

THE INFLUENCE OF RESONANT LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE ON LECTURER PERFORMANCE IN ASAHAN DISTRICT

Fajar Rezeki Ananda Lubis

Management Program, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Indonesia

fajarrezekianandalubis@unprimdn.ac.id

Received: 28-06-2024

Revised: 20-07-2024

Approved: 25-07-2024

ABSTRACT

The role of leaders in running an organization is enormous. This is because leaders influence the decision-making in each program. Suppose there are decision-making errors, which will have fatal consequences for the company's progress. Thus, this study aims to investigate how the organizational atmosphere and resonant leadership affect the performance of academics at the Asahan Regency. This study used quantitative methodologies for data collection, and SmartPLS 3.0 software was used for SEM-Partial Least Square (PLS) data analysis procedures. Two hundred thirty permanent lecturers at the Asahan Regency served as the research sample. The research results show that resonant leadership and organizational climate significantly influence the performance of lecturers in Asahan Regency. So, it is concluded that to increase human resources, resonant leadership, and an organizational environment are needed in higher education institutions in Asahan Regency.

Keyword : Resonant Leadership, Organizational Climate, Lecturer Performance, Asahan Regency

INTRODUCTION

Education aims to help everyone become more skilled, independent, and have character. Education has a significant strategic role in all aspects of human resource development. It is expected of universities to be able to raise the caliber of their workforce. The first is Asahan University, a university-style school in the Asahan Regency. Education that may develop pupils' abilities is considered high quality (Suderadjat, 2005). Enhancing the caliber of education in any establishment is vital, particularly in universities, which spearhead formal education. It is envisaged that raising educational standards will result in superior pupils who are prepared to engage with society. Leaders of educational institutions, organizational environment, and performance are some factors that can illustrate this.

University leaders are vital to ensuring effective learning and teaching processes, improving the quality of human resources, and improving university outcomes. Apart from leadership factors, the organizational environment of lecturers is also another critical factor in ensuring improved lecturer performance. According to Wulandari (2017), organizational climate is a system that will create a particular atmosphere within an organization that refers to its internal characteristics. The work environment greatly influences job satisfaction. In other words, organizational climate influences lecturers' expectations about the results of current actions. In this case, the lecturer's level of satisfaction is influenced by his perception of the work environment.

Employee satisfaction will increase due to the following factors: a work environment that does not support productive work performance; inadequate provision of technology and working conditions; communication flows that do not meet quantity and quality standards; decision-making practices that are not aligned with organizational

levels; and lack of attention to the value of workforce welfare (Siahaan et al., 2022). In addition, organizational climate can play an essential role in improving the teaching and learning process for work behavior and performance. The more appropriate and harmonious an organization is, the better the lecturers are. The climate within an organization influences the way people view and perceive money.

Many lecturers believe that the money they receive is only enough to meet their living needs and cannot be allocated for personal development. As a result, lecturers often complain about this. Performance results are unique because each person will have a distinct level of pleasure based on the values that apply to them. A teacher performs better when more work components align with their personal preferences. In the management of an organization, lecturer performance is also critical. This research was conducted based on the above background to evaluate the influence of resonant leadership and organizational environment on the performance of lecturers in Asahan Regency.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Resonant Leadership

According to Burhanuddin (2015), "leadership determines the direction and goals of the organization by providing guidance and creating an organizational climate that supports the implementation of the overall management process," making it the fundamental management component." The attitude and characteristics of a leader towards other people are critical in achieving organizational goals. From this explanation, a manager can behave as a leader if he can influence other people's behavior to achieve specific goals. However, to influence the behavior of others, a manager must hold the title of manager.

According to Indriyo and Mulyana (2007), leadership is an effort to exert influence, not coercion, to encourage employees to work according to the manager's goals, namely organizational achievement. The process of influencing many people through communication to achieve goals is known as leadership (Purba et al., 2019; Andrew J Dubrin, 2006). The process encourages all employees to do their best to achieve the expected results. Based on the expert opinion above, researchers can say that a leader has the ability and strength of emotional intelligence to influence others to collaborate in specific actions to achieve particular goals.

Organizational Climate

Rahsel (2017) states that cultural characteristics as a generalized belief system are responsible for artistic integrity and direct cultural development. Organizational practices create and support organizational climate. Changes will influence production and employee performance in the organizational climate. According to Wahyono (2019), Ingtyas et al. (2021), and Purba et al. (2018), organizational climate is the quality of personal experience that originates from perceptions about the relatively enduring nature of the organization. According to Tadampali et al. (2016), organizational climate is a unique situation that occurs within an organization and is influenced or caused by conditions that appear in the organization's environment.

