

Paais & Sui, 2018

Volume 4 Issue 3, pp.421-435

Date of Publication: 22nd November 2018

DOI-<https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2018.43.421435>

This paper can be cited as: Paais, M., & Sui, J. M. (2018). The Influence Analysis of the Leadership Behavior toward Working Satisfaction of the Employee. PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences, 4(3), 421-435.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

THE INFLUENCE ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR TOWARD WORKING SATISFACTION OF THE EMPLOYEE

Maartje Paais

Lecturer, Economics Management of Universitas Kristen Maluku, Indonesia
maartjepaais19@gmail.com

Jeky Melkianus Sui

Lecturer statistics of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Managemet Rutu Nusa, Maluku, Indonesia
Jekysuy@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

The scope of this Study is restricted to the review on the human resources management which is approached from the employee aspect in the organization. The use of this design is premised on the fact that questionnaire with Likert scale 1-5. The sampling technique of this study is census refers to the quantitative research method, in which all the members of the population are enumerated. The analysis method on this research use approach multiple regression analysis. The finding of the study reveals that variables of instructive, consultative, participative, and delegative behaviors have influence toward satisfaction of the employees. But instructive behavior did not significant toward working satisfaction of the employees. It was therefore recommended among others that combination of participative, consultative behaviors and delegative behaviors in leadership allows the improvement of employee satisfaction at STIA

Ambon. Future studies should look further at the policy and leadership behavior models, specifically in public organizations, besides other influencing factors. The results of this study contribute to knowledge regarding the impact of leadership behavior on good work satisfaction of employee. Practically, this study can be used as a guideline for the future development and good work satisfaction.

Keywords

Multiple Regression Analysis, Leadership Behavior, Working Satisfaction

1. Introduction

The roles of both instructor and employee on higher educational institutions will determine the success in bringing the given mission into reality. It is based on the fact that instructor as the operational and technical executives of the educational institution who have to teach their students while the employees have done their jobs in supporting the implementation of the teaching and learning process. Therefore, quality of both the instructor and employee should be improved. If any organization has the leader with ethical leadership, knowledge and ability, it can successfully compete with any other organization. Therefore, ethical leadership is necessary and important to the development of the organization and the country (Choojeen et al., 2017, Pasricha et al., 2018, Babalola et al., 2018 and Welty et al., 2018).

Selcuk and Elvira (2017) described as the idealized impact is the attribute that leaders have which in turn gives the followers inspiration for taking their leaders as the role models for themselves. This attribute is also called charisma. Charisma develops value that inspires and establishes a sense of understanding between people. Naturally, charisma tends to be inspirational. The objectives are to provide knowledge and skills as well as behavior that is badly needed in higher educational institutions. Behavioral change is a quality indicator for both instructor and employee that can be improved through education, training, funding and providing motivation and influence from the leader's behavior. For an employee at the lower position, subordinate, their behavioral changes are mostly influenced by their superior's behavior (Paterson & Huang, 2018, et al., 2018 and Tu et al., 2018).

Concerning with the problem, a specific leadership style is required in which leadership is defined as a process to influence others in order to achieve the given goal (Ivancevich, 2001:17). Paul Harsey & Kenneth Blanchard (1998:83) have categorized the leader's behavior

into 4 (four) categories; instructing, consulting, participating, and delegating. Each behavior shows different impact toward the employee satisfaction especially in doing their jobs.

This research is the background to suspect that the decline in employee satisfaction at STIA about issues related to leadership behaviors. Problems were found from observations among others is the low participation in the ceremony for national holidays and important events the university level, the level of presence that needs to be improved, the low exemplary behavior of superiors, employee performance appraisal system issues that are not clear. The symptoms are felt in the work unit faculties and service units of faculty that may be caused by jealousy to the behavior and performance of employees are encouraged that seemed untouched by a number of rules that are applied to administrative personnel. Based on this research issue, this study attempts to find answers to the following research questions; whether the behavior of the leadership effect on employee job satisfaction STIA Ambon.

1.1 Leadership

More experts suggest many concepts of leadership, such as: leadership as a process to influence activities of an organized group in order to establish and achieve the definite goal. Leadership is considered as a process to provide briefing and influence to the group's activities which relate to each other. (Stoner, 1982: 468); leadership is as an activity that influences others to achieve the given goal of the organization. (Terry, 1983: 12); leadership is as a process to influence both individual and group activities. (Hersey, 1992: 83); leadership as an effort that applying influential style in order to motivate individual to achieve the goal. (Gibson et al., 1991: 191). Three important implications of those definitions are (1) leadership relates to someone else, subordinates or followers; (2) leadership relates to unbalanced delegation authority among leaders and members of an organization; (3) a leader may employ his/her influence as well as give certain guideline to the subordinates.

