

The Influence of Leadership Democracy, Work Discipline and Work Environment on Individual Employee Performance in PT. Indosino Agrochemical

Mega Putri Handayani ^{1*}, Prayekti Nugroho ²

^{1,2} Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding email: megaputrihandayani9@gmail.com

Article History	Abstract
Received: September 31, 2022 Revised: November 13, 2022 Accepted: December 30, 2022	<p>This study aims to determine the effect of democratic leadership, work discipline, and work environment on individual employee performance. This type of research is quantitative. The population in this study were employees of PT. Indosino Agrochemical. Data collection is done by distributing online questionnaires to employees, data directly obtained from respondents. The results of this study indicate that (1) democratic leadership has a significant effect on individual employee performance, (2) work discipline has an effect on individual employee performance, (3) work environment has no significant effect on individual employee performance.</p> <p>Keywords: democratic leadership, work discipline, work environment, employee individual performance. JEL Classification : M1 Type of paper: Research Paper.</p>

DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.46306/bbijbm.v2i3.30>

Web:
<http://bbijbm.lppmbinabangsa.ac.id/index.php/home>

Citation:

Handayani, M.P., & Nugroho, P. (2022) The Influence of Leadership Democracy, Work Discipline and Work Environment on Individual Employee Performance in PT. Indosino Agrochemical. *Bina Bangsa International Journal of Business and Management (BBIJBM)*, 2(1), 212-226. DOI: 10.46306/bbijbm.v2i1.30

I. Introduction

1.1. Background

In this era of globalization, competition between companies is very tight, both state-owned and private. Every company is competing to be the top guard for its competitors. They try to come up with the best ideas in order to maintain an already achieved position or seize a leading position. PT. Indosino Agrochemical is the latest formulator company, established in 2009 in the Lippo Cikarang Industrial area which is a modern and most comprehensive industrial area in Indonesia. PT Indosino's production capacity is capable of producing 3000 KL per product. The head of production at our company is from China and is an expert in the field of pesticides and has decades of experience. With this expertise, PT Indosino can guarantee that the products produced are of the same quality as other products.

This intense competition requires PT Indosino Agrochemical to strive to achieve a strong position in the competition, so that it always carries out comprehensive innovations in an effort to improve performance. The success of a business organization can be measured by the results that have been achieved (performance), either at the individual, team, or organizational level. The success to achieve high organizational performance certainly starts from the individual performance of employees. Therefore, the individual performance of employees becomes the main focus of PT. Indosino Agrochemical, with various managerial steps that are considered capable of improving the individual performance of its employees.

The company's goals or objectives will be achieved if the individual employee performance shows high or even very high performance. Organizational performance begins with performance at the individual level, namely the individual performance of employees. Individual performance of employees collectively leads to individual performance. Individual employee performance is the quality and quantity of work achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities assigned to him. Meanwhile, Benardin and Russell stated that performance is the result produced by certain job functions or activities at certain jobs during a certain period of time. The results of the work are the result of the abilities, skills and desires achieved.

According to research results (A. C. H-E., 1915) individual employee performance is influenced by several factors, namely ability and expertise, work design, knowledge, personality, leadership, job satisfaction, organizational culture, work environment, loyalty, work discipline and commitment. Therefore the company certainly strives to display individual performance in several ways. The efforts made to improve the individual performance of employees can be by practicing democratic leadership, because it has been proven to be able to affect employee performance (Alam et al., 2021; Heriyanti & Apriyani, 2021; Rathore et al., 2017).

Democratic leadership implies that one of the main responsibilities of leaders is to build institutions with democratic values, such as promoting equality and social justice in organizations as well as in society at large (Møller, 2010). It emphasizes that the principles and values that underlie the democratic approach need to be embedded in both management and leadership practices.

