



The Effect of Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline on Employee Performance in Sosorgadong Subdistrict, Central Tapanuli Regency

Rido Permana Simanjuntak

STIE Al-Wasliyah Sibolga, Sibolga, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

participative leadership style,
work discipline,
employee performance,
multiple linear regression

Email :

ridopermanasimanjuntak001
@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the effect of Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at the Government of Kecamatan Sosorgadong. This research employed a quantitative approach using a survey method. The population consisted of all employees at the Sosorgadong Subdistrict Office, with a total sample of 52 respondents determined using a saturated sampling technique. Data were collected through questionnaires and analyzed using multiple linear regression with SPSS version 27. The results indicate that all research instruments are valid and reliable and have met the classical assumption tests, including normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity tests. The regression equation obtained is $Y = 39.880 - 0.269X_1 + 0.209X_2$. Partially, Participative Leadership Style has a significance value of 0.061 (>0.05), and Work Discipline has a significance value of 0.108 (>0.05), indicating that both variables do not have a significant effect on Employee Performance. Simultaneously, the F-test shows a significance value of 0.106 (>0.05), meaning that both variables together do not significantly affect Employee Performance. The coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.087, which indicates that only 8.7% of Employee Performance variation can be explained by Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline, while the remaining 91.3% is influenced by other factors outside the model.

Copyright © 2025 JEMA.

All rights reserved is Licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution- NonCommercial 4.0 International License \(CC BY-NC 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

INTRODUCTION

Human resources constitute a strategic factor in determining organizational success, including within government institutions. Employees who possess strong competencies, skills, and work commitment play a crucial role in achieving organizational goals effectively and efficiently. Although organizations may be supported by adequate financial resources, infrastructure, and technology, public service processes will not operate optimally without high-quality human resources. Therefore, improving employee performance has become a primary focus in public sector management.

Employee performance reflects the level of achievement in carrying out assigned tasks, both in terms of quality and quantity, in accordance with established responsibilities. Efforts to enhance performance represent a significant managerial challenge, as organizational success largely depends on the quality of human resource performance. One of the factors influencing employee performance is leadership style. An appropriate leadership style can motivate employees to work more effectively and achieve better results. Regina (2016) states that employee performance is strongly influenced by the leadership style of supervisors.

In addition to leadership style, work discipline is an important factor in improving employee performance. Work discipline reflects employees' awareness and willingness to comply with organizational rules and norms. According to Rivai and Sagala (2015), work discipline is a tool used by leaders to encourage employees to modify their behavior and increase adherence to organizational regulations. Susanty et al. (2016) found that leadership style has a significant influence on work discipline, and work discipline positively affects employee performance. Similarly, Hasibuan (2017) emphasized that good discipline enhances productivity and employees' responsibility toward their duties.

Sosorgadong Subdistrict, as one of the government institutions in Central Tapanuli Regency, plays an important role in delivering public services to the community. In facing increasingly complex service demands in the era of globalization, improving employee performance has become a top priority. A participative leadership style that involves employees in decision-making processes, combined with the consistent implementation of work discipline, is expected to optimally enhance employee performance.

Previous studies have demonstrated the positive influence of leadership style and work discipline on employee performance. Amir and Wakatita (2020) found that leadership style has a positive and significant

effect on employee performance. Fitroni and Yuniarto (2017) concluded that leadership style and work discipline simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance. Likewise, Christin and Suprastha (2019) stated that participative leadership style contributes to improving employee performance.

Based on the description above, this study aims to analyze the effect of participatory leadership style and work discipline on employee performance at the Sosorgadong Subdistrict Office, Central Tapanuli Regency, both partially and simultaneously. Theoretically, this study is expected to enrich the study of human resource management in the public sector, while practically the results are expected to serve as a consideration for institutional leaders in formulating policies related to improving employee performance through the implementation of participatory leadership styles and the strengthening of work discipline. Based on the conceptual framework that links participatory leadership style and work discipline to employee performance (Sugiyono, 2017), the hypotheses proposed in this study are that participatory leadership style affects employee performance, work discipline affects employee performance, and both simultaneously have a significant effect on employee performance.