Robbins (2007) states that "organizational climate" refers to a collection of behavioral variables that refer to the main principles, values, and beliefs that form the basis of an organization's management system. According to Wirawan (2007), organizational climate can be defined as the perceptions held by organizational members that can influence their attitudes, behavior, and performance, which in turn determine organizational performance. Sumantri (2024) said organizational climate is

the internal culture or how organizational members behave. Organizational climate can be defined as a comfortable, calm, and free work atmosphere where people can carry out tri dharma higher education activities without fear.

Performance

According to Bernardin and Russell (2013), performance is a record of output results on tasks or activities over a predetermined period. Performance is the degree to which you succeed in finishing assignments and reaching objectives. A standard called "expected work performance" was developed to evaluate an employee's performance to these requirements based on their position. Performance, in the opinion of several experts mentioned above, is the outcome of the job a professor has accomplished over a specific duration of time by carrying out his tasks and obligations, which supports the university's objectives. Nadeak (2020) lists the following five metrics for performance: 1) Work product quality, 2) punctuality, 3) initiative, 4) skill, and 5) communication. If goals are achieved in accordance with predetermined standards, performance is considered good and satisfactory (Setiyati, 2014; Ade Galih et al., 2018; Amal et al., 2022). Madgopes mentioned seven performance measures in Natapriatna (2001): productivity, work quality, initiative, team work, problem solving, pressure, and motivation.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research employs quantitative techniques with an emphasis on management and economics. This study aims to investigate the factors that enhance the quality of education by taking into account the intervention variable of professor performance at universities located in the Asahan Regency. Two hundred thirty individuals from Asahan universities who have served for at least two years made up the research sample. Every variable in this study has a score determined by a five-point Likert scale. On the scale, TS (Disagree) received a score of 2, STS (Strongly Disagree) received a score of 1, S (Agree) received a score of 4, and N (Neutral) received a score of 1. This study's independent and dependent variables are lecturer performance and leadership. The SEM-Partial Least Square (PLS) data analysis technique will be applied with SmartPLS 3.0 software to analyze quantitative data in this study. Measures of extracted variables and composite SEM reliability will be used.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Description of Lecturer Performance Variables

The description of the variables in the research is that all the variables studied are the Lecturer Performance, Resonant Leadership and Organizational Climate variables.

Table 1. Description of Lecturer Performance Variables

Question	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
	F	f	f	f	f	F	Score	TCR	Mean	Category
1	82	92	30	20	6	230	914	0,79	3,97	Good/Fair
2	132	71	16	8	3	230	1011	0,88	4,40	Very Good/High
3	87	82	51	9	1	230	935	0,81	4,07	Good/High
4	7	24	87	61	51	230	565	0,49	2,46	Not Good/Low
5	91	51	51	20	17	230	869	0,76	3,78	Good/Fair
Average	79,8	64	47	23,6	15,6	230	858,8	0,75	3,73	Good/Fair

Source: Data Processed Results

In response to the first question, which asked whether I had prepared the lecture materials and RPS before I started teaching, six respondents strongly disagreed, twenty disagreed, thirty entirely agreed, 92 agreed, and 82 strongly agreed. In response to the second question, which asked about my role as a student supervisor and examiner for the final assignment, three respondents indicated they strongly disagreed, eight indicated they disagreed, sixteen indicated they quite agreed, 71 indicated they agreed, and 132 indicated they strongly agreed. Regarding the third question, which asked whether I routinely publish articles in approved national journals, one respondent said they strongly disagreed, nine said they disagreed, 51 said they somewhat agreed, 82 said they agreed, and 87 said they strongly agreed. Regarding the fourth issue, which I posed to a reputable international magazine, the responses were as follows: 51 respondents said they severely disagreed, 61 said they disagreed, 87 said they somewhat agreed, 24 said they agreed, and seven said they strongly agreed. About the fifth question, which asked whether they usually perform or participate in community service, 17 respondents strongly disagreed, 20 disagreed, 51 somewhat agreed, 51 agreed, and 91 strongly agreed.

