Multidisciplinary Output Research For Actual and International Issue (MORFAI Journal) ISSN (e): 2808-6635
Volumes 6 No. 6 (2026)

THE INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP FUNCTIONS ON OFFICIAL PERFORMANCE AT THE PALU SEARCH AND RESCUE OFFICE

Muh. Rizal[1]*, Mustainah[2], Dandan Haryono[3]
[1]Master of Public Administration Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tadulako, Palu, Indonesia
[2,3]Master of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tadulako, Palu, Indonesia
E-mail: [muhrizal270483@gmail.com][1]*, [mustainahmappatoba@gmail.com][2][Dandanharyono@gmail.com][3],

Received:05/09/2026 | **Revised** : 12/09/2026 | **Accepted:** 30/09/2026 | **Published:** 16/11/2026

Abstract

This study analyzes the influence of leadership functions (instructive, consultative, participative, delegative, and controlling) on official performance at the Palu Search and Rescue Office, a high-risk and time-sensitive public organization. A quantitative explanatory design supported by qualitative data was used. From a population of 114 officials, 89 respondents were selected using the Slovin formula and purposive sampling. Data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, observation, and documentation, then analyzed using validity and reliability tests, descriptive statistics, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression, and F- and t-tests. The instruments were valid and reliable (Cronbach's alpha 0.74–0.83). The five leadership functions simultaneously had a significant effect on performance ($F = 34.336$; $p < 0.001$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.654$). Partially, every function had a positive and significant effect, ranked by standardized beta: instructive (0.474), consultative (0.448), controlling (0.418), participative (0.321), and delegative (0.296). The participative and delegative functions obtained the lowest scores. Multidimensional leadership is therefore a key determinant of official performance, and integrated leadership training with a flexible situational approach is recommended.

Keywords: Leadership functions, Official performance, Public administration, Search and rescue, Situational leadership

INTRODUCTION

Human resources play a central role in every organization because they provide initiative, guidance, and service in carrying out organizational activities (Mukminin et al., 2021). In public organizations, the performance of officials is the key factor that determines whether institutional goals are achieved. Performance is the work output produced by an employee within a certain period (Ansory & Indrasari, 2024) and, according to Moeheriono (2012, as cited in Abdullah, 2023), can be assessed through six indicators: effectiveness, efficiency, quality, timeliness, productivity, and safety.

The Palu Search and Rescue Office is a technical implementation unit of the National Search and Rescue Agency (Basarnas) that carries out search and rescue (SAR) functions in Central Sulawesi, as mandated by Law No. 29 of 2014 on Search and Rescue. The region is prone to earthquakes, tsunamis, and sea and air transport accidents, so the performance of its officials has direct consequences for human lives. Preliminary observations, however, show that performance is not yet optimal. Field coordination among SAR teams is still manual and repetitive, fuel and logistics use is poorly measured, activity reports are often returned for correction because of inaccurate data and incomplete documents, operational tasks are sometimes delayed because equipment is not prepared on time, and some personnel do not wear complete personal protective equipment in difficult terrain.

Leadership is suspected to be a major factor behind these problems. In a semi-militaristic organization that still demands flexibility in the field, a leader acts as both manager and commander who must decide quickly under pressure. Leadership is the way a leader encourages subordinates to cooperate and work efficiently to achieve organizational goals (Riyanda, as cited in Afdhal et al., 2023). Nawawi (2011, as cited in Yusuf et al., 2023) identifies five leadership functions: instructive, consultative, participative, delegative, and controlling. Initial observations and interviews reveal weaknesses in several of them. Instructions are issued quickly but sometimes lack detail, so team members ask one another for clarification or improvise. Weekly coordination meetings are dominated by structural officials while field and administrative staff remain silent. Direct supervision during working hours is limited, which reduces discipline and focus.