METHODS

This study uses a quantitative approach with a descriptive correlational design to analyze the effect of participatory leadership style (X1) and work discipline (X2) on employee performance (Y). The research was conducted at the Sosorgadong Subdistrict Office, Central Tapanuli Regency, from March to August 2025, with a population of 52 employees, all of whom were selected as the sample using the census method. The data used were quantitative primary data obtained through Likert-scale questionnaires and interviews. The research instruments were tested using validity and reliability tests. Data analysis was carried out using SPSS through classical assumption tests, correlation analysis, coefficient of determination, and multiple linear regression, while hypothesis testing was conducted using t-tests and F-tests at a 5% significance level.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Respondent Characteristics

This study involved 52 employees of the Sosorgadong Subdistrict Office, all of whom were included as research samples. Based on educational level, the majority of respondents had a senior high school education (79%), followed by bachelor's degree holders (15%) and Diploma III graduates (6%). In terms of age, most respondents were in the 26–40 years range (42%), which falls within the productive working age category. Based on gender, the respondents were predominantly male (73%), while female respondents accounted for 27%.

This composition indicates that employees are within a productive working age range and possess relatively homogeneous educational backgrounds.

Descriptive Analysis of Variables

The results of the descriptive analysis indicate that participative leadership style has a mean score of 3.93, which falls into the “good” category. This suggests that leaders have involved employees in the decision-making process and have encouraged two-way communication within the organization.

Work discipline obtained a mean score of 3.77 and is also categorized as “good.” Employees demonstrate compliance with organizational regulations, good attendance levels, and responsibility in carrying out their duties.

Employee performance recorded a mean score of 3.72 and is likewise categorized as “good.” Employees are considered to show work initiative and responsiveness to the work environment; however, the aspect of accuracy still requires improvement.

Instrument Testing and Classical Assumption Tests

All questionnaire items were declared valid, with corrected item-total correlation values greater than 0.30, and reliable, with Cronbach's Alpha values for each variable exceeding 0.80.

The normality test results showed a significance value of 0.200 (> 0.05), indicating that the data are normally distributed. The multicollinearity test showed a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value of 1.151 (< 10) and a tolerance value of 0.869 (> 0.10), indicating no multicollinearity. The heteroscedasticity test also

revealed no specific pattern in the scatterplot graph, suggesting that the regression model satisfies the classical assumptions.

Multiple Linear Regression

To determine the effect of Participatory Leadership Style (X1) and Work Discipline (X2) on Employee Performance (Y), multiple linear regression analysis was used with the following equation:

$$Y = 39.880 - 0.269X1 + 0.209X2$$

Based on the regression analysis results, the constant value of 39.880 indicates that if the variables Participatory Leadership Style and Work Discipline are equal to zero (constant), then the Employee Performance value is 39.880. The regression coefficient for Participatory Leadership Style (X1) is -0.269, indicating a negative effect on Employee Performance. This means that every increase in Participatory Leadership Style, assuming other variables remain constant, will decrease Employee Performance by 0.269. Meanwhile, the regression coefficient for Work Discipline (X2) is 0.209, indicating a positive effect on Employee Performance. This means that every increase in Work Discipline, assuming other variables remain constant, will increase Employee Performance by 0.209. Based on the t-test results, Participatory Leadership Style has a significance value of 0.061 and Work Discipline has a significance value of 0.108, indicating that both variables do not have a significant effect on Employee Performance at the 5% significance level.

Partial Test (t-Test)

The partial test (t-test) was conducted to determine the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable, namely Employee Performance at the Sosorgadong Subdistrict Office. The total sample in this study consisted of 52 respondents, with a degree of freedom (df) of 50 ($n-k = 52-2$). The test was carried out at a 5% significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) or 0.025 for a two-tailed test.

Based on the test results for the Participative Leadership Style variable (X1), the calculated t-value was -1.914, while the critical t-value was ± 2.00856 . Since the absolute value of the calculated t (1.914) is smaller than the critical t-value (2.00856), H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. This result indicates that, conventionally, Participative Leadership Style has a negative but not significant effect on Employee Performance. The SPSS output also shows a significance (Sig.) value of 0.061 (6.1%), which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, statistically, it can be concluded that Participative Leadership Style does not have a significant effect on Employee Performance. Thus, the hypothesis stating that Participative Leadership Style influences Employee Performance is not supported.

Furthermore, the test results for the Work Discipline variable (X2) show a calculated t-value of 1.638, while the critical t-value is 2.00856. Since the calculated t-value is smaller than the critical t-value ($1.638 < 2.00856$), H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. This means that, conventionally, Work Discipline does not have a significant effect on Employee Performance. The SPSS output indicates a significance value of 0.108 (10.8%), which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that Work Discipline does not have a significant effect on Employee Performance. The hypothesis proposed in this study is not empirically supported.