Theories of leadership on the classification of the leading behavioral approach are determined which effective effort performed by the leaders, how the leaders communicate with and motivate the subordinates, how the leaders perform their jobs, and so on. Behavior can be maintained and developed; therefore, individuals can be trained by applying appropriate leadership behavior in order to lead more effectively (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018,. Shamir, 2018, and Two Maurer & London, 2018). Leadership behavioral aspects are leadership functions and

styles- The leadership functions comprise of task-related function or problem solutions as well as group maintenance or social function (Thomas et al., 2018).

The first function relates to the suggestion of problem solution, information, and opinion. The second is anything that can assist the group smoothness in doing its activities, agreement with other groups, mediation of different opinions, and etc. Leadership styles are comprised of task-oriented style and employee-oriented style. For the task-oriented leader, he/she will guide and monitor his/her subordinates closely in order to guarantee that the task will be done as what he/she wanted. A leader who applies task-oriented style will be more concerned about working performance than the employee development and growth. While the employee-oriented leader will strive for motivating than monitoring his/her subordinates. The leader motivates all members of the organization in doing their jobs as well as providing an opportunity to participate in a decision-making process, creating companionship atmosphere as well as trusting relationship to each other and respecting members of the organization.

1.2 Leadership Behavior

Research that related to the leadership behavior was performed by Douglas McGregor in 1961 and well-known as theory X and Y. A leader who supported ideas of theory X would tend to choose an autocratic leadership style. While a leader who supported theory Y would tend to choose participative or democratic leadership styles. In 1978, Likert examined a management system; a leader who was more oriented to work and through employees would bring about more effective outcomes. It didn't mean that the leader ignored the production needs as well as tasks in the department. In the same period, Blake and Mouton examined the managerial framework; team management was the most effective type of the leadership behavior. This approach was suitable for any situation because it improved the employee achievement, reduced the absenteeism level and the employee shift, as well as improved working satisfaction of the employees. Another study was performed at the Ohio State in 1978; the lowest level of employee shift and the highest level of the employee satisfaction were under the leadership of a leader who had high consideration. A leader who had low consideration and high initiative structure bring about more complaints and high employee shift. The subordinate's assessment of the leader effectiveness was not depended on a specific style of the leader, but on the situation where the style was applied.

1.3 Working Satisfaction of the Employee

Working satisfaction refers to the employee attitude. Working satisfaction is a set of feelings perceived by the employees concerning with their jobs, enjoyable or not (Davis and Merther; 1996: 105). Satisfaction shows conformity between someone's expectation and reward which would be gained from the job. The dimensions of the working satisfaction are: first, the wage is a reward for service, energy, though, and time which have been spent by the employees. Second, the working environment is a condition which is physically related to types of equipment as well as working devices, peace and free of noise as well as adequate lighting. Such working condition will create employee satisfaction. Third, the superior will make a performance assessment as a systematic and formal procedure in an organization to evaluate its member's performance. Fourth, career is a set of separate but interrelated working activities which create continuous, peacefulness, and specific meaning for someone.

2. Method

This research used an explanative approach which described causal relationship between leadership behaviors (instructive, consultative, participative, and delegative) and working satisfaction of the employee. The scope of this research is restricted to the review on the human resources management which is approached from the employee aspect in the organization. The use of this design is premised on the fact that questionnaire with likert scale 1-5 was designed to obtain information that provided answers to research questions from the sampled subjects, and that samples were chosen from the population with a view to ascertaining the comparative events, issues and correlations among. The sampling technique of this study is census. Census and sampling are two methods of collecting survey data about the population that is used by many countries. Census refers to the quantitative research method, in which all the members of the population are enumerated. On the other hand, the sampling is the widely used method, in statistical testing, where in a data set is selected from the large population, which represents the entire group. Sugiyono (2001:61) describes the sampling is a technique of determination of saturated samples when all members of a population are used as a sample. This is often done when the population is highly small. Another term sample census is saturated, where all members of the population are used samples.