The categories for this variable are good and moderate because they have a TCR value of 72% and a mean of 3.6. The highest instrument is in the second question with the categories TCR, which means very good and high, where this instrument is included in the indicators of implementing education and teaching. The lowest instrument is in the fourth question. Namely, I have a reputable international journal with TCR and mean, not good, and low categories, which is where this instrument is included in the indicators of carrying out research.

Description of Resonant Leadership Variables

Table 2. Description of Resonant Leadership Variables

Question	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
	F	f	f	f	f	F	Score	TCR	Mean	Category
1	40	35	108	31	16	230	742	0,645	3,226	Good/Fair
2	64	74	63	21	8	230	855	0,743	3,717	Good/Fair
3	42	48	126	11	3	230	805	0,7	3,5	Good/Fair
4	32	27	132	23	16	230	726	0,631	3,157	Good/Fair
5	25	29	121	37	18	230	696	0,605	3,026	Good/Fair
6	51	41	112	23	4	231	805	0,7	3,485	Good/Fair
7	57	42	112	16	3	230	824	0,717	3,583	Good/Fair
8	23	41	135	23	8	230	738	0,642	3,209	Good/Fair
9	51	56	89	22	12	230	802	0,697	3,487	Good/Fair
10	32	35	125	26	12	230	739	0,643	3,213	Good/Fair
Average Value	41,7	42,8	112,3	23,3	10	230	773,2	0,672	3,36	Good/Fair

Source: Data Processed Results

The first query is: How frequently does your leadership look into the work actions of lecturers? Thirteen respondents said they disagreed, sixteen said they disagreed, 108 said they agreed, thirty-five said they agreed, and forty said they strongly agreed. Second, to what extent does your boss oversee the three dharma work activities that the lecturers go through? Eight respondents indicated they strongly disagreed, twenty-one indicated they disagreed, sixty-three indicated they very agreed, seventy-four indicated they agreed, and sixty-four indicated they strongly agreed. The final query is: What steps does the leadership take to ensure that the work environment and individual lecturers are in good condition? Three respondents indicated they

strongly disagreed, eleven indicated they disagreed, 126 indicated they very agreed, 48 indicated they agreed, and 42 indicated they strongly agreed. In response to the fourth question, which asked whether leaders assign extra work to lecturers while working on other assignments, 16 respondents strongly disagreed, 23 disagreed, 132 respondents quite agreed, 27 respondents agreed, and 32 strongly agreed. For the fifth question, do your leaders often ask lecturers for advice and criticism regarding decisions that have been taken, 18 respondents answered strongly disagree, 37 respondents answered disagree, 121 respondents answered quite agree, 121 respondents answered agree, as many as 29, and respondents answered strongly agree as many as 25.

The sixth question is whether the leadership often encourages individual lecturers to express implementing the tridharma of higher education. There were four respondents who answered strongly disagree, 23 respondents answered disagree, 112 respondents answered quite agree, and 41 respondents answered agree and strongly agreed. 51. In the seventh question, Do leaders often encourage lecturers as a group to develop new skills and abilities (exploration of skills/such as making textbooks, research grants, etc.)? There were three respondents who answered strongly disagree, and 16 respondents answered disagree. One hundred twelve respondents answered quite agree, 42 respondents answered agree, and 57 respondents answered strongly agree. Question eight: Has your boss ever asked you what difficulties you face at work? Eight respondents answered strongly disagree; respondents answered no; 23 respondents agreed; 135 respondents answered quite agree; 41 respondents answered I agree, and 23 respondents answered strongly agree. In the ninth question, Do leaders understand the problems that occur in the work environment? There were 12 respondents who answered strongly disagree, respondents answered disagree as many as 22, respondents answered quite agree as many as 89, respondents answered agree as many as 56, and respondents answered strongly agree as many as 51. For the tenth question, does your boss often ask questions about your work experience? There were 12 respondents who answered strongly disagree, respondents who answered no, 26 respondents who agreed, 125 respondents who answered quite agree, 35 respondents who answered agree, and 32 respondents who.

The categories for this variable are good and moderate because they have a TCR value of 67% and a mean of 3.36. The highest instrument is in the second question with the TCR and means good and medium categories; which is this instrument? How is your leader's attention to the process of the lecturer's tri dharma work activities, which is included in the concern indicator? The lowest instrument is in the fifth question, namely: Does your leader often ask for advice and criticism from lecturers regarding decisions that have been taken, namely included in the awareness indicators with the TCR and mean good and average categories.

