

The Role of Leadership Style and Work Culture in Employee Performance: A Scoping Review

Karina Yudi Agustina^{1*}, Wiwin Ariani², M. Safrudin³, Ratnawati⁴

¹²³⁴Universitas Wisnuwardhana Malang, Indonesia

karinayudi22@gmail.com

Abstract

Leadership style and work culture are the two determinants of employee performance most frequently examined in the Indonesian management literature, yet that literature remains fragmented across small, single-site studies with occasionally divergent findings, and its scope, methods, and gaps have not previously been mapped. This scoping review characterises Indonesian empirical research published between 2016 and 2025 on these relationships, synthesises the reported direction and magnitude of the effects, and identifies the methodological and conceptual gaps that should guide subsequent inquiry. The review followed the five-stage framework of Arksey and O'Malley as refined by Levac and colleagues, and is reported in accordance with the PRISMA-ScR checklist; consistent with scoping review convention, no critical appraisal of individual study quality was undertaken. Indonesian-language empirical articles indexed in Google Scholar were retrieved using two predefined Boolean search strings and screened in two stages against a priori eligibility criteria, yielding twelve included studies. Data were charted on setting, sample, measurement, analytical technique, and reported effect, then synthesised narratively. Eleven studies reported a positive and statistically significant effect; the three that reported a coefficient of determination gave values between 36% and 61%, while one found no significant effect of leadership style. All twelve were cross-sectional, single-organisation designs using single-source self-report data analysed by simple or multiple linear regression; none modelled the two predictors jointly, and none tested mediation or moderation. The evidence converges on a positive association but is methodologically narrow, and the reported coefficients are best read as upper bounds pending multi-source, longitudinal, and jointly specified designs.

Keywords: Leadership Style, Work Culture, Employee Performance, Scoping Review, Human Resource Management.

Introduction

Human resources occupy a decisive position in determining whether an organisation attains its objectives. Employees are no longer treated merely as a factor of production but as strategic assets whose competence, commitment, and behaviour underwrite organisational competitiveness in an increasingly volatile environment. Mangkunegara (2017) defines employee performance as the quality and quantity of work an individual accomplishes in discharging assigned responsibilities, while Sutrisno (2019) frames it as the demonstrated capacity to execute tasks, attain expected outcomes, and display appropriate work behaviour throughout the process. Because organisational performance is in aggregate the sum of individual contributions (Kasmir, 2018), any systematic weakness at the individual level propagates upward into service quality, operational efficiency, and goal attainment.

The issue carries particular weight in Indonesia. Successive waves of bureaucratic reform, culminating in the codification of the core values of the state civil apparatus (*aparatur sipil negara*, ASN), have placed employee performance at the centre of public-sector policy, while private firms face intensifying regional competition. Sedarmayanti (2017) identifies mental attitude, education, competence, leadership, remuneration, and working conditions as the principal determinants of performance. Of these, two have attracted disproportionate empirical attention in the Indonesian literature: the style a leader adopts in directing subordinates, and the culture of work that prevails within the organisation.

Leadership style refers to the recurrent behavioural pattern a leader exhibits when guiding, directing, and influencing subordinates toward collective goals. Robbins and Coulter (2018) describe it as the approach by which leaders induce willing cooperation, and Northouse (2019) as the behavioural repertoire used to direct, motivate, and coordinate members. Theoretically, the mechanism linking style to performance is well specified. House's (1971) path-goal theory holds that a leader raises subordinate performance by clarifying routes to valued outcomes and removing obstacles, with directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented styles each suited to different task and follower contingencies. Bass and Riggio (2006) advance a complementary account in which transformational behaviours idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualised consideration elevate follower effort beyond transactional expectations. In operational terms, Indonesian studies typically observe style through communication quality, motivational capacity, decisiveness, accountability, clarity of direction, and the quality of leader-subordinate relationships.

Work culture, in turn, denotes the values and habitual practices embedded in the working environment. Triguno (2013) characterises it as a philosophy rooted in a view of life that becomes the distinguishing habit and driving force of work within an organisation. Schein (2010) offers the more general construct of organisational culture as a pattern of basic assumptions invented or developed by a group as it learns to cope with external adaptation and internal integration, assumptions that are taught to new members as the correct way to perceive and act. Denison and Mishra (1995) demonstrate empirically that traits such as involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission are associated with effectiveness. A constructive work culture is thus expected to institutionalise discipline, accountability, cooperation, and a results orientation, thereby stabilising performance independently of any individual supervisor.