The analysis method on this research use approach multiple regression analysis was used to answer all the research questions. The mathematic expression is;

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + e$$

In which: Y=working satisfaction of the employee, X₁=instructive behavior, X₂=consultative behavior, X₃=participative behavior, X₄= delegative behavior, β₀= Constanta, e = error, β₁ ... β₄ = regression coefficient, and by using the smallest square method we can gain coefficient β₁ ... β₄, therefore, a model which shows the influence between working satisfaction of the employee as dependent variable and instructive, consultative, participative, a well as delegative behaviors of leadership as independent variables can be revealed.

3. Results

By using LR. Klein-Test, it shows that the correlation coefficient value of the entire used-independent variable is smaller than the determination coefficient value as a result of its regression model. Therefore, it can be concluded mat there is no multicollinearity among its independent variables in this model. For more information, the correlation matrixes among those variables are as follow;

Table 1: Relationships among the Predictors and Criterion Variables

Variable	Instructive Behaviour	Consultative Behaviour	Participative Behaviour	Delegative Behaviour	Work Satisfaction
Instructive Behavior	1.000	0.402*	0.058	0.425*	0.107
Consultative Behavior	0.402*	1.000	0.576*	0.164	0.384*
Participative Behavior	0.058	0.576*	1.000	-0.045	0.392*
Delegative Behavior	0.425*	0.164	-0.045	1.000	0.178
Work Satisfaction	0.107	0.384*	0.392*	0.178	1.000

Source: Results of Primary data analysis, 2018

Review of the correlation coefficients in table 1 shows that there were significant correlations between the participative behavior, delegative behavior and instructive behavior. Also, the 3 indicators of leadership behavior significantly correlated one another.

Table 2: Multiple Regression Analysis of leadership behavior to Work Satisfaction

Model	Sum of Squares	df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	127.963	4	31.991	9.692	0.000
Residual	547.900	166	3.301		
Total	675.863	170			
R = .944 $R^2 = .891$ Adj. $R^2 = .796$ Std. Error = 1.816					

Table 2 presents the model summary and regression Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). From the table, the multiple correlation R Square=0.891, indicates that the model accounts for only 89.10% of variance in satisfaction changes of the employee, can be described by variations in change, instructive behavior, consultative behavior, participative, as well as delegative behaviors, while the rest, 10.9% is described by other variable which is not analyzed on this model. The results show that, though high, the overall model of leadership behavior significantly predicted work Satisfaction in STIA Ambon ($F_{(4, 166)} = 9.69, p < 0.05$).

Table 3: Multiple Regression Analysis showing the Contributions of each of the Predictor Variables to work Satisfaction

Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardize	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)		
(Constant)	5.764	1.600		3.602	.000*
Instructive behavior	.568	0.600	-.081	-.954	.342
Consultative behavior	.285	.097	.255	2.653	.009*
Participative behavior	.343	.143	.213	2.408	.017*
Delegative behaviour	.231	.101	.178	2.285	.024*
a. Dependent Variable: work Satisfaction					

Source: Results of Primary data analysis, 2018

Review of the beta weights (β) in table 3 shows that only three indicator leadership behaviors (consultative, participative and delegative behavior) had significant positive contribution to working satisfaction of the employee. The one indicator leadership behaviors (Instructive behavior) did not significantly contribute to the model β =.568, t =.954,

$p = .342$. Model Multiple Regression Analysis in this study as follows;

$$Y = 5.765 - 0.568 X_1 + 0.285 X_2 + 0.343 X_3 + 0.231 X_4 + e$$

4. Discussion

The analysis result of this research shows that variable of instructive behavior did not significantly influence toward work satisfaction of the employee, and it shows that both employees and or instructors at STIA Ambon do not like this behavior. The results of this study indicate the average level of maturity of good employees, do not require detailed direction in carrying out their work. This condition is in accordance with the demographic characteristics of employees, where the employee population is dominated by employees who have worked over six years with undergraduate and age greater than 30 years. They have a dislike such behavior whereas it tends to treat them as subordinates. For the employees, they feel as being dictated and not to be given any trust to finish their task and make any decision according to their working scope.

Consultative behavior, in doing their activities the subordinates often face more problems which sometimes cannot be solved. They assume that the competent person who can solve these problems is their superior because employees are the one who has signed the tasks on them. Basically, each leader should recognize any job that must be done, in which the job completeness will be imposed on the subordinates. As most subordinates hold a consultation with their superior concerning with their task, so that the superior should have an ability to analyze, knowledgeable and smart, high imagination, self-confidence, integrity, enthusiasm, courageous, and etc.