Simultaneous Test (F-Test)

The simultaneous test (F-test) was conducted to determine whether Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline jointly influence Employee Performance at the Sosorgadong Subdistrict Government, Central Tapanuli Regency. Based on the ANOVA test results, the calculated F-value was 2.345, with a numerator degree of freedom (df1) of 2 and a denominator degree of freedom (df2) of 49. At a 5% significance level, the critical F-value was 3.19.

Since the calculated F-value is smaller than the critical F-value ($2.345 < 3.19$), H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. This result is reinforced by the significance value of 0.106 (10.6%), which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, simultaneously, Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline do not have a significant effect on Employee Performance at the Sosorgadong Subdistrict Government, Central Tapanuli Regency. Thus, the hypothesis stating that both variables jointly influence Employee Performance is not statistically supported.

Discussion

Based on the results of the instrument testing, which included validity and reliability tests using SPSS version 27, all questionnaire items were declared valid. This applies to all research variables, namely

Participative Leadership Style, Work Discipline, and Employee Performance, as each statement item met the required validity criteria based on correlation values. Furthermore, the reliability test results indicated that the research instrument demonstrated a very high level of reliability. The Participative Leadership Style variable obtained a reliability coefficient of 0.849, while the Work Discipline and Employee Performance variables obtained coefficients of 0.836 and 0.866, respectively. Since all values exceed 0.80, it can be concluded that the instrument is reliable and appropriate for data collection.

The classical assumption tests showed that the data met all the requirements for multiple linear regression analysis. The normality test produced an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.200, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05, indicating that the data are normally distributed. In the multicollinearity test, the Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline variables both had a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value of 1.151, which is well below the maximum threshold of 10. This indicates that there is no multicollinearity among the independent variables. In addition, the heteroscedasticity test showed that the residual points were randomly distributed, did not form a specific pattern, and were spread both above and below zero on the Y-axis. Therefore, the regression model does not exhibit heteroscedasticity.

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis showed a significance value of 0.061 for the Participative Leadership Style variable and 0.108 for the Work Discipline variable. Both values are greater than the significance level of 0.05, indicating that partially, the two independent variables do not have a significant effect on Employee Performance. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected. This means that neither Participative Leadership Style nor Work Discipline has a statistically significant effect on Employee Performance. The regression constant value of 39.880 indicates that if Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline are assumed to be constant, the Employee Performance score remains at that value.

The hypothesis testing using the t-test further supports these findings. The calculated t-value for Participative Leadership Style was -0.269 with a significance value of 0.061, while Work Discipline had a calculated t-value of 0.209 with a significance value of 0.108. Both values do not meet the criteria for statistical significance. Thus, Participative Leadership Style has a negative and non-significant effect on Employee Performance, whereas Work Discipline has a positive but non-significant effect on Employee Performance at the Sosorgadong Subdistrict Government.

The coefficient of determination (R^2) test produced a value of 0.087 or 8.7%. This means that variations in Employee Performance can be explained by Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline by only 8.7%, while the remaining 91.3% is influenced by other factors outside this research model, such as work motivation, work environment, compensation, organizational culture, and individual employee characteristics.

The findings of this study indicate that empirically, Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline have not been able to provide a significant influence on Employee Performance. This suggests that in the context of government organizations, particularly at the subdistrict level, employee performance is not solely determined by leadership style and work discipline, but also by structural, administrative, and bureaucratic policy factors.

These results are inconsistent with previous studies conducted by Amir and Wakatita (2020), who concluded that leadership style has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Similarly, Fitriani and Yunianto (2017) found that leadership style and work discipline have a positive and significant effect on employee performance both partially and simultaneously. In addition, Christin and Suprastha (2019) reported that participative leadership style significantly influences employee performance. The differences in findings may be attributed to variations in organizational characteristics, work environments, bureaucratic culture, and human resource conditions of the research objects.

In conclusion, this study produces findings that differ from previous research, as both partially and simultaneously, Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline do not have a significant effect on Employee Performance at the Sosorgadong Subdistrict Government, Central Tapanuli Regency.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study examining the influence of Participative Leadership Style and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at the Sosorgadong Subdistrict Government, it can be concluded that all research instruments were declared valid and reliable, and the regression model satisfied the classical assumption tests, including normality, heteroscedasticity, and multicollinearity. The results of the multiple