Empirical studies on leadership and performance in Indonesian public organizations report inconsistent results, ranging from positive and significant effects (Mulyati et al., 2025; Prasetiawan et al., 2025) to positive but insignificant effects (Muzakkir et al., 2023) and even negative effects (Andayani & Tirtayasa, 2022). Most of these studies were conducted in conventional government offices, whereas research on SAR organizations, which are high-risk, time-sensitive, and hierarchical, remains scarce. This study therefore examines (1) the simultaneous effect of the five leadership functions on official performance and (2) the partial effect of each function at the Palu Search and Rescue Office. The findings are expected to enrich empirical evidence in public administration and to give practical input for leadership development in disaster-prone regions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership in Public Administration

Public administration is concerned with how government organizes and coordinates resources and personnel to formulate and implement public policy (Revida et al., 2021). Weber's bureaucratic model, built on hierarchy, written rules, and impersonality, remains a foundation of the field, but it has been criticized as mechanistic, rigid, and neglectful of the social and psychological side of employees (Triprasetyo et al., 2024; Widanti, 2022). Reform paradigms such as New Public Management and New Public Service then shifted expectations toward leaders who are innovative, performance-oriented, and service-minded (Rodiyah et al., 2025).

Leadership has been defined as a competence used to influence individuals or groups through communication so that they follow organizational direction consciously and voluntarily (Wibowo, 2015, as cited in Seto et al., 2023), and as the ability to make others perform better than usual (Drucker, as cited in Wulandari & Mulyanto, 2024). Leadership theory has moved from trait and behavioral approaches to contingency approaches, which hold that no single style is universally effective (Daswati et al., 2026). Situational leadership argues that the best style depends on the task and the maturity of subordinates (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, as cited in Wulandari & Mulyanto, 2024), which is highly relevant for SAR organizations that alternate between emergency response and routine capacity building.

Leadership Functions

Several frameworks describe what leaders do. Siagian emphasizes external and organizational roles such as direction setting, spokesperson, communicator, mediator, and integrator, while Rohman stresses role modelling and moral responsibility (Krisnandi et al., 2022; Rohman, 2021). This study adopts Nawawi (2011, as cited in Yusuf et al., 2023) because it is operational and describes how leaders relate to subordinates, from directive to delegative behavior, and explicitly includes control. The instructive function is one-way communication in which the leader decides and gives orders. The consultative function is two-way communication in which the leader listens to opinions, suggestions, and questions. The participative function involves subordinates in decision making and planning. The delegative function transfers authority and trust according to position. The controlling function covers guidance, direction, coordination, and supervision.

Official Performance

Performance is the quality and quantity of work achieved by an employee in carrying out assigned duties (Mangkunegara, 2005, as cited in Afdhal et al., 2023). Indicators differ among scholars. Mathis and Jackson (2006, as cited in Khaeruman, 2021) use quantity, quality, and cooperation; Silaen et al. (2023) add timeliness, effectiveness, and commitment; Moeheriono (2012, as cited in Abdullah, 2023) proposes effectiveness, efficiency, quality, timeliness, productivity, and safety. The last framework is adopted here because it captures both results and process, and its safety indicator is essential for risky SAR operations.

Leadership–Performance Relationship and Previous Studies

Effective leadership directly affects organizational performance by creating a supportive environment, motivating employees, and guiding the organization toward its goals (Wulandari & Mulyanto, 2024). Supervision is also needed because employees may delay work or reduce effort when they are not monitored (Wijaya et al., 2023). Previous studies show mixed evidence. Mulyati et al. (2025) and Prasetiawan et al. (2025) found that leadership improves performance in a district office and a communication agency, and Putri et al. (2024), in a literature review, concluded that performance is strongly influenced by leadership style and organizational culture. Muzakkir et al. (2023) found a positive but insignificant partial effect of leadership in an agricultural agency, and Andayani and Tirtayasa (2022) reported a negative and significant effect in a public works agency. These studies mostly used

OPEN ACCESS

general leadership styles in conventional offices. The gap addressed here is the effect of Nawawi's five functions, measured against a six-dimension performance construct including safety, in a high-risk SAR office, with qualitative triangulation.

Hypotheses

Based on the framework above, two hypotheses are proposed: H_1, the instructive, consultative, participative, delegative, and controlling functions simultaneously have a significant effect on official performance at the Palu Search and Rescue Office; and H_2, each of the five functions partially has a significant effect on official performance.

METHOD

This study used a quantitative approach with an explanatory design, which explains the position of variables and tests the relationships between them (Sugiyono, 2022), supported by qualitative data from interviews and observation. The research was conducted at the Palu Search and Rescue Office, Palu City, Central Sulawesi. The location was chosen because of its strategic role in a disaster-prone region that experienced the 2018 earthquake, tsunami, and liquefaction, its high-pressure working environment, and the limited number of studies in this setting.