Despite an abundance of Indonesian empirical work on these two determinants, the resulting evidence base is fragmented. Studies are overwhelmingly conducted in a single office, agency, or firm, with samples frequently below fifty respondents, and they are dispersed across dozens of national journals of varying indexation. Their findings are usually reported as significant, but not invariably so: at least one study in the present corpus concludes that leadership style exerts no significant effect on performance. Furthermore, the constructs

themselves are used inconsistently. The Indonesian terms *budaya kerja* (work culture) and *budaya organisasi* (organisational culture) are often treated as interchangeable, although they are theoretically distinguishable the former denoting behavioural norms enacted in the execution of work, the latter the deeper assumption structure of the collective. Under these conditions, a practitioner or policymaker seeking guidance from the literature cannot readily determine what is known, how confidently, or where the boundaries of that knowledge lie.

This is precisely the situation for which a scoping review is the appropriate instrument. Munn et al. (2018) argue that scoping reviews are indicated when the objective is to identify the types of available evidence, clarify concepts, examine how research is conducted, and identify knowledge gaps, rather than to answer a narrow question of intervention effectiveness. Because the corpus here is heterogeneous in setting, measurement, and analytical technique, and because effect sizes are reported inconsistently, statistical pooling through meta-analysis would be premature. Mapping the territory is the necessary prior step.

Accordingly, this review addresses four questions. RQ1: What are the characteristics of Indonesian empirical studies published between 2016 and 2025 that examine the influence of leadership style or work culture on employee performance, in terms of setting, sample, measurement, and analytical method? RQ2: What direction and magnitude of relationship do these studies report? RQ3: How consistent are the findings, and how can any discrepant results be interpreted? RQ4: What methodological and conceptual gaps in this evidence base should be addressed by subsequent research?

The contribution of this study is threefold. First, it provides the first structured map of the Indonesian evidence on these two determinants within a defined decade. Second, it makes explicit the methodological homogeneity of that evidence uniformly cross-sectional, single-site, and self-reported and the interpretive limits that follow. Third, it sets out a concrete research agenda, identifying the joint modelling of leadership and culture, the specification of mediating mechanisms, and the adoption of designs less vulnerable to common method variance as priorities for future inquiry.

Research Method

This study employed a scoping review design, an approach indicated when the objective is to map the extent, range, and nature of an existing body of evidence, clarify concepts, and identify knowledge gaps rather than to estimate the effect of a specific intervention (Munn et al., 2018). The review followed the five-stage framework of Arksey and O'Malley (2005) identifying the research question; identifying relevant studies; study selection; charting the data; and collating, summarising, and reporting the results incorporating the procedural refinements recommended by Levac et al. (2010), and was informed throughout by the updated guidance of Peters et al. (2020). Reporting adheres to the PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR; Tricco et al., 2018). Consistent with established scoping review methodology, no formal critical appraisal of individual study quality

was undertaken; instead, the methodological attributes of each study were charted so that the strength and the limitations of the evidence base could be characterised descriptively.

The review question was framed using the Population–Concept–Context (PCC) mnemonic: employees of Indonesian organisations, whether civil servants, cooperative members, or private-sector staff (population); the association between leadership style and/or work culture and employee performance (concept); and Indonesian organisational settings between 2016 and 2025 (context). This framing was operationalised through the four research questions (RQ1–RQ4) stated in the Introduction, which together address the characteristics of the available studies, the direction and magnitude of the relationships they report, the consistency of those findings, and the gaps that remain.