Description of Organizational Climate Variables

Table 3. Description of Organizational Climate Variables

Question	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
	f	f	f	f	f	F	Score	TCR	Mean	Category
1	64	77	67	18	4	230	869	0,755	3,778	Good/Fair
2	138	82	10	0	0	230	1048	0,911	4,556	Very Good/High
3	42	52	121	15	0	230	811	0,705	3,526	Good/Fair
4	57	51	118	3	1	230	850	0,739	3,695	Good/Fair
5	75	92	54	8	1	230	922	0,801	4,008	Very Good/High
6	37	32	127	32	2	230	760	0,660	3,304	Good/Fair

Question	5	4	3	2	1	Total				
	f	f	f	f	f	F	Score	TCR	Mean	Category
7	18	30	128	51	3	230	699	0,607	3,039	Good/Fair
8	89	85	52	4	0	230	949	0,825	4,126	Very good/High
9	27	21	118	42	22	230	679	0,590	2,952	Fair/Low
10	57	78	81	14	0	230	868	0,754	3,773	Good/Fair
Average Value	60,4	60	87,6	18,7	3,3	230	845,5	0,735	3,676	Good/Fair

Source: Data Processed Results

In the first question, participants were asked if they believed that leaders—the study program, dean, or chancellor—and lecturers had a strong working relationship. 18 said they disagreed, 64 said they strongly agreed, 67 said they agreed, and 77 said they very agreed. Four respondents strongly disagreed. In response to the second question, I think lecturers and (the study program/dean/rector) have a pleasant connection. Ten respondents agreed, 82 respondents agreed, and 138 respondents strongly agreed. No respondents disagreed. In response to the third question, I am a lecturer; thus, I am aware of the study plan and faculty program that will be implemented. Of those surveyed, 121 expressed agreement, 52 expressed strong agreement, 0 expressed disagreement, 15 expressed disagreement, and 15 expressed disagreement. Regarding the fourth question, which enquired about the degree of enthusiasm with which academic departments and programs embrace and endorse the lecturers' ideas, 118 participants expressed complete agreement, 51 expressed agreement, 57 expressed strong agreement, and one voiced disagreement. Concerning the fifth question, which enquired whether the team works together continuously to complete tasks, one respondent strongly disagreed, eight disagreed, 54 somewhat agreed, 92 agreed, and 75 highly agreed.

Is there funding provided by the faculty/study program for lecturers to be more inventive in enhancing the tri dharma of higher education? This is the sixth question. Two respondents indicated they strongly disagreed, 32 indicated they disagreed, 127 indicated they very agreed, 32 indicated they agreed, and 37 indicated they strongly agreed. In response to query seven, the faculty recognizes and honors teachers who exhibit original thought and effort. Three respondents indicated they strongly disagreed, 51 indicated they disagreed, 128 indicated they very agreed, 30 indicated they agreed, and 18 indicated they strongly agreed. In response to the eighth question, which asked lecturers to describe recent advancements in learning as a basis for discussion and experience sharing, 0 respondents said they strongly disagreed, four said they disagreed, 52 said they agreed, 85 said they agreed, and 89 said they strongly agreed. The ninth question consistently serves as a reminder to keep the objective in mind. Twenty-two respondents indicated they strongly disagreed, 42 indicated they disagreed, 118 indicated they somewhat agreed, 21 indicated they agreed, and 27 indicated they strongly agreed with each activity. Teachers can choose the work steps for the tenth question. Results showed that 57 respondents strongly agreed, 78 respondents agreed, 81 respondents quite agreed, and 14 disagreed. No respondents strongly disagreed.

The categories for this variable are good and moderate because they have a TCR value of 73% and a mean of 3.67. The highest instrument is in the second question with the categories TCR, which means very good and high, which is this instrument. I feel that the relationship between lecturers and (study program/dean/chancellor) is very

pleasant, which is included in the indicator of the relationship between colleagues and superiors (vertical horizontal). The lowest instrument is in the ninth question, namely: We are always reminded not to forget the aim of each activity, namely entering the indicators of active support and cooperation with the TCR and mean sufficient and low categories.