The leadership that can be applied to PT Indosino is democratic leadership. Democratic leadership generally assumes that the opinion of the crowd is better than their own opinion and participation will lead to responsibility for the implementer (Kurniawan, 2018) stating that there are several characteristics possessed by a democratic leader, namely: happy to receive suggestions and opinions even criticism from employees. Always try to prioritize cooperation in an effort to achieve goals, sincerely give the widest possible freedom to employees who make mistakes which are then corrected so that employees do not make the same mistakes but are more daring to make other mistakes, always try to make employees more successful than their leaders, and strive to develop self-capacity as a leader leadership element is very influential in the development of individual employee performance. Providing direction and motivation by company leaders to employees.

In addition to democratic leadership, of course, employees need an adequate work environment, so that they can work comfortably, which in turn will improve their performance. There are several research results that prove that the work environment has a positive effect on employee performance (Selvarajan et al., 2007; Yeh & Huan, 2017).

According to (Setiawan, 2018), the work environment is everything that is in the environment around workers and that can affect him in carrying out work tasks. The work environment can have positive and negative impacts on employees in order to achieve their work results. Although the work environment does not carry out the production process in a company, the work environment has a direct influence on the employees who carry out the production process. The work environment has an important role in the sustainability of a company.

Leadership and work environment have been proven to have a positive effect on employee performance, but without work discipline, the role of democratic leadership and work environment will not be effective without employee work discipline. Work discipline plays a very important role in influencing work results (performance). Several studies have proven that work discipline has a positive effect on employee work, both in terms of process and work results (Gunawan & Sunardi, 2016; Kasmir & Ramlawati, 2020; Metra & Kartini, 2017).

Discipline is a process used to deal with performance problems where this process involves leaders in identifying and communicating performance problems to employees. According to (Dewi & Harjoyo, 2019) the nature of work discipline is a

person's ability to regularly, diligently, continuously and work in accordance with applicable rules without violating the rules that have been set. The success of the company can be influenced by work discipline. The company's goals will not be achieved without the discipline of all employees and company leaders.

Democratic leadership has a significant influence on individual employee performance. Thus, variables such as work discipline, work environment theoretically have a close relationship in influencing individual employee performance.

1.2. Objective

The research has the following objectives:

1. To determine the effect of democratic leadership on individual employee performance
2. To determine the effect of work discipline on individual employee performance
3. To determine the effect of the work environment on the individual performance of employees
4. To determine the effect of leadership, work discipline and work environment on individual employee performance.

II. Literature Review

2.1. Background Theory

Democratic Leadership

Leadership that prioritizes policy making with group discussions, leaders respect the opinions of each member of the organization and provide alternative procedures if there are obstacles in implementing policies.

One of the democratic leaderships according to Evan and Robert House quoted by Thoha in their book entitled Leadership in Management (Khairizah et al., 2016) is defined as "participatory (democratic) leadership. In this leadership style, the leader tries to ask for and use suggestions from his subordinates. But the decision still rests with him."

Then according to (Beglar & Nemoto, 2014) "In this case the manager has perfect trust in his subordinates". Fitriyadi et al., (2019) This style usually manifests in various ways, such as:

1. The view that no matter how large the resources and funds available to the organization, all of them in themselves do not mean anything unless used and utilized by humans in the organization for the sake of achieving the goals and objectives of the organization.

2. In organizational life it is not possible, unnecessary and even not all activities are carried out by the leadership themselves and therefore always strive for practical and realistic delegation of authority without losing organizational control.
3. Subordinates are actively involved in self-determination through their participation in the decision-making process.
4. Real sincerity in treating subordinates as political beings, economic beings, social beings and as individuals with distinctive characteristics and identities who have very complex needs, ranging from material ones such as clothing, food and housing, increasing to needs. which are security, social needs, and the need for status recognition to mental and spiritual needs.
5. Efforts to obtain sincere recognition from subordinates for the leadership of the person concerned are based on proving the ability of the organizational leader to be effective, not just because of having formal authority based on his appointment.

Work Discipline

Discipline is the level of compliance and obedience to applicable rules and is willing to accept sanctions or penalties if violating the rules set out in the discipline. (Istan & Hardinata, 2020).