The population comprised all 114 officials of the office. The sample size was determined using the Slovin formula (Zulfikar et al., 2024) with a 5% error tolerance, as shown in Equation (1), and respondents were selected by purposive sampling based on employment status as state civil apparatus.

$$n = N / (1 + N e^2) \quad (1)$$

where n is the sample size, N is the population, and e is the error tolerance. Substitution gives $n = 114 / (1 + 114 \times 0.05^2) = 88.72$, rounded up to 89 respondents. All 89 questionnaires were returned and usable (100%).

The independent variable was leadership (X), consisting of instructive (X_1), consultative (X_2), participative (X_3), delegative (X_4), and controlling (X_5) functions, each measured with four items (20 items). The dependent variable was official performance (Y), measured with 12 items covering effectiveness, efficiency, quality, timeliness, productivity, and safety. Items were scored on a five-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Marta et al., 2024). Qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with personnel and structural officials, field observation, and documentation.

Data were processed with SPSS 25. Validity was tested using Pearson product-moment correlation, with an item considered valid when the significance was below 0.05, and reliability using Cronbach's alpha with a threshold of 0.60 (Ghozali, 2021). Mean scores were interpreted with five equal-interval categories from very poor (1.00–1.80) to very good (4.21–5.00) (Sugiyono, 2022). Classical assumptions comprised a Kolmogorov–Smirnov normality test (significance above 0.05) and a multicollinearity test (tolerance above 0.10 and VIF below 10). The relationship between variables was estimated with multiple linear regression as in Equation (2), and hypotheses were tested using the F-test (simultaneous), the t-test (partial), and the adjusted coefficient of determination at $\alpha = 0.05$.

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + e \quad (2)$$

where Y is official performance, a is the constant, b_1–b_5 are regression coefficients, X_1–X_5 are the five leadership functions, and e is the error term.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section reports the respondent profile, descriptive scores, instrument quality, classical assumption tests, and regression results, and then discusses the findings in light of theory and previous studies.

Respondent Characteristics

Of the 89 respondents, most were male (81 people; 91.01%) and aged 31–40 years (46 people; 51.69%), followed by those aged 21–30 years (37.08%) and 40 years or older (11.24%). Senior high school was the most common education level (60 people; 67.42%), followed by bachelor's degree (17.98%), diploma (8.99%), and master's degree (5.62%). Civil servants accounted for 91.01% of respondents and the rest were government employees with work agreements. The largest group had worked for 16 years or more (44.94%). The profile shows a mature and experienced workforce.

Descriptive Results

Table 1 shows that all variables fall in the "good" category (3.41–4.20). Instructive leadership scored highest (3.98), followed by controlling (3.92), consultative (3.88), delegative (3.78), and participative (3.77). Official

OPEN ACCESS

performance scored 3.93. Behind these averages, the share of neutral answers was notable for participative and delegative items (up to 36.0% and 38.2%), indicating practices that are not yet consistent or visible to staff.

Table 1. Descriptive scores of research variables (n = 89)

Variable	Mean	Category	Notable indicators
Instructive (X_1)	3.98	Good	Highest: task allocation (4.01); lowest: clarity of work orders (3.94)
Consultative (X_2)	3.88	Good	Lowest: responsiveness to suggestions (3.81)
Participative (X_3)	3.77	Good	Lowest: involvement in planning (3.73)
Delegative (X_4)	3.78	Good	Lowest: clear accountability (3.73)
Controlling (X_5)	3.92	Good	Highest: periodic technical guidance (3.99)
Official performance (Y)	3.93	Good	Mostly "agree" answers (64–86% per indicator)

Source: Primary data processed (2026)

Interviews and observation help explain these patterns. The head of general affairs said that the head of office always states that his door is open, yet staff hesitate to raise personal or workload issues when he has just returned from a two-day SAR operation. A rescuer added that complaints about insufficient equipment are raised at morning roll call but are not always followed up because meetings continue immediately. Staff reported that suggestions are more often voiced informally than in formal forums.