B. Testing the Validity of Research Instruments
Convergent Validity on Lecturer Performance Variables

There are ten question instruments on lecturer performance variables. Based on the results of data analysis, convergent validity was obtained through the loading factors in the table below:

Table 4. Outer Model of Lecturer Performance

Indicator	Loading Factor	Information
Y2.1	0.772	Valid
Y2.2	0.871	Valid
Y2.3	0.778	Valid
Y2.4	0.701	Valid
Y2.5	0.762	Valid

All lecturer performance variable instruments have a loading factor value of more than 0.6, meaning that all instruments can be declared valid.

Convergent Validity of Resonant Leadership Variables

There are ten questions on the resonant leadership variable. Based on the results of data analysis, convergent validity was obtained through the loading factors in the table below:

Table 5. Outer Resonant Leadership Model

Indicator	Loading Factor	Information
X1.1	0.762	Valid
X1.2	0.692	Valid
X1.3	0.725	Valid
X1.4	0.826	Valid
X1.5	0.758	Valid
X1.6	0.702	Valid
X1.7	0.700	Valid
X1.8	0.803	Valid
X1.9	0.761	Valid
X1.10	0.726	Valid

All instruments for the Resonant Leadership variable have a loading factor value of more than 0.6, meaning that all instruments can be declared valid.

Convergent Validity on Organizational Climate Variables

There are ten questions on the organizational climate variable. Based on the results of data analysis, convergent validity was obtained through the loading factors in the table below:

Table 6. Outer Organizational Climate Model

Indicator	Loading Factor	Information
X2.1	0.762	Valid
X2.2	0.692	Valid
X2.3	0.725	Valid
X2.4	0.826	Valid
X2.5	0.758	Valid
X2.6	0.702	Valid
X2.7	0.700	Valid
X2.8	0.803	Valid
X2.9	0.761	Valid
X2.10	0.726	Valid

All organizational climate variable instruments have a loading factor value of more than 0.6, which means they are all valid.

C. Discriminant Validity

To evaluate the degree to which a latent construct varies from other constructs, discriminant validity is employed. A high discriminant validity score suggests that the construct is distinct and can explain the occurrence under study.

1. Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

All variables' AVE values must be higher than 0.5 to demonstrate sufficient convergent validity. This number indicates that over half of the indicators in the daily average can be explained by a single latent variable.

Table 7. Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

Variable	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Resonant Leadership	0,742
Organizational Climate	0,827
Lecturer Performance	0,682

Based on Table 9, the results show that the average variant extracted value of the resonant leadership variable (0.742), organizational climate (0.827), and lecturer performance (0.682) is greater than 0.5, so it can be concluded that all instruments in each variable meet the terms and conditions of discrimination validity.

2. Research Instrument Reliability Testing

The purpose of this reliability testing is to find out how consistent the construct variable instrument is in measuring the variable itself. This research uses two

approaches: Cronbach alpha and composite reliability testing. In both approaches, the lower limit of the construct reliability value must be greater than 0.7 to 0.6, which is an acceptable value as a variable that has an instinct.

Table 8. Cronbach Alpha dan Composite Reliability

Variabel	Cronbach Alpha	Composite Reliability	conclusion
Resonant Leadership	0,993	0,993	Reliabel
Organizational Climate	0,788	0,846	Reliabel
Lecturer Performance	0,945	0,951	Reliabel

Based on the test results in Table 8, the test results above are greater than 0.70. So, it can be concluded that all instruments for each research variable have met the reliability assumptions in the Cronbach Alpha test.

D. Hypothesis testing

Table 9. Coefficient Test and Significance of Direct Effect

	Original Sample (O)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
Resonant Leadership (X3) -> Lecturer Performance (Y)	0.082	2.413	0.001
Organizational Climate (X4) -> Lecturer Performance (Y2)	0.049	2.128	0.011

Based on the Path of Coefficient test results in Table 9, it can be concluded that the influence categories of each equation are as follows :

1. The influence of resonant leadership → lecturer performance is included in the significant category because the t-statistic value is > 1.969 ($2,413 > 1.969$), and the P-value is < 0.00 ($0.001 < 0.05$). The direction of influence is positive, and the magnitude of the influence is 8.2%. If resonant leadership increases, the performance of lecturers in Asahan Regency will improve.
2. The influence of organizational climate → lecturer performance is included in the significant category because the t-statistic value is > 1.969 ($2,128 > 1.969$), and the P-value is > 0.05 ($0.011 > 0.05$). The direction of influence is positive, and the magnitude of the influence is 4.9%. If the organizational climate improves, the performance of lecturers in Asahan Regency will increase.