Literature was retrieved by systematic searching of Google Scholar, which offers the broadest coverage of Indonesian national journals, many of which are not indexed in Scopus or Web of Science. Two Boolean strings were applied (“gaya kepemimpinan” OR “kepemimpinan”) AND (“kinerja karyawan” OR “kinerja pegawai”) AND “pengaruh”, and (“budaya kerja” OR “budaya organisasi”) AND (“kinerja karyawan” OR “kinerja pegawai”) AND “pengaruh” with English equivalents used as a secondary strategy. Searching was supplemented by backward citation tracking of retrieved articles and by targeted searching of the Garuda and SINTA portals to verify bibliographic details and locate full texts. The publication window of 2016 to 2025 was chosen to capture a full decade of scholarship: long enough to reveal developmental trends, yet recent enough that the organisational conditions described remain broadly comparable to the present. Eligibility criteria were specified in advance and are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Eligibility Criteria for Study Selection

Criterion	Inclusion	Exclusion
Publication period	Published between 2016 and 2025 (a ten-year observation window)	Published before 2016
Language	Indonesian, reflecting the predominant language of the national evidence base	Languages other than Indonesian
Publication type	Peer-reviewed journal articles reporting primary empirical research	Theses, conference abstracts, book chapters, opinion pieces, prior literature reviews
Study design	Quantitative designs testing the effect of leadership style and/or work culture on employee performance	Studies not testing this relationship, or reporting descriptive statistics only
Setting	Organisations located in Indonesia (public sector, private sector, or cooperatives)	Non-Indonesian settings

Availability	Full text accessible and reporting sufficient statistical detail to chart the outcome	Full text unavailable; outcome not reported in extractable form
--------------	---	---

Study selection proceeded in two screening stages. Records retrieved from the electronic search were exported to a reference manager and duplicate entries removed. The titles and abstracts of the remaining unique records were first assessed against the eligibility criteria, and records that plainly fell outside the scope of the review were excluded at this point. The full texts of all potentially eligible records were then examined to confirm that the study empirically tested the effect of leadership style or work culture on employee performance, and that it reported sufficient statistical detail for the outcome to be charted; records failing either condition, or whose full text could not be obtained, were excluded. Twelve studies satisfied all criteria and were carried forward to data charting. Screening at both stages was performed independently by two reviewers, with disagreements resolved through discussion and, where consensus could not be reached, by adjudication from a third reviewer.

Data were charted using a structured form developed a priori and piloted on three studies, after which two fields were refined for clarity. The final form captured the authors and year of publication, the journal, the organisational setting and sector, the sample size and sampling technique, the independent and dependent variables as operationalised by the original authors, the analytical technique employed, the direction and statistical significance of the reported effect, and the coefficient of determination or correlation coefficient where reported. Two reviewers charted all studies independently and compared entries, reconciling discrepancies against the source article.

Charted data were then analysed in two complementary ways. A descriptive numerical summary characterised the distribution of studies by publication year, sector, sample size, and analytical technique, addressing RQ1, while a basic qualitative content analysis grouped the reported findings into themes, addressing RQ2 and RQ3. Because the included studies report heterogeneous effect statistics and none reports a standardised effect size together with its variance, results are summarised narratively rather than statistically pooled. Where the count of significant versus non-significant findings is reported, it is presented descriptively and interpreted with explicit reference to the well-documented limitations of vote counting as a method of synthesis.

Results and Discussion

A. Characteristics of the Included Studies

Twelve studies published between 2016 and 2025 met the eligibility criteria. Six examined leadership style as the predictor of employee performance, and six examined work culture; no study modelled both predictors simultaneously. Publication was distributed across the decade, with a concentration in the period 2020–2025, indicating sustained rather than episodic interest in the topic.

Settings were predominantly public: seven studies were conducted in government offices or agencies (a city education and culture office, urban village (kelurahan) offices, a population and civil registration office, a national unity and politics agency, and a ministry of religious affairs office), while three were conducted in private firms or state-owned enterprises, one in a savings and loan cooperative, and one in a university's administrative unit. This distribution has a direct bearing on the transferability of the findings, an issue taken up in Section (F).

Sample sizes, where reported, were small. The largest was 76 respondents (Agustin, 2021) and the smallest 30 (Moron, Herdi, & Rangga, 2023), with several studies employing census or saturated sampling of an entire small population. Analytical techniques were correspondingly modest: simple linear regression predominated, with multiple linear regression, correlation analysis, and coefficient-of-determination testing also reported. All twelve studies collected data by self-administered Likert-scale questionnaire, and all were cross-sectional. Table 2 charts the included studies in full.

