (X) and Work Discipline (Z) are equal to zero.
- 2) The regression coefficient value of Leadership Style (X) (b1) of 0.146 indicates the magnitude of the role of Leadership Style (X) on Employee Performance (Y) with the assumption that the Work Discipline variable (Z) is constant. This means that if the Leadership Style (X) factor increases by 1 unit value, it is predicted that Employee Performance (Y) will increase by 0.146 unit value with the assumption that Work Discipline (Z) is constant.
- 3) The regression coefficient value of Work Discipline (Z) (b3) of 0.235 indicates the magnitude of the role of Work Discipline (Z) on Employee Performance (Y) with the assumption that the Leadership Style variable (X) is constant. This means that if the Work Discipline factor (Z) increases by 1 unit value, it is predicted that Employee Performance (Y) will increase by 0.235 unit value with the assumption that Leadership Style (X) is constant.

3.7 Coefficient of Determination (R2)

The coefficient of determination is used to see how much the independent variable contributes to the dependent variable. The greater the value of the coefficient of determination, the better the ability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable. If the determination (R2) is getting bigger (closer to 1), it can be said that the influence of the X variable is large on Work Discipline (Z). The value used to see the coefficient of determination in this study is in the adjusted R square column. This is because the adjusted R square value is not susceptible to the addition of independent variables. The value of the coefficient of determination can be seen in Table 8. below:

Table 9
Koefisien Determinasi

Model Summary ^b					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.482 ^a	.232	.175	1.201	1.897

a. Predictors: (Constant), Discipline_work_Z, style_leadership_X

b. Dependent Variable: performance_employee_Y

Based on table 9, it can be seen that the adjusted R square value is 0.175 or 17.5%. This shows that Work Discipline (Z) and Leadership Style (X) can explain Employee Performance (Y) by 17.5%, the remaining 82.5% (100% - 17.5%) is explained by other variables outside the model. this research: Motivation, Incentives and Salary.

4. Conclusion

Based on the results of research and discussion in the previous chapter, it can be concluded as follows:

- a. What is proposed states that: From table 4.16, the tcount value is 4,363 With = 5%, ttable (5%; nk = 28) the ttable value is 2,048. From the description it can be seen that tcount (4,363) > ttable (2,048), as well as the significance value of 0.367 0.05, it can be concluded that the first hypothesis is accepted, meaning that the Leadership Style variable (X) has a positive and significant effect on Work Discipline (Z).
- b. From table 4.17, the tcount value is 1,917. With = 5%, ttable(5%; nk = 28) the ttable value is 2,048. From the description it can be seen that tcount(1,917) < ttable (2,048), and the significance value of 0.367 0.05, it can be concluded that the second hypothesis is rejected, meaning that Leadership Style (X) has a significant effect on Employee Performance (Y).
- c. From table 4.17, the tcount value is 2,504. With = 5%, ttable (5%; nk = 28) the ttable value is 1,701. From the description it can be seen that tcount(2,504) > ttable(2,048), and the significance value is 0.144 0.05, it can be concluded that the third hypothesis is accepted, meaning that Work Discipline (Z) has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y).
- d. In Figure 4.3 the path analysis shows the direct effect of variable X on variable Y of 0.200. Meanwhile, the indirect effect through the Z variable is 0.636 x 0.329 = 0.2092. From the calculation results obtained, the indirect effect through the Z variable is greater than the direct effect on the Y variable.



References

- [1] A A. Anwar Prabu Mangkunegara, 2011. Evaluation of Human Resources Performance.: Refika Aditama. Bandung
- [2] Bastian, Indra. 2010. Public Sector Accounting Third Edition.: Erlangga Jakarta
- [3] Agus, Heri Prayatna. 2016 the influence of leadership style on work stress and employee job satisfaction, at Fave
- [4] B. Uno, Hamzah. 2012. Theory of Motivation and Its Measurement: PT. Earth Literacy.. Jakarta
- [5] Dwiyanto. 2013The Influence of Leadership Style, Organizational Climate and Work Motivation on Employee Performance at the Regional Secretariat of Kendal Regency.
- [6] Ghozali, Imam. 2011. "Application of Multivariate Analysis With SPSS Program" Diponegoro University Publishing Agency. Semarang
- [7] Hasibuan, MalayuS.P. 2017. Human Resource Management. Revised Edition. Jakarta: Earth Literacy.
- [8] Hotel Seminyak, Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University (Unud), Bali, Indonesia
- [9] Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly. 2010. Organization, Behavior, Structure, Process. Literature Development. Jakarta.
- [10] Guntur, Bayu Saputro. 2017 EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP STYLE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE THROUGH THE INTERVENING VARIABLES OF WORK MOTIVATION. Petra Christian University Jl. Siwalankerto
- [11] Hani, T. Handoko. 2014. Personnel Management and Human Resources. BPFE-Yogyakarta.Yogyakarta.
- [12] Hasibuan, Malayu S. P. 2012. Human Resource Management, Revised Edition: Jakarta. Earth Literature Dharma,
- [13] Surya. 2012. Performance Management Philosophy Theory and Its Application. Yogyakarta
- [14] Dwiyanto, 2010. Title Effect of Leadership Style, Organizational Climate and Work Motivation on Employee Performance at the Regional Secretariat of Kendal Regency.
- [15] Diana Sari. 2013. Basic Concepts of Taxation. PT Refika Adimata Bandung
- [16] Ghozali, Imam, 2011. Application of Multivariate Analysis with SPSS Program, Fourth Edition, Diponegoro University Publisher. Gibson, James L, John M Ivancevich and James H. Jr.
- [17] Donnelly. 2011. Organization and Management. Translated Edition. Jakarta
- [18] Kartono, Kartini. 2010. Leaders and Leadership. : PT Raja Grafindo Persada. Jakarta.
- [19] Khoiriyah, Lilik, 2009. The Effect of Wages and Work Environment on Employee Performance at CV. Aji Bali Jayawijaya Surakarta.
- [20] Kusuma, 2013. The Influence of Motivation and Work Environment on Employee Performance at Muria Hotel Semarang. Essay. Semarang.
- [21] Miftah Thoha. 2013 "Leadership in management" Raja GrafindoPersada Jakarta
- [22] Rivai. 2014. Human Resource Management. Second printing. Erlangga. Jakarta
- [23] Rivai, Veithzal. 2011, Human Resource Management for Companies: from Theory to Practice, Jakarta Robbins,
- [24] Stephen P. & Judge, Timoty A. 2012. Organizational Behavior. First Book. Edition Twelve. Diana Angelica's translation. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- [25] Samsudin, Sadili. 2010. Human Resource Management. Bandung: Faithful Library.
- [26] Sugijono. 2016. "Job Analysis in Human Resource Management". Semarang: Semarang State Polytechnic.