Journal : **Journal of Management and Innovation Entrepreneurship (JMIE),**
Publisher : **Yayasan Nuraini Ibrahim Mandiri**
ISSN : **e-ISSN 3026-6505**
Volume / Issue / Year/ Page : **4/ 1/ 2026: October / 386-501**

SPIRITUAL INTELLIGENCE AS A MODERATOR OF LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Raga Buana[1]*, Ronal Aprianto [2], Mulyadi[3]
[1,2,3]Master of Management Program, Bina Insan University, Indonesia
[1]raga@univbinainsan.ac.id, [2]ronal_aparianto@univbinainsan.ac.id
[3]mulyadi91@gmail.com
* Coresponding Author

Article Information

Submission	:	03-09-2026
Review	:	07-09-2026
Revised	:	27-09-2026
Accepted	:	17-10-2026
Published	:	27-10-2026

Keywords
Leadership Style, Organizational Commitment, Employee Performance, Spiritual Intelligence, Local Government

Abstract

Performance accountability in Indonesian local government remains a concern, yet little is known about whether employees' spiritual intelligence conditions the effects of leadership style and organizational commitment on performance. This study examines the influence of leadership style and organizational commitment on employee performance, and tests whether spiritual intelligence moderates these relationships, at the Communication, Informatics, Statistics, and Encryption Service of Lubuklinggau City. Using a quantitative approach with a total sampling technique involving all 42 employees of the agency, data were analyzed using Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA). The results show that neither leadership style ($B = -0.045$; $t = -0.580$; $p = 0.565$; $R^2 = 0.008$) nor organizational commitment ($B = 0.045$; $t = 0.376$; $p = 0.709$; $R^2 = 0.004$) has a statistically significant effect on employee performance, with correlation coefficients ($R = 0.091$ and $R = 0.059$, respectively) indicating a very weak relationship. The interaction terms testing spiritual intelligence as a moderator were also not significant for either leadership style ($p = 0.528$) or organizational commitment ($p = 0.511$), indicating that spiritual intelligence does not significantly strengthen or weaken these relationships in this sample. All four hypotheses are therefore not statistically supported. These findings suggest that performance at this agency is shaped by factors beyond those modeled here; given the small sample ($N = 42$) and low statistical power, the null results should be read as inconclusive rather than as evidence of no effect.

How To Cite: Buana, R., Aprianto, R., & Mulyadi. (2026). Spiritual intelligence as a moderator of leadership style and organizational commitment on employee performance in local government. *Journal of Management and Innovation Entrepreneurship (JMIE)*, 4(1), 386–501. https://doi.org/10.70248/jmie.v4i1.4643

DOI : . https://doi.org/10.70248/jmie.v4i1.4643
This is an open access article under https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
Copyright© 2026 by Author. Published by Yayasan Nuraini Ibrahim Mandiri

INTRODUCTION

Leadership style is a key factor in public sector organizations. A leader is expected to be capable of directing and optimizing the organization to deliver quality services and achieve optimal public satisfaction (Jimad et al., 2020). Essentially, public sector organizations are established to serve the public, and the smooth functioning of an organization in achieving its established goals is greatly influenced by the quality of leadership. Leaders therefore often become the central focus of evaluation, serving as indicators of an organization's success (Shafiu et al., 2020), a pattern corroborated by recent public-sector evidence showing that transformational and transactional

leadership styles significantly shape staff work engagement and, through it, task performance at the department level (Thanh et al., 2022). Leadership itself can be understood as the art of directing subordinates to complete their work with a spirit of confidence; good leadership is leadership that is able to bring the organization in line with the principles of modern management while remaining willing to provide welfare and happiness to subordinates and the wider community (Sulhan & Nurhamzah, 2021).

A successful leader is able to manage the organization, constructively influence others, and demonstrate the right path and behavior that must be pursued together, since leadership greatly influences the spirit of group work. Each generation requires different leaders and characters (Ambarwati & Raharjo, 2018); to lead the millennial generation in particular, a leader must be able to set a good example, carry a strong sense of responsibility, and dare to take risks. In this study, leadership is measured through decision-making ability, motivational ability, communication ability, the ability to control subordinates, responsibility, and emotional control ability (Asykur & Sitti Muthmainnah, 2024). This is consistent with evidence that the effectiveness of a given leadership style is not uniform but is instead conditioned by contextual and psychological moderators such as employees' positive psychological capital (Baig et al., 2021), and with broader reviews showing that the link between leadership and follower performance is frequently contingent on additional individual-level and relational factors rather than operating as a direct, unconditional effect (Coronado-Maldonado & Benítez-Márquez, 2023).

Employee performance improvement is expected to drive progress in government institutions, enabling them to survive in an unstable governmental environment (Alibašić, 2018); efforts to improve employee performance are therefore one of the most serious management challenges (Almulaiki, 2023). The success of achieving organizational goals and the sustainability of public institutions depends largely on the performance quality of their human resources (Githui & Njuru, 2024), so it is essential for public institutions to develop appropriate strategies to enhance performance (Jafri et al., 2025). Performance itself can be defined as the work results of individuals or groups in an organization, adjusted to the authority and responsibility given legally and in accordance with law, morals, and ethics, in order to achieve organizational goals (Rohmah et al., 2023). Meanwhile, performance has also been described as the result of work or work achievement that also includes the process of the work itself, meaning that performance assessment covers both results and processes rather than the final product alone (Fitriana, 2024). In any organization, employee performance is crucial to achieving institutional success, as it reflects employees' ability to carry out their duties (Akpa et al., 2021), and (Aldhaheri et al., 2020) stated that performance is an indication of how well programs, activities, or policies are implemented in pursuit of organizational goals and visions.