DISCUSSION

Resonant Leadership with Lecturer Performance in Asahan Regency

The effect of resonant leadership is positive and significant, with a statistical T value (2.413) greater than 1.969 and a P value (0.000) smaller than 0.05. This shows that increasing competency will improve performance, especially in the caring indicator, where leaders care about lecturers in the Asahan Regency area fulfilling their obligations to implement the Tridharma of Higher Education. In addition, lecturer performance and leadership influence can be improved. Previous research results show that leaders with a resonant leadership style tend to produce employees who focus on improving performance both individually and in groups (Hult et al., 2023; Haricharan, 2023; Khalid, 2022; Younis & Mohamed, 2022; Amin et al 2021; Stoller, 2021).

Organizational Climate and Lecturer Performance in Asahan Regency

The influence of organizational climate is positive and significant, with a statistical value of 2.128, greater than 1.969, and a p-value of 0.000 smaller than 0.05. The magnitude of the effect is 4.9 percent, which shows that improving organizational climate will improve performance, especially in the indicators of relationships between

colleagues and superiors (vertical horizontal). This is in line with other variables that indicate a good relationship between coworkers and superiors. The results of this research indicate that employee performance will increase in a comfortable, comfortable, and calm work environment (Narasuci et al. 2018; Dunphy et al., 2019; Sembiring et al., 2020; Uraon & Gupta, 2020; Amal et al., 2022).

CONCLUSION

The study's findings support the conclusion that organizational atmosphere and resonant leadership positively and significantly impact lecturer performance. Resonant Leadership and Organizational Climate influence Lecturer Performance by 67.3% in Universities in Asahan Regency. The performance of professional lecturers in carrying out the tri dharma of higher education is very important in producing human resources, especially in Asahan Regency. So, it is clear that Resonant Leadership and organizational climate have an influence on other variables that improve the performance of lecturers in Asahan Regency. Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to the Resonant Leadership system and organizational climate within a higher education institution, especially those in the Asahan Regency.

REFERENCES

- Andrew J. DuBrin. 2006. Perbedaan antara kepemimpinan dan manajemen. Jakarta.
- Amin, Z., Burhanuddin, B., Shadiq, T. F., & Purba, A. S. (2021). How The Choice of Academic Majors and Students' Future Achievements According to The Talent Path. *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 4(3), 672-684.
- Amal, B. K., Pasaribu, F., & Purba, A. S. (2022). The Analysis Of The Benefits Of Expo Bank Sumatera Utara To Reduce Poverty. *Webology*, 19(1), 6900-6920.
- Ade Galih, N., Wahidah, A., Purba, A. S., Nurbayani, S., Abdullah, A. G., & Danuwijaya, A. A. (2018). Women and Achievement.
- Amal, B. K., Rambe, T., Ampera, D., Purba, A. S., & Ridho, H. (2022). Parents' perceptions of children's education and parents' attitudes towards the education of fishermen's children. *Jurnal Pendidikan, Sains Sosial, dan Agama*, 8(1), 85-97.
- Burhanuddin, Y. (2015). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Lembaga Keuangan. Syariah. Jakarta: PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Bernardin, H. Jhon., Russel, Joyce E. A. (2013). Human Resouces: An Expimetal Approach. Singapore: Mc. Graw - Hill book.co.
- Dunphy, K., Baker, F. A., Dumaresq, E., Carroll-Haskins, K., Eickholt, J., Ercole, M., ... & Wosch, T. (2019). Creative arts interventions to address depression in older adults: A systematic review of outcomes, processes, and mechanisms. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 2655.
- Haricharan, Shanil J. (2023). Leadership, management and organisational implications for public service employee well-being and performance. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v21i0.2080>
- Hult, Marja, Terkamo-Moisio, Anja, Kaakinen, Pirjo, Karki, Suyen, Nurmeksela, Anu, Palonen, Mira, Peltonen, Laura Maria, & Häggman-Laitila, Arja. (2023). Relationships between nursing leadership and organizational, staff and patient outcomes: A systematic review of reviews. *Nursing Open*, 10(9), 5920-5936. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1876>
- Indriyo Gitosudarmo & Agus Mulyono. 2001. Prinsip Dasar Manajemen Edisi 3. Yogyakarta: BPFE. Little John, Foss.