Instrument Quality and Classical Assumptions

All questionnaire items were valid, with correlations between 0.422 and 0.899 and significance of 0.000. Cronbach's alpha for every variable exceeded 0.60 (Table 2), so the instrument is reliable. The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test gave an asymptotic significance of 0.627 (above 0.05), so residuals are normally distributed. Tolerance values of 0.916–0.993 and VIF values of 1.007–1.091 indicate no multicollinearity. The regression model therefore meets the requirements for hypothesis testing.

Table 2. Reliability test results

Variable	Cronbach's alpha	Criterion
Instructive (X_1)	0.82	Reliable
Consultative (X_2)	0.83	Reliable
Participative (X_3)	0.83	Reliable
Delegative (X_4)	0.83	Reliable
Controlling (X_5)	0.83	Reliable
Official performance (Y)	0.74	Reliable

Source: Primary data processed (2026)

Regression and Hypothesis Testing

Table 3 presents the regression estimates, which yield Equation (3).

$$Y = 1.300 + 0.793X_1 + 0.650X_2 + 0.447X_3 + 0.426X_4 + 0.634X_5 + e \quad (3)$$

Table 3. Multiple linear regression results

Variable	B	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	1.300	–	–	–
Instructive (X_1)	0.793	0.474	7.401	0.000
Consultative (X_2)	0.650	0.448	7.128	0.000
Participative (X_3)	0.447	0.321	4.967	0.000
Delegative (X_4)	0.426	0.296	4.524	0.000
Controlling (X_5)	0.634	0.418	6.619	0.000

Dependent variable: official performance. Source: Primary data processed (2026)

All coefficients are positive, so a higher score on each leadership function is associated with higher performance. The F-test (Table 4) gives F = 34.336 with significance 0.000, so H_1 is accepted. The adjusted R^2 of

0.654 means that the five functions explain 65.4% of the variation in official performance, while 34.6% is explained by factors outside the model. In the partial tests, all t-values exceed the critical value and all significance values are 0.000, so H_2 is accepted for every function.

Table 4. Simultaneous test and coefficient of determination

Statistic	Value
F-value (df = 5; 83)	34.336
Significance	0.000
R	0.821
R square	0.674
Adjusted R square	0.654
Standard error of the estimate	1.949

Source: Primary data processed (2026)

Simultaneous Effect of Leadership Functions

The significant F-test shows that the five functions work together as a system rather than as isolated behaviors. An adjusted R^2 of 0.654 is a substantial value in social and public management research and indicates that about two-thirds of the variation in performance can be predicted from the way leaders lead. This is consistent with the idea that effective leadership is a combination of behaviors adapted to the situation rather than a single style (Bass & Avolio, 1994, as cited in Gofur et al., 2024), and with situational leadership theory. In a SAR organization, leaders must simultaneously provide clear command in the first minutes of an operation (instructive), draw on field knowledge (consultative), involve personnel in planning (participative), trust field coordinators to decide quickly (delegative), and maintain competence through supervision (controlling). The remaining 34.6% leaves room for studies that add motivation, work discipline, organizational climate, and reward systems.

Partial Effects of Leadership Functions

Instructive. This function has the strongest effect (β = 0.474; t = 7.401). Its mean score of 3.98 is the highest, with task allocation highest (4.01) and clarity of work orders lowest (3.94). Under situational leadership, a directive "telling" style is most adaptive when risk is high, time is extreme, and information is incomplete, as in the golden period of a rescue, when personnel have limited capacity to make sense of the situation because of pressure and uncertainty. The relatively lower score for clarity of orders matches the field observation that fast instructions can still be ambiguous, for example an order to "prepare water equipment" without specifying the type of terrain.

Consultative. This function ranks second (β = 0.448; t = 7.128) with a mean of 3.88. Internal deliberation and solutions to problems scored 3.91, but responsiveness to suggestions was lowest at 3.81. The small gap is substantively important because it suggests a top-down pattern of inquiry in which leaders ask and subordinates answer, while bottom-up suggestions are not fully absorbed. The hierarchical culture of a semi-militaristic organization makes staff reluctant to voice corrections in formal forums.