Employee performance evaluations typically involve comparing actual outcomes with desired outcomes; in public sector contexts, performance reflects achievement in managing and operating the organization over a specific period, and performance measurement is essential for continuous improvement (Cunha et al., 2023). The performance indicators used in this study are evaluation for making general human resource decisions, criteria for selection and program development, providing feedback to employees on their performance, and a basis for allocating imbalances in obtaining salary increases and other imbalances (Fanaei et al., 2023).

Organizational commitment is another critical topic frequently addressed by

both organizational management and researchers focusing on employee behavior (Hirschi & Spurk, 2021). It is defined as the willingness of employees to remain members of the organization, reflecting their intention to stay and influencing their decision to either continue or leave (Ghosh et al., 2013). According to (Abolade, 2018), when employees lack commitment to the organization, they tend to be indifferent in their work, produce low performance, and are more likely to leave the organization voluntarily or be terminated. Organizational commitment plays an essential role in determining organizational success, as higher employee commitment correlates with higher productivity and goal achievement (Hendri, 2019); this commitment arises from the alignment of individual goals with those of the organization, and highly committed employees feel like integral parts of the organization, experiencing social and psychological fulfillment in the workplace, trusting their colleagues, and exhibiting strong integration with organizational values (Cesário & Chambel, 2017).

More specifically, commitment can be traced to the fundamental principle underlying a contract or agreement, namely responsibility or obligation (Wahyudi et al., 2025); it can therefore be concluded that organizational commitment is an attitude of employee loyalty to the organization, expressed by remaining in the organization, helping to achieve organizational goals, and having no desire to leave the organization for any reason (Viona et al., 2023). In public sector settings specifically, organizational commitment has been shown to mediate, rather than directly and independently drive, the link between the organizational climate employees experience and their subsequent performance, suggesting that its behavioral consequences are often channeled through other organizational conditions (Abu Bakar et al., 2023). A committed employee's attitude is in line with the organization's vision, mission, and goals, and his or her behavior conforms to the organization's policies, regulations, and standard operating procedures. The indicators of organizational commitment used in this study are being able to identify oneself with the organization, feeling appreciated, feeling comfortable, and feeling supported (Fahruni et al., 2025).

Beyond these theoretical linkages, the empirical starting point of this study is a performance problem at the Communication, Informatics, Statistics, and Encryption Agency of Lubuklinggau City. This gap between planned and realized performance suggests that human-resource factors, particularly the way leader direct employees and the extent to which employees are committed to the organization, deserve closer examination.

Spiritual Intelligence (SQ) is selected as a moderating variable because it reflects an individual's ability to resolve issues of meaning and value in life (Skrzypińska, 2021). It includes the ability to contextualize behavior and actions universally and gives deeper meaning to life; spirituality includes values of ultimate truth and is often contrasted with worldly matters, and a person's level of spirituality can foster innovative thinking, broader knowledge, and the ability to create or revise rules, ultimately enhancing work performance (Iqbal et al., 2024). SQ is considered the core of human intelligence, the pinnacle of all intelligences, and is used to address problems of principle and spiritual values (Arnout & Alkhatib, 2019); it is argued that SQ enables individuals and organizations to realize their true selves, develop creativity, cope with adversity, pursue the right path, and attain personal maturity (Hacker & Washington, 2017), guiding individuals in facing life's inevitable choices and realities. More specifically, spiritual intelligence has also been defined as the intelligence to address issues of meaning, that is, the intelligence to place behavior and life within a broader and richer context of

meaning, and to assess whether one person's actions or life path are more meaningful than another's (Fahrisi, 2020). This is consistent with evidence that workplace spirituality raises employee performance most reliably when it operates alongside related individual-level resources, with citizenship behavior and emotional intelligence found to condition the strength of this relationship rather than spirituality acting as a uniform, unconditional driver of performance (Jena, 2021). In this study, spiritual intelligence is measured through indicators of being an individual who wants to continue to develop, being more creative, facing existential problems, being guided toward a more correct path, having the right religious abilities, maintaining friendship, personal maturity, and being able to face real choices.

Theoretically, spiritual intelligence is positioned here as a moderator rather than a direct predictor, because it is conceptualized as an internal resource that shapes how employees interpret and respond to their leader's style and to organizational expectations, rather than as a determinant of performance in its own right. Employees with higher spiritual intelligence may derive meaning and resilience from their work regardless of leadership quality, potentially buffering the effect of weak leadership, or may instead amplify the effects of strong leadership and commitment by interpreting them within a broader framework of purpose. This conceptual mechanism, rather than an assumption of direct effect, is the theoretical rationale for testing spiritual intelligence as a moderating, rather than an independent, variable in the present model.

Two complementary theories support this moderating role. Path–goal theory holds that the effect of a leader's behavior on followers' performance depends on followers' characteristics and on how they interpret the work situation (House, 1971); individual differences such as spiritual intelligence may therefore change how strongly a given leadership style translates into performance. Conservation of resources theory proposes that individuals with greater personal resources are less vulnerable to resource loss and better able to benefit from the resources the organization provides (Hobfoll, 1989). Spiritual intelligence, understood as the capacity to draw meaning, values, and resilience from one's work (Emmons, 2000; Zohar & Marshall, 2000), can be treated as such a personal resource that conditions how employees respond to their leader and to their attachment to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). This resource is particularly relevant in the public sector, where motivation is closely tied to values and a sense of service (Perry & Wise, 1990). The Communication, Informatics, Statistics, and Encryption Agency of Lubuklinggau City play a key role in assisting the mayor in carrying out regional authority in communication and informatics.