Table 2. Charted Characteristics and Findings of the Twelve Included Studies

No	Author(s), Year	Setting / Sector	n	Analytical technique	Reported finding
1	Halim (2020)	Makassar City Education and Culture Office (public)	58	Multiple linear regression	Leadership style (supportive, directive, participative) has a positive and significant effect on employee performance, both partially and simultaneously
2	Batubara (2020)	Procurement Department, PT Inalum (Persero) (SOE)	36	Multiple linear regression	Directive leadership style has a significant effect on employee performance ($t = 2.748$ > 1.691 ; $p = 0.008$)
3	Agustin (2021)	PT Gama Panca Makmur, Tangerang (private)	76	Simple regression, correlation, determination, hypothesis testing	Positive and significant effect; $Y = 12.275 +$ $0.730X$; $r = 0.780$; $R^2 =$ 60.8% ; $p = 0.000$
4	Marlina, Mardiana, Fiansi, & Astuti (2023)	Baru Urban Village (Kelurahan) Office, Tolitoli Regency (public)	NR	Descriptive statistics, correlation, simple linear regression	Leadership style has a significant effect on employee performance
5	Kiranie, Prihadi, &	Cigugur Tengah Urban Village (Kelurahan)	NR	Simple linear regression	No significant effect of leadership style on employee performance

	Suryaman (2023)	Office, Cimahi (public)			($p = 0.070 > 0.050$); $R^2 = 24.3\%$
6	Maharani, Affrian, & Dharma (2024)	Population and Civil Registration Office, East Barito Regency (public)	NR	Simple linear regression	Positive and significant effect ($t = 6.136 > 2.001$; $p = 0.000$); $R^2 = 39.0\%$
7	Sari, Jonathan, & Latif (2016)	National Unity and Politics Agency, East Kutai Regency (public)	45	Simple regression	Positive and significant effect of work culture on performance; $Y = 0.286 + 0.256X$; $r = 0.404 > r\text{-table } 0.245$
8	Anggelina, Meitriana, & Sujana (2017)	PT BPR Nusamba Kubutambahan, Bali (private)	31	Simple linear regression	Work culture has a significant effect on employee performance
9	Sari & Anitra (2020)	Administrative staff, Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur (private university)	NR	Simple regression	Work culture has a significant positive effect on employee performance
10	Sukartini & Gaol (2022)	Pejagalan Urban Village (Kelurahan), North Jakarta (public)	50	Multiple linear regression	Positive and significant effect ($t = 5.233 > 2.010$); $R^2 = 36.3\%$
11	Moron, Herdi, & Ranga (2023)	IKAMALA Savings and Loan Cooperative, Maumere (cooperative)	30	Descriptive statistics, simple linear regression, product-moment correlation	Work culture (discipline, decisiveness, self-confidence) rated good; positive effect on employee performance
12	Firmansyah, Hasnawati, & Juita (2025)	Ministry of Religious Affairs Office, Pesisir Selatan Regency (public)	NR	Multiple linear regression	Work culture influences employee performance

Note. NR = not reported in the accessible full-text record. R^2 = coefficient of determination.

B. Leadership Style and Employee Performance

Five of the six leadership studies reported a positive and statistically significant effect on employee performance, across public agencies, a state-owned enterprise, and a private manufacturer. The strongest reported association was that of Agustin (2021), where leadership style accounted for 60.8% of the variance in

performance with a correlation of 0.780; Maharani et al. (2024) reported a more moderate 39.0%. Where studies disaggregated style into sub-dimensions, supportive, directive, and participative variants were each found to contribute (Halim, 2020), with Batubara (2020) isolating directive leadership as the significant predictor in a procurement setting characterised by standardised, rule-bound tasks.

These results align with the causal logic of path-goal theory (House, 1971). Leaders who communicate expectations clearly, supply both moral and material support, and involve subordinates in decisions reduce role ambiguity and increase the perceived instrumentality of effort. The corollary reported in several studies that authoritarian styles which exclude subordinate participation depress motivation and satisfaction is consistent with the same framework, and with the proposition of Robbins and Judge (2017) that leadership consists in the capacity to influence a group toward goal achievement. Notably, Batubara's finding that a directive style was effective in a highly proceduralised department is not a contradiction of the participative results elsewhere but an illustration of the contingency logic at the heart of path-goal theory: the appropriate style is a function of task structure and follower characteristics rather than a universal prescription.