Controlling. Controlling ranks third (β = 0.418; t = 6.619) and has the second-highest mean (3.92). Periodic technical guidance scored highest (3.99), whereas routine supervision of work procedures was lower (3.85) with 29.2% neutral answers. This supports Kurniawan et al. (2025), who found that stronger work control leads to higher performance, and Wijaya et al. (2023), who emphasize supervision to prevent delays and low effort. Control matters most for safety compliance, such as the use of protective equipment.

Participative. Participation has the fourth-largest effect (β = 0.321; t = 4.967) and the lowest mean (3.77), with involvement in activity planning the lowest indicator (3.73) and 36.0% neutral answers. The result can be explained by Weberian bureaucratic logic, in which command flows downward quickly for safety reasons and formal hierarchy dominates (Umam, 2022). Participation is therefore significant but weakly implemented, so planning documents risk becoming administrative products rather than shared commitments.

Delegative. Delegation has the smallest effect (β = 0.296; t = 4.524) and the second-lowest mean (3.78). Clear accountability for delegated authority scored lowest (3.73) with the highest share of neutral answers (38.2%). Delegation is a high form of leader trust (Badu & Djafri, 2017) and can build ownership and intrinsic motivation, but it is hard to implement in SAR operations where responsibility for life-and-death decisions is sensitive and accountability lines are not always clear. Neutral responses suggest that staff are unsure whether and how delegation is practiced.

Taken together, the results show that in a high-risk and time-sensitive organization, firm, communicative, and controlled leadership has more influence than leadership that emphasizes wide participation and full delegation. Nevertheless, the weak participative and delegative functions deserve attention because they are needed to build innovation, self-reliance, and leadership regeneration in the long term.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that the instructive, consultative, participative, delegative, and controlling leadership functions simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on official performance at the Palu Search and Rescue Office ($F = 34.336$; $p < 0.001$), explaining 65.4% of the variation in performance. Partially, all five functions are also positive and significant, with the strength of influence ordered as instructive (0.474), consultative (0.448), controlling (0.418), participative (0.321), and delegative (0.296). Multidimensional leadership is therefore a key factor in performance in SAR organizations, where firm and controlled leadership dominates, while participation and delegation remain the weakest practices.

Practically, the office is advised to (1) develop integrated leadership training covering all five functions with special attention to participation and delegation, (2) apply flexible situational leadership in which instructive and controlling behaviors dominate during emergency response while consultative, participative, and delegative behaviors are expanded during preparation, evaluation, and capacity building, and (3) build mentoring and coaching between senior and junior leaders for knowledge transfer and regeneration. For future research, it is suggested to add motivation, work discipline, organizational climate, and rewards as additional, intervening, or moderating variables, to use deeper mixed methods including participative observation during real SAR operations, and to extend the setting to other SAR offices to test the generalizability of the model. A limitation of this study is its single-office setting and reliance on perceptual data.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, M. (2023). Manajemen dan evaluasi kinerja karyawan. Aswaja Pressindo.

Afdhal, Putri, D. A., Yusran, R., Martius, Herdiansyah, D., Riyanda, R., Hasan, L., Zulkifli, Hwihanus, Anwar, U. A. A., Susanto, Yusman, E., & Erdawati. (2023). Pengantar ilmu manajemen: Organisasi dan perkembangannya. CV. Gita Lentera.

Andayani, I., & Tirtayasa, S. (2022). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, budaya organisasi, dan motivasi terhadap kinerja pegawai. Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen, 2(1), 45–54.

Ansory, F., & Indrasari, M. (2024). Manajemen sumber daya manusia. Indomedia Pustaka.

Badu, S. Q., & Djafri, N. (2017). Kepemimpinan & perilaku organisasi. Ideas Publishing.

Daswati, Hattab, S., Mustainah, Dalili, S., & Salam, R. (2026). Kepemimpinan dan perilaku organisasi. Badan Penerbit Universitas Negeri Makassar.

Ghozali, I. (2021). Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 26 (10th ed.). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Gofur, A., Senoaji, F., Shafariah, H., & Samsudin. (2024). Buku referensi pemimpin dan kepemimpinan: Dasar kepemimpinan dalam manajemen organisasi. Mafy Media Literasi Indonesia.

Khaeruman. (2021). Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Konsep & studi kasus. CV. AA. Rizky.

Krisnandi, H., Efendi, S., & Sugiono, E. (2022). Pengantar manajemen. LPU-UNAS.