The achievement of this agency's vision and mission requires optimal employee performance, supported by a conducive work environment and strong leadership. Work program planning at the agency is based on its 2024–2026 Strategic Plan, further elaborated in the Annual Work Plan, which is formalized in the Performance Agreement Document that acts as a performance contract and is accounted for through the Government Institution Performance Report. Since the agency is closely involved in public service, its employees must provide the best possible services to the public, and public satisfaction reflects the quality of employee performance. The agency operates under a strategic plan tied to its core duties and functions in the fields of communication and informatics.

The agency's performance is reported annually through the Government Institution Performance Report (LKjIP), which is prepared in accordance with Presidential Regulation No. 29 of 2014 concerning the Government Agency

Performance Accountability System (SAKIP). The report serves both as performance accountability and as a basis for future performance improvement; employee performance can therefore be assessed from the evaluation of SAKIP implementation.

Previous studies have examined leadership style as a predictor of work engagement and task performance in the public sector (Thanh et al., 2022), organizational commitment as a correlate or mediator of performance (Cesário & Chambel, 2017; Hendri, 2019), and psychological moderators of the leadership–performance link such as positive psychological capital (Baig et al., 2021). Research on workplace spirituality, in turn, has largely focused on its direct and mediated links with performance (Iqbal et al., 2024; Jena, 2021). To the authors' knowledge, few studies have tested spiritual intelligence as a moderator of both leadership style and organizational commitment within the same model, and evidence from Indonesian local government agencies remains scarce. This study addresses that gap.

Accordingly, this study aims to (1) analyze the effect of leadership style on employee performance, (2) analyze the effect of organizational commitment on employee performance, (3) examine whether spiritual intelligence moderates the effect of leadership style on employee performance, and (4) examine whether spiritual intelligence moderates the effect of organizational commitment on employee performance at the Communication, Informatics, Statistics, and Encryption Agency of Lubuklinggau City.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a quantitative approach, testing the hypothesized relationships between leadership style, organizational commitment, spiritual intelligence, and employee performance through Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA).

In this study, the population was all 42 employees of the Communication, Informatics, Statistics, and Encryption Department of Lubuklinggau City. Because the number was less than 100, the study used a total sampling approach. A sample of this size, while appropriate given the total population of the agency, carries an important methodological limitation: with only 42 respondents, the statistical power of the Moderated Regression Analysis to detect small-to-moderate effect sizes, particularly for the interaction terms testing spiritual intelligence as a moderator, is low. Non-significant results in this study should therefore be interpreted with this power limitation in mind, alongside the possibility that the hypothesized relationships are genuinely weak in this context. This concern is consistent with methodological guidance showing that interaction (moderation) effects in regression-based designs generally require substantially larger samples than main effects to be reliably detected, since the power to detect an interaction is disproportionately reduced relative to a main effect of equivalent size, particularly when predictor and moderator variables are correlated (Baranger et al., 2023).

Because the sample coincides with the entire population, the basis for inferential testing needs to be stated explicitly. The 42 employees are treated as one realization of the process that generates employee perceptions in this agency (an "apparent population"), so that significance tests express uncertainty about the underlying relationships rather than sampling error from a larger finite population (Berk et al., 1995); the findings therefore describe this agency and are not generalized beyond it. A power sensitivity analysis was also conducted ($\alpha = 0.05$, power = 0.80, $N = 42$; noncentral F distribution, equivalent to the "R^2 increase" sensitivity procedure in

G*Power; Faul et al., 2009). The smallest effect that could be detected with 80% power was $f^2 \approx 0.20$ ($\Delta R^2 = 0.165$) for a single predictor and $f^2 = 0.25$ ($\Delta R^2 = 0.20$) for the block of two interaction terms, that is, effects between Cohen's (1992) medium ($f^2 = 0.15$) and large ($f^2 = 0.35$) benchmarks. Smaller effects, including small interaction effects, therefore could not be reliably detected in this study.

Primary data were obtained directly from respondents through a questionnaire, while secondary data were taken from institutional documents such as the organizational structure, the history of the agency, and previous performance reports. The questionnaire measured four variables. Leadership style (X1) was measured with six indicators: decision-making ability, motivational ability, communication ability, ability to control subordinates, responsibility, and emotional control (Asykur & Sitti Muthmainnah, 2024). Organizational commitment (X2) was measured with four indicators: identification with the organization, feeling appreciated, feeling comfortable, and feeling supported (Fahruni et al., 2025). Spiritual intelligence (Z) was measured with eight indicators: the drive to keep developing, creativity, facing existential problems, being guided toward a more correct path, religious ability, maintaining friendship, personal maturity, and the ability to face real choices (Hacker & Washington, 2017). Employee performance (Y) was measured with four indicators: evaluation for general human resource decisions, criteria for selection and program development, feedback to employees, and a basis for allocating salary increases (Fanaei et al., 2023).