The results of this study indicate leadership behavior in guiding subordinates in carrying out the work. Diversity levels employee maturity faced with intelligent, where employees still need to work guide. From the research is seen leadership behavior that causes the opportunity to argue and invite subordinates to discuss and be involved in the process of a decision. Leadership behavior in applying a consultative style is in line with the situational leadership theory of Hersey and Blanchard in to identify the level of maturity of employees. According to Hersey and Blanchard, a consultative style is used against the subordinates who performed the task. (Gibson, et al., 1991: 363). A leader who has such features will effect on employees, so that will always be able to assist employees in solving any problems in the form of morale support, direction,

suggestion, and give opportunities to his/her employees to develop themselves in order to improve self-indulgence among the employees so that they feel as if they have obtained a solution for these problems. The research findings by Darwish (2000) suggest that those who perceive their superiors as adopting consultative or participative leadership behavior are more committed to their organizations, more satisfied with their jobs, and their performance is high. The results also indicate that national culture moderates the relationship of leadership behavior with job satisfaction.

Participative behavior, the most dominant characteristics of participative behavior are guiding, discussing, and cooperating with subordinates (Li et al., 2018, Strobl et al., 2018, and Yan & Hassan, 2018). Subordinates, who participate in decision-making process, will morally have a sense of responsibility for their own decisions. Such responsibility will bring the taken decision into reality. Result of the research at STIA Ambon shows that almost all subordinates prefer participative behavior in leadership whereas its implementation always involve participation of the subordinate in determining any policies, and it conforms to the real condition at the college where most of its members are scholars (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992: 552).

This style becomes the leader's choice to give effect to feelings of self-esteem in employees so as to increase their commitment to carrying out the work. From the research seen how the behavior of leaders who open two-way communication with subordinates and involve them in decision making. Leadership behavior using participative style is a very appropriate choice for building the loyalty of subordinates. Yukl (2002), in discussion of leadership participation states there are four potential benefits include higher decision quality, higher acceptance of decisions by followers, more process satisfaction decisions, and the development of decision-making skills (Nielsen & Marrone, 2018, Muenjohn & McMurray, 2018, Mroz et al., 2018). Delegative behavior, basically, leader has responsible for finishing all tasks in organization, but it is no longer possible for the leader to finish these tasks alone by himself because of greater organization as well as wider working-scope (Gadirajurrett et al., 2018, and Wren, 2018).

The research findings by Ilham et al., (2014) suggest that indicate high levels of the delegative behavior. With the demographic characteristics of the dominant employee having sufficient experience and well educated, the leadership has adapted itself well through the delegation style it implements. Delegation involves assigning new or different tasks or

responsibilities to a subordinate (Akinola et al., 2018). The main aspects of the delegation include the diversity and magnitude of responsibilities, the number of freedoms or ranks of options introduced in deciding how to carry out the responsibility responsibilities, authority to take action and implement decisions without prior consent, the frequency and nature of the reporting requirements and the flow of information on performance (Yukl, 2002).

Consequence of such authority delegation implementation required accountability from the person whom has been entrusted with the task. The leader will make specific note, for the subordinates who succeeded in doing their jobs, as a performance assessment of his/her subordinates. For subordinates, it is the precise opportunity for them to improve their career. Therefore, the authority delegation has close relationship with career improvement of the employees, because without such authority delegation, it is difficult to determine the employee performance and it might create dissatisfaction of the employees who want to make an achievement in their jobs. Result of the research has also shown that the employees of STIA Ambon prefer a combination between participative and consultative leadership behaviors from management of the Administrative College, the Dean as well as the Dean Assistant in order to improve performance and satisfaction of the employees.

5. Conclusions

Results of the research shows that variables of instructive, consultative, participative, and delegative behaviors have influence toward satisfaction of the employees. But, one of them, the instructive behavior did not significant toward working satisfaction of the employees. Variable of Participative behavior has the most dominant influence toward satisfaction of the employees. Such leadership behavior is required in a college because its application is always involving subordinates in any decision-making process, and it conforms to the real condition at the college where most of its members are scholars. Combination between participative and consultative behaviors in leadership allows the improvement of employee satisfaction. Influence of the leadership behavior toward work satisfaction of the employee will create new idea in leadership application at STIA Ambon in order to improve work satisfaction of the employees.