Kurniawan, T., Adriza, A., & Wibowo, H. M. (2025). Pengaruh pengendalian kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Koyorad Jaya Indonesia. AKADEMIK: Jurnal Mahasiswa Humanis, 5(3), 1735–1742. https://doi.org/10.37481/jmh.v5i3.1690

Marta, R. F., Kristina, Yulianto, A., & Febrianto, Y. (2024). Metode penelitian: Memahami pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan campuran. PT. Media Penerbit Indonesia.

Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Prasojo, D. L., & Yuliana, L. (2021). Manajemen sumber daya manusia dalam pendidikan. UNY Press.

Mulyati, S., Rahyu, P., & Nuryadin. (2025). Pengaruh kepemimpinan dan budaya organisasi dalam meningkatkan kinerja pegawai di Kantor Camat Woha pada tahun 2024. Al-Ittihad: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Hukum Islam, 11(1), 30–47.

Muzakkir, N., Arfan, H. H., & Asri. (2023). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, budaya organisasi, dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai Dinas Pertanian Kabupaten Bantaeng. Jurnal Magister Manajemen Nobel Indonesia, 4(1), 116–130.

Prasetiawan, M. A., Suharno, S., & Aisyah, S. (2025). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, budaya organisasi, dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai negeri sipil pada Dinas Komunikasi dan Informatika Kabupaten Tana Tidung. Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Sistem Informasi, 6(3), 1565–1577.

Putri, R. D. Z., Yulianti, S., & Anshori, M. I. (2024). Pengaruh budaya organisasi dan gaya kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja karyawan: Literature review. Jurnal Ilmiah dan Karya Mahasiswa, 2(2), 298–310.

Revida, E., Hidayatulloh, A. N., Simarmata, H. M. P., Silalahi, M., Nurjaya, M., & Purba, S. (2021). Pengantar ilmu administrasi publik. Yayasan Kita Menulis.

Rodiyah, I., Mursyidah, L., Choiriyah, I. U., & Sukmana, H. (2025). Buku ajar teori administrasi publik. UMSIDA Press.

Rohman, A. (2021). Dasar-dasar manajemen. CV. Cita Intrans Selaras.

Seto, A. A., Febrian, W. D., Mon, M. D., Senoaji, F., Kusumawardhani, N., Rusman, I. R., Simarmata, N., Sari, Y. P., Novita, D., Hasanah, H., Kristanti, D., Sukaesih, I., Jaya, H., Nuraeni, & Arifin. (2023). Manajemen sumber daya manusia. PT. Global Eksekutif Teknologi.

Silaen, N. R., Syamsuriansyah, Chairunnisah, R., Sari, M. R., Mahriani, E., Tanjung, R., Triwardhani, D., Haerany, A., Masyruroh, A., Satriawan, D. G., Lestari, A. S., Arifudin, O., Rialmi, Z., & Putra, S. (2023). Kinerja karyawan. Widina Bhakti Persada.

Sugiyono. (2022). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D. Alfabeta.

Triprasetyo, R. A., Armita, D., Ulum, M. C., Irawan, A. D., & Royani, E. (2024). Pengantar ilmu administrasi publik (terjemahan konsep para ahli). Deepublish.

Umam, K. (2022). Relasi kepemimpinan dan budaya organisasi. Pustaka Ilmu.

Widanti, N. P. T. (2022). Prinsip administrasi publik. Jagat Langit Sukma.

Wijaya, R., Halin, H., & Wulandari, T. (2023). Pengaruh pengawasan dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT Promexx Stationery Kota Palembang. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Manajemen Teknologi, 7(4), 1375–1385.

Wulandari, A., & Mulyanto, H. (2024). Kepemimpinan. Kimshafi Alung Cipta.

Yusuf, M., Haryoto, C., Husainah, N., & Nuraeni. (2023). Teori manajemen. Yayasan Pendidikan Cendekia Muslim.

Zulfikar, R., Sari, F. P., Fatmayati, A., Wandini, K., Haryati, T., Jumini, S., Nurjanah, Annisa, S., Kusumawardhani, O. B., Mutiah, R., Linggi, A. I., & Fadilah, H. (2024). Metode penelitian kuantitatif (teori, metode dan praktik). Widina Media Utama.

OPEN ACCESS