Discipline is an obedient and obedient behavior to the rules of applicable norms. Obedience and obedience are really based on a high awareness of the responsibility given to him not because of fear or coercion. Discipline must be based on (1) Ability to carry out responsibilities (2) Readiness to accept sanctions if a violation occurs (3) Self-sacrificing dedication to achieve goals (Hasibuan & Prastowo, 2019).

(Irwanto & Melinda, 2015) explains that discipline is a condition that causes or encourages employees to act and carry out all activities in accordance with established norms or rules. The emphasis of discipline according to this explanation is on creating a conducive situation or atmosphere so as to enable employees to carry out activities according to organizational norms and rules.

Work Environment

The work environment is the overall tools and materials faced by the surrounding environment where a person works, work methods, and work arrangements both individually and as a group as well as the conditions around the workplace both physically and non-physically that can give a pleasant impression, secure, and feel at home at work. (Mahajaya & Subudi, 2016). The condition of the work environment is said to be good if humans can carry out activities optimally, healthy, safe and comfortable. The suitability of the work environment can be seen as a result in the long term. An unfavorable work environment can demand more manpower and time and does not support obtaining an efficient work system design.

Trang et al., (2015) the work environment is everything that is around the employee and that can affect him in carrying out the tasks assigned to him. Meanwhile, according to (Trang et al., 2015) suggests the work environment is something that is around the workers and which affects him in carrying out the tasks assigned (Trang et al., 2015).

According to (Mahajaya & Subudi, 2016) the work environment has an influence on reducing employee performance caused by lack of flexibility in the work environment, work noise disturbance, lack of interpersonal relationships between superiors and subordinates. From the opinion of experts, it can be concluded that the work environment is everything that is around employees at work, both physical and non-physical that can affect employees at work. The physical work environment is all physical conditions that exist around the workplace that can affect employees either directly or indirectly. While the non-physical work environment is all conditions that occur related to work relationships, both relationships with superiors, as well as relationships with fellow coworkers or relationships with subordinates. So this non-physical work environment is also a group of work environments that cannot be ignored. According to (Sari et al., 2016) The physical work environment is a physical condition found around the workplace that can affect employees either directly or indirectly.

Employee Individual Performance

According to (Assyifa, 2014) "Performance is the result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him." According to (Putri et al., 2020) "Performance is the result of a process that refers and is measured over a certain period of time based on pre-determined provisions or agreements."

According to (Wati, 2019) "Performance is a person's achievement/achievement with regard to the tasks assigned to him". Meanwhile, according to Sudarmanto (2011: 9) "Performance is something that people actually do and can be observed. In this sense, performance includes actions and behaviors that are relevant to organizational goals. According to (Ariani, 2018) "Performance is the result obtained by an organization, both the organization is profit oriented and non-profit oriented which is produced over a period of time".

2.2. Hypothesis

The hypothesis is a temporary answer to the research objectives derived from the framework that has been made. Hypothesis is a statement about the relationship between some two or more variables. Based on the theoretical basis and framework of thought, the research hypotheses proposed in this study are:

1. The effect of democratic leadership on individual employee performance

The democratic leadership style is a leadership style known as the decision-making process that is more likely to have results from having a greater commitment to organizational goals and objectives (Andrysyah et al., 2020).

H1: Leadership has a significant effect on individual employee performance.

2. The influence of the work environment on the individual performance of employees

The work environment is everything that is around the employee's workplace both physical and non-physical that can support the individual performance of employees in carrying out the tasks assigned to them (Kurniawan, Harry, 2019).

H2: The work environment has a significant positive effect on the individual performance of employees

3. The effect of work discipline on individual employee performance

Work discipline can be interpreted as an attitude of respect, respect, obeying applicable regulations both written and unwritten and not deviating and willing to accept sanctions if they violate the duties and authorities given (Sarwani, 2016).

H3: Work discipline has a significant positive effect on individual employee performance

4. The Influence of Democratic Leadership, Work Environment, and Work Discipline on Employee Performance.

Many factors affect performance, for example leadership (Iqbal et al., 2015), Work Environment (Riyadi, 2019), and Discipline (Arif et al., 2019; Solihah et al., 2021; Yudhistianto et al., 2017). Based on some of the results of these studies, the researchers tried to propose four hypotheses as follows:

H4: Democratic Leadership, Work Environment, and Work Discipline simultaneously have a significant positive effect on individual employee performance.