linear regression analysis produced the equation $Y = 39.880 - 0.269X_1 + 0.209X_2$, indicating that Participative Leadership Style has a negative direction of influence and Work Discipline has a positive direction of influence on Employee Performance; however, neither variable has a significant effect, either partially or simultaneously. This is evidenced by the t-test significance values of 0.061 and 0.108 (both > 0.05), as well as the F-test significance value of 0.106 (> 0.05). The coefficient of determination (R^2) value of 0.087 indicates that only 8.7% of the variation in Employee Performance can be explained by the two independent variables, while the remaining 91.3% is influenced by other factors outside the research model. Based on these findings, it is recommended that leaders and employees continue to improve the quality of leadership and work discipline through more systematic supervision, periodic performance evaluations, strengthened participative communication, and the development of a more disciplined and responsible work culture. Furthermore, future research is expected to incorporate additional variables such as work motivation, compensation, or organizational culture and to expand the research object in order to develop a more comprehensive model and produce more generalizable results.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi. (2021). *Optimalisasi motivasi & kinerja pegawai: Memahami faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhinya* (N. Nurrahmawati, Ed.). Bintang Pustaka Madani.
- Ahmadi, S., & Sulistyono, S. (2019). Pengaruh kompetensi, kepemimpinan, dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai di Kantor Pertanahan Kabupaten Bogor. *Jurnal Manajemen Kewirausahaan*, 15(2), 203–210.
- Agustini, F. (2019). *Strategi manajemen sumber daya manusia*. UISU Press.
- Amir, & Wakatita. (2020). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja pegawai.
- Arikunto, S. (2017). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik*. Rineka Cipta.
- Budihardjo, I. M. (2017). *Panduan praktis penilaian kinerja karyawan (Cetakan pertama)*. Raih Asa Sukses.
- Burhanuddin. (2019). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, lingkungan kerja, dan komitmen organisasional terhadap kinerja karyawan: Studi pada Rumah Sakit Islam Banjarmasin. *Maksipreneur*, 8(2), 191–206. <https://doi.org/10.30588/jmp.v8i2.425>
- Christin, N., & Suprastha, N. (2019). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan partisipatif dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan.
- Fahmi, I. (2016). *Pengantar manajemen sumber daya manusia: Konsep dan kinerja*. Mitra Wacana Media.
- Fitroni, & Yuniarto. (2017). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai.
- Gujarati, D. N. (2017). *Dasar-dasar ekonometrika (Edisi ke-5, R. C. Mangunsong, Penerj.)*. Salemba Empat.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2018). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia (Edisi revisi)*. PT Bumi Aksara.
- Insan, P. D., & Yuniawan, A. (2016). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan partisipatif, lingkungan kerja, kompensasi dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Diponegoro Journal of Management*.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2019). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Salemba Empat.
- Mandagie, S. A., Kawet, L., & Uhing, Y. (2016). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, komunikasi dan stres kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Politeknik Kesehatan Manado. *Jurnal EMBA*, 4(1).
- Masrufi, N., & Jannah, K. (2018). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, disiplin kerja dan komitmen organisasi terhadap kinerja karyawan tetap pada PT Dwi Prima Sentosa Ngawi (Skripsi, Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo).
- Regina, A. (2016). Analisis pengaruh pengawasan dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen SDM*, 3(6).
- Rivai, V., & Sagala, E. J. (2015). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia untuk perusahaan: Dari teori ke praktik*. Rajawali Pers.
- Sastrohadwiryo, S., & Syuhada, A. H. (2019). *Manajemen tenaga kerja Indonesia (Edisi pertama)*. Bumi Aksara.
- Sinambela, L. P. (2019). *Manajemen kinerja: Pengelolaan, pengukuran, dan implikasi kinerja*. Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Singodimedjo. (2017). *Kinerja dan pengembangan kompetensi*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Situmorang, S. H., & Lufti, M. (2016). *Analisis data untuk riset manajemen dan bisnis (Edisi ke-2)*. USU Press.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

- Supriyanto, A., Wiyono, B. B., & Burhanuddin. (2021). Effects of service quality and customer satisfaction on loyalty of bank customers. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1937847>
- Sutrisno, E. (2017). Manajemen sumber daya manusia. Kencana.
- Syamsuddinnor. (2014). Pengaruh pemberian insentif dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT Ben Line Agencies (BLA) Banjarmasin. *Jurnal Socioscientia*, 6(1), 1–44.
- Thoha, M. (2017). Kepemimpinan dalam manajemen (Cetakan ke-16). Rajawali Pers.
- Wibowo. (2020). Manajemen kinerja (Edisi ke-4). Rajawali Pers.
- Wirawan. (2017). Evaluasi kinerja sumber daya manusia: Teori, aplikasi dan penelitian. Salemba Empat.
- STIE Al-Washliyah Sibolga/Tapanuli Tengah. (2025). Pedoman penulisan laporan penelitian penyusunan skripsi. STIE Al-Washliyah.