- Ingtyas, F. T., Ampera, D., Wahidah, S., Purba, A. S., & Amal, B. K. (2021). Development of " Product Design" Learning Based On Kkni through Creative Industry Students. *Rigeo*, 11(3).
- Khalid, Dalia. (2022). Impact of resonant leadership in reducing workplace bullying : A case from Sulaymaniyah chamber of commerce & industry. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 11(6), 264–276.
- Natapriatna, Sulaeman (2001) Kinerja Kepala Sekolah Dasar, Studi Korelasional Antara Pengetahuan tentang Manajemen dan Sikap terhadap Jabatan dengan Kinerja Kepala Sekolah Dasar di Kotamadya Depok. Disertasi. Program Pascasarjana UNJ Jakarta.
- Narasuci, W., Setiawan, M., & Noermijati, N. (2018). Effect of work environment on lecturer performance mediated by work motivation and job satisfaction. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 16(4), 645-653.
- Nadeak B. 2021. *Deskripsi Kinerja Guru Perguruan Tinggi Swasta di Indonesia*. Bandung (ID): Penerbit Widina.
- Purba, A. S., Hufad, A., & Sutarni, N. (2019). Women’s entrepreneurial literacy and their business competitiveness. In *Research for Social Justice* (pp. 163-168). Routledge.
- Purba, A. S., Hufad, A., Negara, C. P., Nasrawati, N., & Ramdani, A. M. (2018, November). The implication of Baduy Dalam tribe’s closure on Indonesia’s rank in the World Economic Forum. In *Annual Civic Education Conference (ACEC 2018)* (pp. 426-428). Atlantis Press.
- Rahsel, Y. (2017). Kinerja Pegawai Universitas Padjadjaran Bandung: Iklim Kerja Dan Motivasi Kerja. *Jurnal Manajemen Magister Darmajaya*, 3(01), 107-123.
- Robbin & Judge. 2007. *Perilaku Organisasi Edisi 16*. Jakarta. Salemba Empat.
- Sumantri, A. (2024). Hubungan Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah Terhadap Mutu Kinerja Sekolah. *Risalah, Jurnal Pendidikan dan Studi Islam*, 10(2), 666-693.
- Sembiring, N., Nimran, U., Astuti, E. S., & Utami, H. N. (2020). The effects of emotional intelligence and organizational justice on job satisfaction, caring climate, and criminal investigation officers’ performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 28(5), 1113-1130.
- Siahaan, M., Anantadjaya, S. P., Kurniawan, I. M. G. A., & Purba, A. S. (2022). Syariah Technology Financial Potential to Reach Non-bank Financing. *Webology*, 19(1), 77-91.
- Stoller, James K. (2021). Leadership Essentials for CHEST Medicine Professionals: Models, Attributes, and Styles. *Chest*, 159(3), 1147–1154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2020.09.095>
- Setiyati, S. (2014). Pengaruh kepemimpinan kepala sekolah, motivasi Kerja, dan budaya sekolah terhadap kinerja guru. *Jurnal Pendidikan Teknologi dan Kejuruan*, 22(2), 200-206.
- Suderadjat, (2005),” Manajemen Peningkatan Mutu berbasis Sekolah “ (MPMBS) , CV, Cipta Cemas Grafika , Bandung.
- Tadampali, A. C. T., Hadi, A., & Salam, R. (2016). Pengaruh iklim organisasi terhadap turnover intention melalui kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening pada PT Bank Sulselbar. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Publik*, 6(2), 35-46.
- Uraon, R. S., & Gupta, M. (2020). Do HRD practices affect perceived market performance through operational performance? Evidence from software industry. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 69(1), 85-108.
- Wulandari, S. (2017). Analisis Beban Kerja Mental, Fisik Serta Stres Kerja Pada Perawat Secara Ergonomi Di RSUD Dr. Achmad Mochtar Bukittinggi, *JOM Fekon*, Vol. 4 No. 1

- (Februari) 2017 4(1), 954–966.
- Wirawan. 2007. *Budaya Dan Iklim Organisasi : Teori, Aplikasi, Dan Penelitian*. Jakarta : Salemba Empat.
- Wahyono, I. (2019). Mengembangkan iklim organisasi di sekolah dengan menggunakan model tagiuri. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 3(2), 61-72.
- Younis, Zeinab Shawky, & Mohamed, Dina Assem Abelmounem. (2022). The impact of Leadershift on cultural agility policy: The search for effective ways of mindfulness. *Journal of Business & Retail Management Research*, 17(01), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.24052/jbrmr/v17is01/art-03>