C. Work Culture and Employee Performance

All six work-culture studies reported a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The magnitude, where reported, was moderate: Sukartini and Gaol (2022) obtained a coefficient of determination of 36.3%, while Sari, Jonathan, and Latif (2016) reported a correlation of 0.404. The cultural attributes measured were broadly consistent across studies disciplined conduct, decisiveness in decision-making, confidence in one's work, integrity, cooperation, and results orientation and were consistently associated with higher-rated quality, quantity, cooperation, and responsibility in work output.

This convergence is theoretically unsurprising. Schein (2010) holds that culture functions as a shared solution set that regulates member behaviour in addressing internal integration and external adaptation; where those shared solutions embed discipline and accountability, individual behaviour is stabilised in a performance-supporting direction without continuous supervisory intervention. Denison and Mishra (1995) provide comparable evidence internationally that involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission traits predict organisational effectiveness. The Indonesian findings are best read as a local instantiation of this general proposition rather than as an independent discovery.

D. The Discrepant Case and Its Interpretation

One study warrants separate treatment. Kiranie, Prihadi, and Suryaman (2023), examining employees of the Cigugur Tengah urban village (kelurahan) office, concluded that leadership style exerted no significant effect on employee performance, reporting a significance value of 0.070 against a threshold of 0.050 and a coefficient of determination of 24.3%. This is the sole discrepant result in the corpus, and it is analytically valuable precisely because it is discrepant.

Three interpretations merit consideration. First, statistical power: the study drew on the full complement of staff in a single small urban village office, and with a sample of that size a moderate population effect can readily fail to reach conventional significance. A p-value of 0.070 with an R^2 of 24.3% is more plausibly read as an underpowered test of a real but modest association than as evidence of no association. Second, contingency: path-goal theory predicts that leadership matters least where task structure is already high and procedures are tightly codified, conditions that characterise routine front-line local-government administrative work. Third, restriction of range: where leadership behaviour is fairly uniform across a small unit, there is little variance for the model to explain. Rather than treating this study as an outlier to be discounted, the review reads it as evidence that the effect of leadership style is conditional rather than universal, and as a caution against the assumption that a positive finding is guaranteed in every organisational setting.

E. The Interaction of Leadership Style and Work Culture

Although no included study modelled the two predictors jointly, the pattern across the corpus supports a reciprocal rather than parallel relationship. Schein (2010) argues that leaders are the primary embedders of culture: through what they attend to, how they allocate rewards, how they respond to critical incidents, and the example they set, leaders inscribe assumptions that subsequently operate independently of them. Read through this lens, the leadership findings and the culture findings in this review are not two separate effects but two observation points on a single process. Effective leadership generates a disciplined, accountable, results-oriented culture; an established culture of that kind in turn makes leadership directives more readily accepted and more consistently implemented, while a weak culture attenuates their effect. This interpretation is theoretically defensible but, importantly, untested within the present corpus a gap identified in Section (F).

F. Methodological Profile and Gaps in the Evidence Base

Charting the methodological attributes of the twelve studies reveals a strikingly homogeneous evidence base, and this homogeneity constrains what can legitimately be concluded. Five features stand out. All twelve are cross-sectional, so no study can establish temporal precedence, and reverse causality in which high-performing units elicit more supportive leadership or sustain stronger cultural norms cannot be excluded. All twelve measure predictor and outcome with a single self-administered questionnaire completed by the same respondent at the same time, a design known to inflate observed associations through common method variance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003); the reported coefficients should therefore be treated as upper bounds. All twelve are single-organisation studies with samples between 30 and 76 where reported, limiting both statistical power and external validity. None specifies a mediating mechanism, although work motivation, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and employee engagement

are the obvious candidates. And none tests the two predictors in a single model, so their relative contribution and any interaction remain unknown.

A further consideration concerns the interpretation of the near-uniform significance of the reported findings. Eleven of twelve studies reporting a significant positive effect is a pattern consistent with a genuine underlying relationship, but it is equally consistent with selective reporting and publication practices that favour confirmatory results. The presence of even one null finding in a corpus of twelve is therefore informative, and the count should not be read as a measure of the strength of the evidence. Vote counting of this kind ignores sample size and effect magnitude and is a recognised weak form of synthesis; it is reported here descriptively, in keeping with scoping review conventions, and not as a substitute for the meta-analysis that the current state of reporting does not permit.