Before the main analysis, the instrument was tested for validity and reliability. Item validity was assessed with the corrected item–total correlation (Pearson product–moment), and an item was considered valid if its coefficient exceeded the critical r-table value of 0.304 ($n = 42$, $\alpha = 0.05$, $df = 40$). Reliability was assessed with Cronbach's alpha, with a value above 0.60 considered acceptable for exploratory research (Ghozali, 2018). The results of both tests are reported in Table 1.

The classical assumption tests of linear regression were then carried out: (1) normality of the residuals using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test, with the residuals considered normal if $p > 0.05$; (2) multicollinearity, with no multicollinearity if tolerance > 0.10 and VIF < 10 (Kim, 2019); (3) autocorrelation using the Durbin–Watson test, with no autocorrelation if the DW statistic lies between dU and 4 − dU (Durbin & Watson, 1951); and (4) heteroscedasticity using the Glejser test, in which the absolute residuals are regressed on the independent variables, with no heteroscedasticity if $p > 0.05$ (Glejser, 1969).

To find out whether Spiritual Intelligence (Z) moderates the influence of Leadership Style (X1) and Organizational Commitment (X2) on Employee Performance (Y), this study uses Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) as its sole data analysis technique, tested in a hierarchical model: leadership style and organizational commitment are entered first as direct predictors, followed by spiritual intelligence, and finally the interaction terms (X1*Z and X2*Z) that represent the moderation effect proper. The significance of each path is evaluated using the t-test at $\alpha = 0.05$, with the decision rule applied consistently throughout this study: a hypothesis is supported only if its significance value (p) is less than 0.05 and the calculated t-value exceeds the critical t-table value (1.682, $df = 40$); if the significance value is greater than or equal to 0.05, the hypothesis is rejected, regardless of the sign or apparent magnitude of the coefficient.

The three hierarchical models are specified as follows (Aiken & West, 1991):

Model 1: $Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon$

Journal : Journal of Management and Innovation Entrepreneurship (JMIE),
Publisher : Yayasan Nuraini Ibrahim Mandiri
ISSN : e-ISSN 3026-6505
Volume / Issue / Year/ Page : 4/ 1/ 2026: October / 386-501

Model 2: $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3Z + \varepsilon$

Model 3: $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3Z + \beta_4(X_1 \cdot Z) + \beta_5(X_2 \cdot Z) + \varepsilon$

where Y is employee performance, X1 is leadership style, X2 is organizational commitment, Z is spiritual intelligence, X1·Z and X2·Z are the interaction terms, α is the constant, β1–β5 are the regression coefficients, and ε is the error term. Spiritual intelligence is considered a moderator if the coefficient of the corresponding interaction term (β4 or β5) is significant in Model 3, and the change in R^2 (ΔR^2) from Model 2 to Model 3 indicates the contribution of the moderation effect.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

Validity and Reliability Test

Table 1 reports the validity and reliability results for the four research variables. [ISI: ringkas hasil, misalnya jumlah item valid dan gugur pada setiap variabel, rentang r hitung, dan nilai Cronbach's alpha; sebutkan bahwa alpha > 0,60 bila benar.]

Table 1. Validity and Reliability Test Results

Variable	Number of items	Corrected item–total r (min–max)	r-table (n = 42)	Cronbach's α	Result
Leadership style (X1)	18	0.556–0.730	0.304	0.912	Valid and reliable
Organizational commitment (X2)	12	0.509–0.838	0.304	0.893	Valid and reliable
Spiritual intelligence (Z)	21	0.720–0.829	0.304	0.971	Valid and reliable
Employee performance (Y)	12	0.534–0.826	0.304	0.881	Valid and reliable

Source: data processed by the researcher

Normality Test

Normality of the residuals is a prerequisite for valid t and F tests, particularly in small samples (Ghozali, 2018). The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was applied to the unstandardized residuals of the regression model. The output shows an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.602, which is greater than 0.05; according to the decision rule of the test, it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed. Thus, the assumption or requirement of normality in the regression model has been met.

Test Multicollinearity

The multicollinearity test aims to test whether a correlation is found among the independent variables in the regression model. Multicollinearity can be seen from the tolerance value and VIF (Variance Inflation Factor). To be free from this problem, the tolerance value must be greater than 0.10 and the VIF value less than 10 (Kim, 2019). Based on the output coefficient, it is known that the collinearity statistics of the tolerance value for the Leadership Style (X1) and Organizational Commitment (X2) variables are 0.972 greater than 0.10. While the VIF value for the Leadership Style (X1) and Organizational Commitment (X2) variables is 1.028 <10.0, then referring to the basis for decision making in the Multicollinearity test, it can be concluded that there are no symptoms of Multicollinearity in the regression model. For the model that includes the interaction terms (Model 3), the tolerance and VIF values were [ISI: tolerance dan VIF X1, X2, Z, X1*Z, X2*Z]; [ISI: bila VIF > 10, lakukan mean-centering pada variabel

pembentuk interaksi].

Autocorrelation Test

The autocorrelation test used the Durbin–Watson statistic. The model yielded DW = [ISI: nilai DW]; with n = 42 and k = [ISI: jumlah prediktor] predictors at α = 0.05, the critical values are dL = [ISI: nilai] and dU = [ISI: nilai]. Because [ISI: dU < DW < 4 − dU], the residuals [ISI: show no evidence of] first-order autocorrelation (Durbin & Watson, 1951).

Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test used the Glejser test, which regresses the absolute residuals on the independent variables. The significance values were [ISI: p X1], [ISI: p X2], [ISI: p Z], [ISI: p X1*Z], and [ISI: p X2*Z], all [ISI: greater] than 0.05, so [ISI: no symptoms of heteroscedasticity were found] (Glejser, 1969).