III. Methodology

Based on this research, the population in this research are all employees who work at PT Indosino Agrochemical. The method of data collection was done through a questionnaire. The researcher used a questionnaire which was directly distributed to the employees of PT Indosino Agrochemical, which would be filled in directly by the employees of PT Indosino Agrochemical. While the distribution is by accidental sampling. To set the style, type Equation in the style box. But this style only set the tab stop position. To put the equation on the right place just press tab button one time.

IV. Results and Discussion

4.1. Validity and Reliability Test

Validity Test

Table 1. Validity Test Results

Variable	Indicators	Correlation item total	Cronbach Alpha	Results
Democratic Leadership	KD1	.685	0.854	Valid & Reliable
	KD2	.785		
	KD3	.664		
	KD4	.710		
Work Discipline	DK1	.668	0.957	Valid & Reliable
	DK2	.770		
	DK3	.498		
	DK4	.707		
Work Environment	LK1	.746	0.872	Valid & Reliable
	LK2	.819		
	LK3	.826		
	LK4	.559		
Employee Individual Performance	KI1	.585	0.859	Valid & Reliable
	KI2	.743		
	KI3	.598		
	KI4	.748		
	KI5	.748		

Based on the table, it can be concluded that from the correlation calculation, a correlation coefficient will be obtained which is used to measure the level of validity in determining whether or not it is feasible, then a correlation coefficient significance test is carried out at a significance level of 0.05 a, so from the four statements from democratic leadership variables to individual employee performance declared valid so that it can be used for further data collection.

Reliability Test

Based on table 4.1 from the reliability test that has been carried out, it can be seen that Cronbach's Alpha each variable is more than the required standard Cronbach's Alpha, which is 0.60. So all the variables in this study in measuring the questionnaire which contains statements based on indicators of the variables declared reliable and trusted or consistent answers.

4.2. Classic Assumption Test

Normality Test

The normality test was conducted to see whether the residual values were normally distributed or not. The following is a table of data processing results for the classical assumption test stage, namely the normality of the data:

Table 2.Validity Test Results

		Unstandardized Residual
N		39
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	1.50463217
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.105
	Positive	.105
	Negative	-.068
Test Statistic		.105
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200 ^{c,d}

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. b. Calculated from data.

From table , it can be seen that the significance value between the variables of Democratic Leadership (X1) Work Discipline (X2) Work Environment (X3) and Employee Individual Performance (Y) is 0.200 which means greater than 0.05. From these data it can be concluded that the residual value is normally distributed.

Heteroscedasticity Test

Democratic Leadership (X1), Work Discipline (X2), Work Environment (X3), Employee Individual Performance (Y).

Table 3. Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.281	.421		.667	.509
	TOT_DK	.117	.085	.383	1.386	.175
	TOT_LK	.029	.084	.101	.342	.734
	TOT_KD	-.019	.068	-.054	-.274	.786
a. Dependent Variable: Abs_Res						

Based on table , it can be seen that the heteroscedasticity statistical test stated that the significant value of the independent variable was above 0.05. So it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity in this model.

Multicollinearity Test

Democratic Leadership (X1), Work Discipline (X2), Work Environment (X3), Employee Individual Performance (Y).

Table 4. Multicollinearity Test Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1.308	.767		1.706	.097		
	TOT_DK	.739	.154	.710	4.788	.000	.302	3.312
	TOT_LK	.009	.154	.009	.056	.956	.263	3.803
	TOT_KD	.285	.125	.241	2.283	.029	.594	1.683
a. Dependent Variable: TOT_KI								

Based on table , it can be seen that the tolerance value > 0.10 or the VIF value < 10, then there is no multicollinearity.