A final gap is conceptual. Several included studies use budaya kerja and budaya organisasi interchangeably, and the instruments used to measure them overlap substantially. Because the two constructs are theoretically distinct work culture referring to enacted behavioural norms in task execution, organisational culture to the deeper assumption structure described by Schein (2010) this conflation impedes cumulative theory building and makes cross-study comparison hazardous. Table 3 consolidates the identified gaps and the corresponding research priorities.

Table 3. Identified Gaps in the Evidence Base and Corresponding Research Priorities

Gap	Consequence for interpretation	Recommended response
Exclusively cross-sectional designs	Temporal precedence unestablished; reverse causality cannot be excluded	Longitudinal or lagged panel designs; quasi-experimental evaluation of leadership development interventions
Single-source, single-occasion self-report	Common method variance inflates observed associations	Multi-source data (supervisor ratings, objective output records); temporal separation of measurement
Small single-organisation samples	Low statistical power; limited external validity	Multi-site studies with a priori power analysis; multilevel modelling of unit-level culture
No joint modelling of the two predictors	Relative contribution and interaction unknown; risk of omitted-variable bias	Structural equation models specifying both predictors and their interaction
No specified mediators or moderators	The mechanism linking predictors to performance remains a black box	Test motivation, job satisfaction, commitment, and engagement as mediators; task structure as moderator
Conceptual conflation of work culture and organisational culture	Cross-study comparison hazardous; impedes cumulative theory	Explicit construct definition and validated, distinguishable measurement instruments

Public-sector dominance in the corpus	Findings may not transfer to competitive private-sector or digital work settings	Deliberate sampling of private, platform, and hybrid work organisations
---------------------------------------	--	---

G. Practical Implications

Subject to the evidentiary caveats above, three implications follow for Indonesian organisations. First, investment in leadership capability should prioritise the communicative and participative behaviours most consistently associated with performance in this corpus, while recognising that the optimal style is contingent on task structure: highly proceduralised units may benefit from clearer direction, whereas discretionary work benefits from participation. Second, culture should be treated as an object of deliberate management rather than a residual, internalised through the socialisation of organisational values, targeted training, and most importantly consistent leader modelling, since values that leaders do not enact are unlikely to be adopted. Third, the two should be addressed together rather than sequentially. A leadership development programme implemented into a weak cultural environment is likely to underperform, as is a values campaign unsupported by leader behaviour.

Conclusion

This scoping review mapped twelve Indonesian empirical studies published between 2016 and 2025 that examined the influence of leadership style or work culture on employee performance. Eleven reported a positive and statistically significant effect, with the three studies that reported a coefficient of determination giving values between approximately 36% and 61%, while one reported no significant effect of leadership style. Leadership styles characterised as supportive, participative, and communicative were consistently associated with higher motivation, discipline, and productivity, and work cultures embedding discipline, accountability, integrity, and cooperation were consistently associated with stronger performance outcomes. Theoretically, these results are congruent with path-goal theory and with Schein's account of culture as a behaviour-regulating assumption structure, and they support the view that leadership and culture operate reciprocally rather than independently: leaders embed the cultural norms that subsequently condition the reception of their own directives.

The review's more consequential contribution, however, concerns the character of the evidence rather than its direction. The corpus is uniformly cross-sectional, single-organisation, and reliant on single-source self-report, with small samples and simple regression models. No study modelled the two predictors jointly, none specified a mediating mechanism, and several conflated work culture with organisational culture. The convergent positive finding should therefore be regarded as a well-supported working proposition rather than a settled causal conclusion, and the reported coefficients as likely upper bounds. Organisations are on defensible ground in strengthening leadership capability and work culture simultaneously, but the Indonesian evidence base is not yet strong enough to specify

how much improvement in performance a given intervention should be expected to deliver.