Hypothesis Testing

This study tested four hypotheses using Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA). H1 and H2 examine the direct effects of leadership style and organizational commitment on employee performance; H3 and H4 examine whether spiritual intelligence moderates these relationships, tested through the interaction terms X1*Z and X2*Z entered together in Model 2. Table 2 summarizes the model at each step of the hierarchical analysis, and Table 2 consolidates the coefficients, t-statistics, and significance values for all tested paths, following the decision rule that a path is significant only if p < 0.05 and the calculated t-value exceeds the critical t-table value of 1.682 (df = 40).

Table 2. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results (MRA)

H	Path	B (Beta)	t	Sig. (p)	Decision
H1	Leadership Style > Employee Performance	-0.045 (-0.091)	-0.580	0.565	Rejected
H2	Organizational Commitment > Employee Performance	0.045 (0.059)	0.376	0.709	Rejected
H3	Leadership Style x Spiritual Intelligence (X1*Z) > Employee Performance	[ISI: B ≥ 4 desimal] (-0.112)	-0.637	0.528	Rejected
H4	Organizational Commitment x Spiritual Intelligence (X2*Z) > Employee Performance	[ISI: B ≥ 4 desimal] (0.117)	0.664	0.511	Rejected

Source: data processed by the researcher

Based on Table 2, the results of the hypothesis testing show that, H1: Leadership style has an unstandardized coefficient of B = -0.045 (Beta = -0.091), t = -0.580, and p = 0.565. Because p > 0.05, and the calculated t-value does not exceed the critical t-table value of 1.682, leadership style does not have a statistically significant effect on employee performance. The correlation coefficient (R = 0.091, R^2 = 0.008) further indicates a very weak relationship. H1 is rejected.

H2: Organizational commitment has an unstandardized coefficient of B = 0.045 (Beta = 0.059), t = 0.376, and p = 0.709. As p > 0.05 and t does not exceed 1.682, organizational commitment does not have a statistically significant effect on employee performance. The correlation coefficient (R = 0.059, R^2 = 0.004) likewise indicates a very weak relationship. H2 is rejected.

H3: The interaction term Leadership Style x Spiritual Intelligence (X1*Z) has B = [ISI: B ≥ 4 desimal] (Beta = -0.112), t = -0.637, and p = 0.528. Since p > 0.05, spiritual intelligence does not significantly moderate the relationship between leadership style

and employee performance. H3 is rejected.

H4: The interaction term Organizational Commitment x Spiritual Intelligence (X2*Z) (Beta = 0.117), t = 0.664, and p = 0.511. Since p > 0.05, spiritual intelligence does not significantly moderate the relationship between organizational commitment and employee performance. H4 is rejected.

Across the models reported in Table 2, the coefficient of determination (R^2) ranges from 0.004 to 0.009, meaning that leadership style, organizational commitment, and spiritual intelligence, whether tested individually or as interaction terms, collectively explain less than 1% of the variance in employee performance in this sample. None of the four hypotheses proposed in this study are statistically supported.

DISCUSSION

Leadership Style and Organizational Commitment on Performance

Contrary to H1 and H2, neither leadership style nor organizational commitment significantly predicted employee performance in this sample, and both relationships were very weak (R = 0.091 and R = 0.059, respectively). Several methodological and contextual factors plausibly explain this pattern. First, with only 42 respondents, the statistical power of this study to detect small effect sizes is low; a true small-to-moderate effect in the population could easily fail to reach significance at this sample size, so these results should be read as inconclusive rather than as definitive evidence that no relationship exists. Second, employee performance at a public sector agency such as Diskominfo Lubuklinggau is formally structured around standard operating procedures, performance contracts (Perjanjian Kinerja), and the government accountability system (SAKIP/LKjIP) described earlier in this paper; performance in this setting may therefore be driven more by regulatory compliance and standardized task completion than by employees' subjective perceptions of their leader's style or their own organizational commitment, both of which were measured here through closed-ended self-report questionnaires susceptible to social desirability and common-method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Third, the very low R^2 values obtained (0.004-0.009) indicate that although the coefficient of organizational commitment has the expected positive sign (B = 0.045) and that of leadership style is negative (B = -0.045), contrary to expectation, the two variables together account for a negligible share of the variance in performance, suggesting that other factors not modeled in this study, such as workload, compensation, or work environment, are likely more consequential drivers of performance at this agency.

The non-significant effect of leadership style differs from previous evidence that leadership styles shape staff work engagement and, through it, task performance in the public sector (Thanh et al., 2022), that leadership strategy improves organizational performance in Indonesian public service agencies (Jimad et al., 2020), and from meta-analytic evidence linking transformational and transactional leadership to follower performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). The negative, although non-significant, coefficient is also at odds with the expectation that better leadership raises performance. The result is, however, in line with reviews showing that the effect of leadership on followers depends on additional individual-level and relational factors rather than operating as a direct, unconditional effect (Coronado-Maldonado & Benítez-Márquez, 2023), which is the logic behind testing spiritual intelligence as a moderator in this study.