6. Recommendation

Combination of the leadership behaviors allows the improvement of work satisfaction of the employees at STIA Ambon, and it should be used as basic consideration for the leader of

STIA Ambon to implement the combination. Whereas work satisfaction of the employee is not only influenced by the leadership variables, but also other variables which are not included in this research, therefore, it is suggested for other researcher to include other variables which are estimated to have influence toward work satisfaction of the employees in order to complete results of this research.

This study has several limitations that present the possibility for future studies. the sample is restricted to employees in STIA Ambon. Therefore, the future is to do research on other campuses; thus, research on job satisfaction that is expected to be generalized in General and generally accepted in Indonesia. The sample size is rather simple. Therefore, future studies should be carried out using a large sample to provide substantial results regarding the determinants of job satisfaction.

7. Impact of the Study

Despite the limitations, the present study has major implications for job satisfaction. This study also provides a practical contribution to the policy makers in STIA Ambon associated with job satisfaction, namely: behavior of leaders who should be oriented on the task that leadership is more concerned with the behavior of leaders, which led to the preparation of work plans, the establishment of organizational pattern, the channel organization, communication channels, methods and procedures for the achievement of clear goals that are expected to have an impact on employee satisfaction, because there are several indicators of leadership behaviors affect the employee satisfaction that is consultative behavior, participative behavior, and Delegative behavior, whereas instructive behavior did not significant effect on job satisfaction. Employees and leaders have a huge contribution to the company because without both companies will not be executed. Therefore, leaders must be able to put his role as the head of all areas of the company so that it can arrange for employees to work well and can also motivate employees

References

Adekunle, A. A. (2017). Administrators' leadership Skills And Employees' job Engagement In Tertiary Educational Institutions In Ogun State Nigeria. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 778-790. <https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2017.33.778791>

- Akinola, M., Martin, A. E., & Phillips, K. W. (2018). To delegate or not to delegate: Gender differences in affective associations and behavioral responses to delegation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(4), 1467-1491. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0662>
- Babalola, M. T., Stouten, J., Euwema, M. C., & Ovadje, F. (2018). The relation between ethical leadership and workplace conflicts: The mediating role of employee resolution efficacy. *Journal of Management*, 44(5), 2037-2063. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316638163>
- Blake, Robert R. & Jane S, Mouton. (1978). *The New Managerial Grid*. Gulf Publishing. Houston.
- Choojeen, K., Phuangsomjit, C., Angsuchoti, S., & Sukapirom, R. (2017). Factors Affecting Ethical Leadership Of Basic Education School Administrators Under The Office Of The Basic Education Commission: A Structural Equation Model. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1).686-697
<https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2017.s31.686697>
- Darwish A. Yousef, (2000). Organizational commitment: a mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 15 Issue: 1, pp.6-24.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940010305270>.
- Davis & Newstrom. (1989). *Human Behavior at Work* (4th ed). New York, McGraw Hill/ Irwin.
- Gadirajurrett, H., Srinivasan, R., Stevens, J., & Jeena, N. (2018). Impact of Leadership on Team's Performance.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, J. H., & Konopaske, R. (1991). *Organizations: Behavior, structure, processes*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
http://dl.motamem.org/organizations_behavior_structure.pdf.
- Harsey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1998). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice Hall.
- Hersey, Paul & Blanchard, Kenneth. (1977). *Management of Organization Behavior* (3th ed). New York, Englewood Cliff: Prentice Hall.
- Ilham, M., Widodo, S., & Warsono, S. (2014). Analisis Gaya Kepemimpinan Dan Kinerja Pegawai Pada Pengadilan Agama Arga Makmur. *The Manager Review Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 15(7), 940-948.
<http://repository.unib.ac.id/7314/1/Mhd%20Ilham%20n%20Sri%20W.pdf>.