4.3. Hypotheses Test

T-Test (Partial)

Partial test (t test) was used to determine the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable individually. The following table contains information regarding the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable partially:

Table 6. T Test Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.308	.767		1.706	.097
	TOT_DK	.739	.154	.710	4.788	.000
	TOT_LK	.009	.154	.009	.056	.956
	TOT_KD	.285	.125	.241	2.283	.029

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL DK : Work dicipline , LK: Work encirontment, KD : Democracy Leadership

a. Democratic Leadership Affects Individual Employee Performance

Testing the influence of Democratic Leadership (X1) on Individual Employee Performance (Y) obtained a significant value of $0.29 < 0.05$ or 2.283 (t-count) > 2.0025 (t-table), it can be concluded that Democratic Leadership has a significant effect on Employee Individual Performance.

H1 which states that Democratic Leadership has an effect on Employee Individual Performance is accepted.

b. Work Environment Affects Employee's Individual Performance

Testing the influence of the work environment (X1) on individual employee performance (Y) obtained a significant value of $0.956 > 0.05$ or 0.056 (t-count) < 2.0025 (t-table), it can be concluded that the work environment has no significant effect on performance Individual Employees.

H2 which states that work discipline affects the individual performance of employees is accepted.

c. Work Discipline Affects Employee Individual Performance

Testing the effect of Work Discipline (X1) on Employee Individual Performance (Y) obtained a significant value of $0.000 < 0.05$ or 4.788 (t-count) > 2.0025 (t-table), it can be concluded that Work Discipline has a significant effect on Individual Performance Employee.

H3 which states that the work environment affects the individual performance of employees is rejected.

F Test (Simultaneous)

Leadership Democracy Work Discipline Work Environment Individual Employee Performance:

Table 5. F Test Results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	284.279	3	94.760	38.552	.000 ^b
	Residual	86.029	35	2.458		
	Total	370.308	38			
a. Dependent Variable: TOT_KI						

Testing the influence of Democratic Leadership (X1) Work Discipline (X2) Work Environment (X3) Together on Individual Employee Performance (Y) obtained F test value $38,552 > 3.18$, it can be concluded that Testing the influence of Democratic Leadership, Work Discipline, and Environment Working together or simultaneously has a significant positive effect on individual employee performance.

H4 which states that Leadership, Democracy, Work Discipline and Work Environment have a significant effect on Individual Employee Performance is accepted.

V. Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1. Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, the following conclusions were obtained:

1. Work discipline on individual employee performance has a significant effect. Where t count is greater than t table, then the hypothesis which states that there is an effect of Work Discipline on individual employee performance is acceptable.
2. The employee's work environment has no significant effect on individual employee performance. This is indicated by where t count is smaller than t table, the work environment has less effect on individual employee performance, meaning that even though the company provides good facilities, it has no significant effect or has a small effect on Employee Individual Performance.
3. And the results of the influence of democratic leadership on individual employee performance have a significant influence. Where t count is greater than t table, then the hypothesis which states that there is an influence of democratic leadership on individual employee performance is acceptable.

5.2. Recommendation

Based on the research that has been done, the researchers put forward some suggestions as follows

1. For the company PT Indosino Agrochemical,
 - a. Based on the results of research on employee respondents of PT Indosino Agrochemical, it can be concluded several things as follows, namely work discipline has a positive and significant effect on individual employee performance. The better the work discipline applied by employees, the higher the individual performance of employees. Therefore, work discipline must be a concern for company managers, because it will affect the good or bad performance of individual employees. From the results of data processing, the average value of work discipline is below 2 on a scale of 1 to 5, this indicates low work discipline.

- b. Democratic leadership needs to be improved because its role is proven to have an effect on individual employee performance. Judging from the average value of employee perceptions of democratic leadership, the average democratic leadership is still below 2 on a scale of 1 to 5, so all democratic leadership practices need to be improved.
2. For further researchers based on the limitations of this study, it can be suggested for further research as follows:
 - a. It is hoped that further research can look for new things such as the number of respondents can be increased, namely by distributing questionnaires with two methods, namely online and offline.
 - b. Future research is expected to provide a more complex model of the framework to fill the limitations of the study, namely not being able to empirically prove the effect of the work environment on individual employee performance.