Likewise, the non-significant effect of organizational commitment contrasts with

studies reporting that commitment is associated with employee performance and productivity (Cesário & Chambel, 2017; Hendri, 2019). Meta-analytic evidence nevertheless indicates that the association between commitment and job performance is positive but modest and varies across commitment components (Meyer et al., 2002), and in public sector settings commitment often channels the effect of other organizational conditions on performance rather than acting as a direct driver (Abu Bakar et al., 2023). A small association such as the one observed here (B = 0.045) therefore cannot be distinguished from zero with 42 respondents.

Spiritual Intelligence in Moderate the Leadership and Commitment on Performance

H3 and H4 proposed that spiritual intelligence would strengthen or weaken the effects of leadership style and organizational commitment on performance; neither interaction term was significant. This null moderation result is consistent with, and partly explained by, the non-significance of the direct effects themselves: because leadership style and organizational commitment were not shown to meaningfully predict performance in this sample, there is correspondingly little variance in that relationship left for a moderator to explain. In addition, spiritual intelligence may operate more directly on employees' internal well-being, meaning, and resilience, than on the specific behavioral pathway between leadership style, commitment, and task performance, particularly in a bureaucratic context where task performance is heavily procedurally defined. It is also possible that the linear interaction specification used here (X1*Z, X2*Z) does not capture a genuinely non-linear or threshold-based moderating mechanism, and that the small sample size further limited the power available to detect an interaction effect, which in regression is statistically harder to detect than a main effect of equivalent size. Taken together, this study does not find support for spiritual intelligence as a moderator of the leadership-performance or commitment-performance relationships in this context, and this null result should be interpreted as a genuine empirical finding worth reporting, rather than reframed as partial or indirect support for the hypothesized moderation.

This null moderation result differs from evidence that positive psychological capital moderates the relationship between leadership styles and employee performance (Baig et al., 2021) and that the performance effect of workplace spirituality depends on citizenship behavior and emotional intelligence (Jena, 2021). One plausible reason is statistical power: the sensitivity analysis reported in the Methodology showed that, with N = 42, only interaction effects of about $f^2 = 0.25$ or larger could be detected with 80% power, so smaller moderation effects that may exist in this population could not be distinguished from zero. Differences in the moderating construct (spiritual intelligence rather than psychological capital or emotional intelligence), in the sector studied, and in the measurement instruments may also contribute.

Consistent with methodological guidance, the non-significant findings are reported here as informative results rather than as failures. Non-significant results are frequently misinterpreted as confirming the absence of an effect, when they more accurately indicate that the present data cannot distinguish the tested effect from zero, and researchers are advised to report and interpret such results as genuinely informative rather than as failures to be explained away (Edelsbrunner & Thurn, 2024).

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis regarding the influence of leadership style

and organizational commitment on employee performance, with spiritual intelligence (SQ) as a moderating variable, at the Communication, Informatics, Statistics and Encryption Service of Lubuklinggau City, it can be concluded as follows:

Leadership style does not have a statistically significant effect on employee performance, and the relationship is very weak; H1 is not supported. Organizational commitment likewise does not have a statistically significant effect on employee performance; H2 is not supported. Spiritual intelligence does not significantly moderate the relationship between leadership style and employee performance (H3 is not supported) or between organizational commitment and employee performance (H4 is not supported).

The overall conclusion of this study is that, within this sample of 42 employees at Diskominfo Lubuklinggau City, the model tested is unable to significantly explain variation in employee performance: none of leadership style, organizational commitment, or spiritual intelligence (as a direct effect or as a moderator) shows a statistically significant relationship with performance. This finding should be reported honestly as a null result rather than reframed as support for the hypotheses, and future research should consider the model refinements and larger samples discussed in the Limitation and Recommendations sections below. Practically, these results suggest that improving performance at the agency requires attention to other determinants, such as workload, compensation, and work environment, in addition to leadership and commitment.

Limitation

This research was conducted only at one specific agency/organization, so the results cannot be generalized widely to other sectors or agencies. Most importantly, the sample size of 42 respondents, while it represents the agency's full population, is small for regression-based hypothesis testing and yields low statistical power, particularly for detecting the interaction (moderation) effects tested in H3 and H4; the non-significant results reported in this study should be interpreted with this power constraint in mind. Different organizational characteristics and work cultures can influence the research results if applied to other contexts. This study used a cross-sectional approach, namely data collection was carried out at a specific point in time. This approach does not allow for observing the dynamics or changes in the relationship between variables (leadership style, organizational commitment, spiritual intelligence, and performance) over time. This is a limitation consistent with broader methodological guidance that cross-sectional, self-reported survey designs constrain causal inference and cannot rule out reverse causality or common-method bias as alternative explanations for observed (or, as in this study, absent) relationships.

The instruments used to measure spiritual intelligence, leadership style, organizational commitment, and employee performance were derived from closed-ended questionnaires that could introduce respondent perception bias. Some respondents may have provided socially expected answers (social desirability bias), rather than answers that reflect actual conditions. Furthermore, this study has not considered other external factors that could potentially influence employee performance, such as workload, work environment, or recovery. This may result in the independent variables not fully explaining variations in employee performance. Finally, although spiritual intelligence was used as a moderating variable, the analysis used was still linear and did not explore the possibility of non-linear interactions or more

complex mediation effects.

Recommendations

Further research is recommended to involve organizations from various sectors, both government and private, so that the results can be more generalized. By involving more institutions, a more comprehensive picture will be obtained regarding the role of spiritual intelligence in strengthening the relationship between leadership style and commitment to performance. It is recommended to use a longitudinal research design in subsequent research to be able to capture changes in the relationship between variables over time and understand the long-term impact of spiritual intelligence on employee performance.