- Ivancevich, Jhon M. (2001). Human resource management (8th ed). Boston, McGraw Hill/Irwin.
- Koran, S., & Koran, E. Principals' Leadership Styles and Strategies Employed to Motivate Teachers in Ronaki Hawler Educational Institutions, Erbil, Iraq. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 4(3), 146-159. <https://dx.doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v4i3p146>.
- Kreitner, R., and Kinicki, A. (1992). organizational behavior (2th ed). Homewood, Ill: Irwin.
- Likert, Rensis. (1978). New Patterns Management. New York, McGraw Hill.
- Li, G., Liu, H., & Luo, Y. (2018). Directive versus participative leadership: Dispositional antecedents and team consequences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(3), 645-664. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12213>.
- Martoyo, Susilo. (1996). Human Resources Management. Edition III. BPFE. Gajah Mada University of Yogyakarta.
- Maurer, T. J., & London, M. (2018). From individual contributor to leader: a role identity shift framework for leader development within innovative organizations. *Journal of Management*, 44(4), 1426-1452. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315614372>.
- Merther, Davis. (1996). Human Resources and Personal Management (9th ed). Boston, McGraw Hill/Irwin.
- McGregor, Douglas. (1961). The Human Side of Enterprise. New York, McGraw-Hill
- Mroz, J. E., Yoerger, M., & Allen, J. A. (2018). Leadership in Workplace Meetings: The Intersection of Leadership Styles and Follower Gender. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 1548051817750542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051817750542>.
- Muenjohn, N., & McMurray, A. (2018). LEADERSHIP AND DECISION MAKING. *Leadership: Regional and Global Perspectives*, 379.
- Nitisemito, Alex S. (1989). Management for Basic and Introduction. Ghalia Indonesia. Jakarta.
- Nielsen, R., & Marrone, J. A. (2018). Humility: Our current understanding of the construct and its role in organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(4), 805-824. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12160>
- Pasricha, P., Singh, B., & Verma, P. (2018). Ethical leadership, organic organizational cultures and corporate social responsibility: An empirical study in social enterprises. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(4), 941-958. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-017-3568-5>.

- Paterson, T. A., & Huang, L. (2018). Am I Expected to Be Ethical? A Role-Definition Perspective of Ethical Leadership and Unethical Behavior. *Journal of Management*, 0149206318771166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318771166>.
- Sugiyono. (2001). *Metode Penelitian Bisnis*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Schuh, S. C., Zhang, X. A., Morgeson, F. P., Tian, P., & van Dick, R. (2018). Are you really doing good things in your boss's eyes? Interactive effects of employee innovative work behavior and leader–member exchange on supervisory performance ratings. *Human Resource Management*, 57(1), 397-409. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21851>
- Shamir, B. (2018). Social distance and charisma: Theoretical notes and an exploratory study. In *Leadership Now: Reflections on the Legacy of Boas Shamir* (pp. 225-254). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/S1479-357120180000009021>.
- Strobl, A., Niedermair, J., Matzler, K., & Mussner, T. (2018). Triggering subordinate innovation behavior: the influence of leaders' dark personality traits and level 5 leadership behavior. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 1950045. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919619500452>
- Stoner, James. (1982). *Management* (11th ed). New York, Englewood Clifft: Prentice Hall International Inc.
- Terry, George. (1983). *Principles of Management*.(7th ed). Richard D. Irwin. Inc. Homewood Illionis. Ohio State University.
- Thomas, C. H., Roberts, F., Novicevic, M. M., Ammeter, A. P., & Loncar, D. (2018). Familiarity and Fluid Team Performance: Leadership and HRM Implications. In *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (pp. 163-196). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/S0742-730120180000036005>
- Tu, M. H., Bono, J. E., Shum, C., & LaMontagne, L. (2018). Breaking the cycle: The effects of role model performance and ideal leadership self-concepts on abusive supervision spillover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Uhl-Bien, M., & Arena, M. (2018). Leadership for organizational adaptability: A theoretical synthesis and integrative framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.009>
- Welty Peachey, J., Burton, L., Wells, J., & Chung, M. R. (2018). Exploring Servant Leadership

- and Needs Satisfaction in the Sport for Development and Peace Context. *Journal of Sport Management*, 32(2), 96-108. journals.humankinetics.com/doi/abs/10.1123/jsm.2017-0153.
- Wren, C. (2018). Employee Perceptions of Leadership Styles That Influence Workplace Performance.
- Wheeler, Wayne R. & Csoka, Louis S. Ohio State University. (1978). Leader Behavior Theory and Study, Study of Organization Leadership Patterns. Harvard Business Review.
- Yan-Li, S., & Hassan, D. (2018). Leadership behaviour on job satisfaction in malaysian national secondary schools: motivation and hygiene satisfaction. *MOJEM: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 6(3), 48-67. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22452/mojem.vol6no3.3>
- Yulk, Gary. (1994). Kepemimpinan dalam Organisasi, Alih Bahasa Yusuf Udaya, Prenhallindo, Jakarta