References

- A. C. H-E. (1915). Chapman. *Notes and Queries*, s11-XI(274), 251.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/s11-XI.274.251-d>
- Alam, A. A., Amilia, A., Hariyati, S., & (2021). The Influence of Democratic Leadership Style and Work Discipline on Employee Performance. *Available at SSRN*
- Andrysyah, A., Basri, A., Junaida, J., Efendi, S., & Tambunan, N. (2020). The Effect of Democratic Leadership Style on the Performance of Employees at PT. Medan Industry Area (Persero). *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(4), 3983–3989.
<https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v3i4.1474>
- Ariani, M. A. (2018). KEPEMIMPINAN, KOMITMEN, DAN BUDAYA ORGANISASI MEMPENGARUHI KINERJA KARYAWAN (Studi Kasus: PT.SUMRE1CON DI KOTA BALIKPAPAN. *Jurnal GeoEkonomi*, 9(1), 32–44.
<https://doi.org/10.36277/geoekonomi.v9i1.18>
- Arif, M., Putri, E. S., Yudi, S., & Jufrizen. (2019). Effect of Compensation and Discipline on Employee Performance. *Proceeding of The 3 Rd Internasional Conference on Accounting, Business & Economics (UII-ICABE 2019)*.
- Assyifa, N. (2014). Analisis Kinerja Pegawai Dalam Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Di Kementrian Energi Sumber Daya Mineral (Studi Kasus Direktorat Jendral Minyak Dan Gas Bumi). *Jurnal SDM*, 1–13.
- Beglar, D., & Nemoto, T. (2014). Developing Likert-scale questionnaires. *JALT2013 Conference Proceedings*, 1–8.
- Dewi, D. P., & Harjoyo. (2019). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. In *Unpam Press* (Issue 1).
- Fitriyadi, A., Tilaar, D., Studi, P., Sekolah, M., Ilmu, T., & Gentiaras, E. (2019). *Issn 2086-9592. XI*, 117–126.

- Gunawan, A., & Sunardi, H. (2016). Pengaruh Kompensasi Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt Gesit Nusa Tangguh. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Bisnis Ukrida*, 16(1), 98066.
- Hasibuan, A. T., & Prastowo, A. (2019). Konsep Pendidikan Abad 21: Kepemimpinan Dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Sd/Mi. *MAGISTRA: Media Pengembangan Ilmu Pendidikan Dasar Dan Keislaman*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.31942/mgs.v10i1.2714>
- Heriyanti, S. S., & Apriyani, E. (2021). The Influence of Democratic Leadership Style, Work Discipline, and Work Motivation on Employee Performance at PT. Sinotrans. *of Research in*.
- Iqbal, N., Anwar, S., & Haider, N. (2015). Effect of leadership style on employee performance. In *Arabian Journal of Business and academia.edu*.
- Irwanto, T., & Melinda, T. F. (2015). *Peternakan dan Kesehatan Hewan Provinsi Bengkulu berjumlah 100 pegawai menggunakan simpel random sampling . Metode Analisis yang digunakan dengan Analisis Regresi Berganda , Analisis Korelasi , Uji T , Uji F serta Uji Koefisien Determinasi (R 2)*. Hasil. 215–228.
- Istan, M., & Hardinata. (2020). Gaya Kepemimpinan Demokratis, Disiplin Kerja Dan Imbalan Finansial Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Yayasan Persatuan Perguruan Taman Siswa Curup. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Bisnis*, 25(1), 66–81. <https://doi.org/10.35760/eb.2020.v25i1.2223>
- Kasmir, T., & Ramlawati, R. (2020). Pengaruh Motivasi Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Pada Dinas Pemberdayaan Perempuan Dan Perlindungan Anak MANOR: *JURNAL Manajemen Dan*, 2(1), 420–428. <https://journal.unifa.ac.id/index.php/manor/article/view/242>
- Khairizah, A., Noor, I., & Suprpto, A. (2016). PENGARUH GAYA KEPEMIMPINAN TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN (Studi pada Karyawan di Perpustakaan Universitas Brawijaya Malang). *Jurnal Administrasi Publik (JAP)*, 3(7), 1268–1272.
- Kurniawan, Harry, H. (2019). Effect of Work Discipline and Work Environment on Employee Performance with Work Motivation as an Intervening Variable in Department of Tourism , Youth and Sport of Padang District. *Archives of Business Research*, 7(7), 88–101.
- Kurniawan, Y. F. (2018). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Demokratis terhadap Kinerja Karyawan di Cv Anugerah Jaya. *Agora*, 6(2), 1–6. <file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/7794-14667-1-SM.pdf>
- Mahajaya, G. R., & Subudi, M. (2016). Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana (Unud), Bali , Indonesia Peningkatan kinerja pegawai menjadi sangat penting dalam perubahan kebijakan pemerintah dalam mengembangkan semangat reformasi untuk memberi ruang gerak serta peran serta masyarakat. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Unud*, 5(11), 7072–7099.
- Metra, P. B. J. S., & Kartini, I. . N. (2017). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Demokrasi, Motivasi Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pt. Mega Auto Finance Di Surabaya. *JEM17: Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen*, 2(2). <http://jurnal.untag-sby.ac.id/index.php/JEM17/article/view/1201/1024>
- Møller, J. (2010). Leadership: Democratic. *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 12–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00445-0>