Future research should consider the use of more extensively validated measuring instruments or instruments or complemented by qualitative approaches (interviews or observations) to enrich the understanding of the dimensions of spiritual intelligence and leadership behavior in more depth. To obtain a more comprehensive model, it is recommended to add other variables such as the work environment, employee well-being, or workload as control or intervening variables, in order to open up a broader influence on employee performance. It is recommended to use more complex statistical analysis methods, such as multigroup structural equation modeling (SEM) or moderated mediation analysis, to understand more deeply the role of spiritual intelligence as a moderator, including the potential for non-linear interactions between variables.

Statement on the Use of Artificial Intelligence.

The author acknowledges the use of Deepl and Grammarly AI as a language editing aid during the preparation of this manuscript, used to support grammar checking and sentence clarity. All ideas, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions presented in this study remain entirely the author's responsibility.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author contributions

Conceptualization, Author1; methodology, Author1 and Author2; data collection, Author1; data validation, Author1 and Author2; formal analysis, Author1 and Author2; writing, original draft preparation, Author1 and Author2; writing, review and editing, Author1 and Author2. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express his deepest gratitude to all parties who have provided support, assistance, and contributions throughout the preparation of this research. Special thanks are extended to the supervisor and supervising lecturer for their invaluable guidance, direction, and constructive input during the research process. Appreciation is also given to all respondents, particularly the employees who willingly took the time to complete the questionnaire and provide essential information, making a significant contribution to the validity and relevance of the data. The author is also grateful to the institution where the research was conducted for their permission and cooperation, which enabled smooth data collection and access to the required

information. Lastly, heartfelt thanks go to the author's family, friends, and colleagues for their continuous encouragement, prayers, and moral support throughout the research journey.

REFERENCE

Abolade, D. A. (2018). Impact of employees' job insecurity and employee turnover on organisational performance in private and public sector organisations. *Studies in Business and Economics*, *13*(2), 5–19. https://doi.org/10.2478/sbe-2018-0016

Abu Bakar, H., Mustamil, N., & Yazid, M. (2023). Organizational climate and employee performance: The mediating role of organizational commitment in the public sector. *Public Organization Review*, *23*(1), 55–73. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-022-00636-5

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Sage.

Akpa, V. O., Asikhia, O. U., & Nneji, N. E. (2021). Organizational culture and organizational performance: A review of literature. *International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management*, *3*(1), 361–372. https://doi.org/10.35629/5252-0301361372

Aldhaheri, F., Ameen, A., & Isaac, O. (2020). The influence of strategy formulation (vision, mission, and goals) on the organizational operations. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, *7*(17). [ISI: DOI/URL artikel]

Alibašić, H. (2018). *Sustainability and resilience planning for local governments: The quadruple bottom line strategy*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72568-0

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *63*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x

Almulaiki, W. A. (2023). The impact of performance management on employee performance. *Saudi Journal of Business and Management Studies*, *8*(2), 22–27. https://doi.org/10.36348/sjbms.2023.v08i02.002

Ambarwati, A., & Raharjo, S. T. (2018). Prinsip kepemimpinan character of a leader pada era generasi milenial. *Philanthropy: Journal of Psychology*, *2*(2), 114. https://doi.org/10.26623/philanthropy.v2i2.1151

Arnout, B. A., & Alkhatib, A. J. (2019). The secret of human existence homeostasis: Spiritual intelligence is the hope of all humanity. *Open Access Journal of Addiction and Psychology*, *2*(3), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.33552/oajap.2019.02.000537

Asykur, M., & Sitti Muthmainnah. (2024). Key leadership traits in madrasah principals: Decision-making, motivation, communication, and management skills. *Journal of Educational Management Research*, *3*(1), 59–70. https://doi.org/10.61987/jemr.v3i1.360

Baig, S. A., Iqbal, S., Abrar, M., Baig, I. A., Amjad, F., Zia-ur-Rehman, M., & Awan, M. U. (2021). Impact of leadership styles on employees' performance with moderating role of positive psychological capital. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *32*(9–10), 1085–1105. https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2019.1665011

Baranger, D. A. A., Finsaas, M. C., Goldstein, B. L., Vize, C. E., Lynam, D. R., & Olino, T. M. (2023). Tutorial: Power analyses for interaction effects in cross-sectional

regressions. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *6*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459231187531

Berk, R. A., Western, B., & Weiss, R. E. (1995). Statistical inference for apparent populations. *Sociological Methodology*, *25*, 421–458. https://doi.org/10.2307/271073

Cesário, F., & Chambel, M. J. (2017). Linking organizational commitment and work engagement to employee performance. *Knowledge and Process Management*, *24*(2), 152–158. https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1542

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155–159. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Coronado-Maldonado, I., & Benítez-Márquez, M.-D. (2023). Emotional intelligence, leadership, and work teams: A hybrid literature review. *Heliyon*, *9*(10), e20356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e20356

Cunha, F., Dinis-Carvalho, J., & Sousa, R. M. (2023). Performance measurement systems in continuous improvement environments: Obstacles to their effectiveness. *Sustainability*, *15*(1), Article 867. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15010867

Durbin, J., & Watson, G. S. (1951). Testing for serial correlation in least squares regression. II. *Biometrika*, *38*(1–2), 159–177. https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/38.1-2.159

Edelsbrunner, P. A., & Thurn, C. M. (2024). Improving the utility of non-significant results for educational research: A review and recommendations. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *80*, 101326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2023.101326

Emmons, R. A. (2000). Is spirituality an intelligence? Motivation, cognition, and the psychology of ultimate concern. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, *10*(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327582IJPR1001_2

Fahrisi, A. (2020). *Kecerdasan spiritual dan pendidikan Islam*. Guepedia.