References

- Agustin, F. (2021). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Gama Panca Makmur di Tangerang. *JENIUS (Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia)*, 4(2), 128–136. <https://doi.org/10.32493/jjsdm.v4i2.9081>
- Anggeline, K. D. N., Meitriana, M. A., & Sujana, I. N. (2017). Pengaruh budaya kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan di PT. BPR Nusamba Kubutambahan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi Undiksha*, 9(2), 441–450. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jjpe.v9i2.20121>
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Batubara, S. S. (2020). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja karyawan pada Departemen Pengadaan PT Inalum (Persero). *Liabilities: Jurnal Pendidikan Akuntansi*, 3(1), 40–58. <https://doi.org/10.30596/liabilities.v3i1.4581>
- Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 6(2), 204–223. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.2.204>
- Firmansyah, V., Hasnawati, H., & Juita, D. (2025). Pengaruh budaya kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai di Kantor Kementerian Agama Kabupaten Pesisir Selatan. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*. [Volume, issue, page range, and DOI/URL to be completed by the authors from the source article.]
- Halim, A. (2020). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Dinas Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Kota Makassar. *Publik: Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Administrasi dan Pelayanan Publik*, 7(2), 92–104. <https://doi.org/10.37606/publik.v7i2.140>
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(3), 321–339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391905>
- Kasmir. (2018). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia (Teori dan praktik)*. Depok, Indonesia: Rajawali Pers.
- Kiranie, D., Prihadi, D., & Suryaman, W. (2023). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja karyawan di Kelurahan Cigugur Tengah. *Professional: Jurnal Komunikasi dan Administrasi Publik*, 10(2), 899–906. <https://doi.org/10.37676/professional.v10i2.4497>
- Levac, D., Colquhoun, H., & O'Brien, K. K. (2010). Scoping studies: Advancing the methodology. *Implementation Science*, 5, 69. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-69>

- Maharani, G., Affrian, R., & Dharma, A. S. (2024). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja pegawai Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kabupaten Barito Timur. *Jurnal MSDM: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, 1(2), 228–234. Retrieved from <https://ejurnal.stiaamuntai.ac.id/index.php/JMSDM/article/view/461>
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. Bandung, Indonesia: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Marlina, M., Mardiana, M., Fiansi, F., & Astuti, A. (2023). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Kantor Kelurahan Baru Kabupaten Tolitoli. *Paraduta: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, 1(3), 107–110. <https://doi.org/10.56630/paraduta.v1i3.502>
- Moron, L. M., Herdi, H., & Rangga, Y. D. P. (2023). Pengaruh budaya kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan Koperasi Simpan Pinjam IKAMALA. *Jurnal Kompetitif*, 12(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.52333/kompetitif.v12i1.56>
- Munn, Z., Peters, M. D. J., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A., & Aromataris, E. (2018). Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18, 143. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>
- Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Peters, M. D. J., Marnie, C., Tricco, A. C., Pollock, D., Munn, Z., Alexander, L., ... Khalil, H. (2020). Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBIM Evidence Synthesis*, 18(10), 2119–2126. <https://doi.org/10.11124/JBIES-20-00167>
- 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>
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2018). *Management* (14th ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Sari, A. E., & Anitra, V. (2020). Pengaruh budaya kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan: Studi pada tenaga kependidikan Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur. *Borneo Student Research*, 2(1). Retrieved from <https://journals.umkt.ac.id/index.php/bsr>
- Sari, D. R., Jonathan, L. R., & Latif, I. N. (2016). Pengaruh budaya kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Badan Kesatuan Bangsa dan Politik Kabupaten Kutai Timur. *Ekonomia*. Retrieved from <http://ejurnal.untagsmd.ac.id/index.php/EKM/article/view/1840>
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Reformasi birokrasi dan manajemen pegawai negeri sipil*. Bandung, Indonesia: PT Refika Aditama.

- Sukartini, S., & Gaol, P. L. (2022). Pengaruh budaya kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Kelurahan Pejagalan Kota Administrasi Jakarta Utara. *Jurnal Sumber Daya Aparatur*, 4(2). [DOI/URL to be completed by the authors from the source article.]
- Sutrisno, E. (2019). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Kencana.
- Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., ... Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7), 467–473. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
- Triguno. (2013). *Budaya kerja: Menciptakan lingkungan yang kondusif untuk meningkatkan produktivitas kerja*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Golden Terayon Press.