- Putri, E. L. W., Marnis, M., & Hendriani, S. (2020). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Job Insecurity Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Non Pns Fakultas Pada Universitas Riau Dengan *Jurnal Tepak Manajemen Bisnis*, XII(2). <https://jtmb.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JTMB/article/view/7865>
- Rathore, K., Khaliq, C. A., & Aslam, N. (2017). The Influence of Leadership Styles on Employees Performance under Perceptions of Organizational Politics: A Study of Telecom Sector in Pakistan. In *International Journal of* researchgate.net.
- Riyadi, S. (2019). THE INFLUENCE OF JOB SATISFACTION, WORK ENVIRONMENT, INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS AND COMPENSATION TOWARD JOB STRESS AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE. *International Review of Management and Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.6920>
- Sari, D. S. E., Sunuharyo, B. S., & Utami, H. N. (2016). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Fisik Dan Non Fisik Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan (Studi pada karyawan PT Telkom Indonesia Witel Jatim Selatan Malang). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 40(1), 76–85.
- Sarwani. (2016). The Effect of Work Discipline And Work Environment. *Jurnal Internasional Sinergi*, 6(2), 53–67.
- Selvarajan, T. T., Ramamoorthy, N., Flood, P. C., Guthrie, J. P., MacCurtain, S., & Liu, W. (2007). The role of human capital philosophy in promoting firm innovativeness and performance: Test of a causal model. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(8), 1456–1470. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190701502588>
- Setiawan, I. (2018). Pengaruh Keselamatan Kerja Fisik Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi Empirik Karyawan PT. Karakatau Posco di Cilegon Banten). *Jurnal Riset Bisnis Dan Manajemen Tirtayasa (JRBMT)*, 2(1), 1–19. <https://jurnal.untirta.ac.id/index.php/JRBM/article/download/3828/2794>
- Solihah, S. M., Budiawan, A., & (2021). The Influence of Autocratic Leadership and Work Discipline on Employee Performance of the “ABC” City Culture and Tourism Office. ... *Asia Pacific Journal*
- Trang, I., Mekel, P., & Sahlan, N. I. (2015). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja, Kepuasan Kerja Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Bank Sulut Cabang Airmadidi. *Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 3(1), 52–62.
- Wati, E. (2019). *Konsep Dasar Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. 1–51. <https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/2rm84>
- Yeh, S. S., & Huan, T. C. (2017). Assessing the impact of work environment factors on employee creative performance of fine-dining restaurants. *Tourism Management*, 58, 119–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.10.006>
- Yudhistianto, S. A., SE, S., & (2017). The Effect of Styles of Leadership and Work Discipline on Performance Through Motivation as Intervening Variables at the Information and Data Processing of TNI AD *Journal of Business and*