Fahruni, R. R., Artiningsih, D. W., & Widyanti, R. (2025). The influence of perceived organizational support and organizational virtuousness on performance mediated by employee well-being in a glass packaging beverage company. *At-Tadbir: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, *9*(1), 61. https://doi.org/10.31602/atd.v9i1.16225

Fanaei, S., Zareiyan, A., Shahraki, S., & Mirzaei, A. (2023). Determining the key performance indicators of human resource management of military hospital managers; a TOPSIS study. *BMC Primary Care*, *24*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-023-02007-7

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, *41*(4), 1149–1160. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

Fitriana, H. (2024). Pengaruh penilaian prestasi kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan. *Management and Business Progress*, *3*(1), 112–115. https://doi.org/10.70021/mbp.v3i1.146

Ghosh, P., Satyawadi, R., Joshi, J. P., & Shadman, M. (2013). Who stays with you? Factors predicting employees' intention to stay. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *21*(3), 288–312. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-Sep-2011-0511

Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 25* (9th ed.). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Githui, F. K., & Njuru, J. W. (2024). The role of public management in the achievement of sustainable development goals. *International Journal of Science and Business*, *31*(1),

64–75. https://doi.org/10.58970/ijsb.2276

Glejser, H. (1969). A new test for heteroskedasticity. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *64*(325), 316–323. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1969.10500976

Hacker, S. K., & Washington, M. (2017). Spiritual intelligence: Going beyond IQ and EQ to develop resilient leaders. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, *36*(3), 21–28. https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.21777

Hendri, M. I. (2019). The mediation effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on the organizational learning effect of the employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *68*(7), 1208–1234. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-05-2018-0174

Hirschi, A., & Spurk, D. (2021). Ambitious employees: Why and when ambition relates to performance and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *127*(March), 103576. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2021.103576

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*(3), 321–339. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391905

Iqbal, S., Bureš, V., Zanker, M., Abdullah, M., & Tootell, B. (2024). A system dynamics perspective on workplace spirituality and employee behavior. *Administrative Sciences*, *14*(1), Article 7. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14010007

Jafri, M., Razak, A., Osman, Z., Razniza, N., & Nadzri, M. (2025). Performance leads to excellence: Strategies for elevating employee performance in the public sector. *[ISI: nama jurnal]*, *5*(41), 24–37. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389674788_Performance_Leads_to_Excellence_Strategies_for_Elevating_Employee_Performance_in_the_Public_Sector

Jena, L. K. (2021). Does workplace spirituality lead to raising employee performance? The role of citizenship behavior and emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *30*(6), 1309–1334. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoa-06-2020-2279

Jimad, H., Maarif, M. S., Affandi, M. J., & Sukmawati, A. (2020). Leadership strategy of state university public service agency to increasing organizational performance in Indonesia. *International Business and Accounting Research Journal*, *4*(1), 23. https://doi.org/10.15294/ibarj.v4i1.110

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 755–768. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Kim, J. H. (2019). Multicollinearity and misleading statistical results. *Korean Journal of Anesthesiology*, *72*(6), 558–569. https://doi.org/10.4097/kja.19087

Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, *22*(140), 1–55.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *61*(1), 20–52. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842

Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, *50*(3), 367–373. https://doi.org/10.2307/976618

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Rohmah, F. A., Andini, A., Wicaksono, T. T., Hakim, M. E. T., & Anshori, M. I. (2023). Analisa pengaruh organisasi pada performa kinerja sumber daya manusia. *Birev*, *1*(5), 61–68. https://doi.org/10.61292/birev.v1i5.48

Shafiu, A. M., Manaf, H. A., & Muslim, S. (2020). Utilization entrepreneurship for job creation, poverty reduction and national development. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, *61*, 97–102. https://doi.org/10.32861/jssr.61.97.102

Skrzypińska, K. (2021). Does spiritual intelligence (SI) exist? A theoretical investigation of a tool useful for finding the meaning of life. *Journal of Religion and Health*, *60*(1), 500–516. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-020-01005-8

Sulhan, M., & Nurhamzah, N. (2021). *Kepemimpinan dan budaya mutu pendidikan tinggi*. YKM.

Thanh, N. H., Quang, N. Van, & Anh, N. N. (2022). The relationship between leadership style and staff work engagement: An empirical analysis of the public sector in Vietnam. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *9*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01354-7

Viona, O., Abunawas, & Hastuti, D. (2023). Pengaruh komitmen organisasi dan komunikasi terhadap kinerja pegawai Inspektorat Daerah Provinsi Riau. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Merdeka EMBA*, *2*(2), 66–77. https://jom.umri.ac.id/index.php/emba/article/view/915

Wahyudi, D., Onsardi, & Utama, Y. N. P. (2025). Pengaruh karakteristik individu, karakteristik pekerjaan dan pengalaman kerja terhadap komitmen organisasi. *Jurnal Manajemen Modal Insani dan Bisnis (JMMIB)*, *6*(1), 90–108. https://doi.org/10.61567/jmmib.v6i1.226

Zohar, D., & Marshall, I. (2000). *SQ: Connecting with our spiritual intelligence*. Bloomsbury.