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ABSTRACT:

PT. Motor Nasional is a company engaged in the showroom which is a retailer of Honda Motorcycle and Honda dealer in Indonesia by having the sales level reached 2647 unit of Honda motorcycles in 2008 and in 2009 increased unit sales of Honda motorcycles to be 2685 unit, but at the end of the year 2010 reached 2490 units of Honda motorcycles. The purpose of this study was to determine how much influence the organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction simultaneously and partial, how large the influence of organizational culture, leadership style and employee job satisfaction on the performance of simultaneously and partial. The method in this study, the research design is associative through a survey by distributing questionnaires to the respondents as a whole (population) and processed with SPSS 16.0. From the research results, SPSS and LISREL approaches have the same results can be explained so that the culture of the organization have a relationship for 0.603 and have a significant effect of (0.322) 2 = 11.20% on job satisfaction, and organizational culture affects employee performance indirectly (0.164) 2 = 2.38% while the direct effect (0.151) 2 = 2.28% and a total of (0.314) 2 = 9.85%. The next style of leadership has a relationship for 0.709 and have a significant effect of (0.544) 2 = 29.59% on job satisfaction, and leadership styles affect employee performance indirectly (0.268) 2 = 6.24% while the direct effect (0.403) 2 = 16.24% and total of (0.671) 2 = 38.06%. likewise, stating that the research results affect the job satisfaction of employee performance (0.494) 2 or by 24.40%.

Keyword: Organizational Culture, Leadership Style, Job Satisfaction, Employee Performance

*The name of the Company has been disguised as desired company.
INTRODUCTION

The era of globalization is happening now is a significant impact to the survival of the company. An important key to competing globally is the capital of human resources. According Thomas (2000) human resources who has the competence, high ability and most importantly the performance of the employee and eventually became a key to corporate success. One of the guidance for companies is to create human resources that can yield optimal performance by keeping the job satisfaction of employee. With high job satisfaction showed a positive attitude towards work which means that high employee performance and conversely, low job satisfaction showed a negative attitude towards work which means low employee performance, according Fullchis & Masreviastuti (2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Period of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 – 3 year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 – 6 year</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 – 9 year</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;10 year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jumlah</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data (2011)

Tabel 2. Company Sales’s Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td>2685</td>
<td>2490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Company’s Sales Reports (2011)

When viewed the data mentioned above the company’s employees have long tenure, but the company’s motorcycle sales decline in 2010 ie 7.8% of sales in 2009. A decrease in the writer wanted to know the causes and research conducted through the entire employee Bandengan Company Located in Northern, North Jakarta.

The results of studies on the author, culture has a role in the success of the company because the culture of the organization is a core for a company, because it will always be associated with the life that exits within the company.
Organizational culture is the ideology, values, assumptions, beliefs, expectations, attitudes and norms which are owned in common and binding in a particular community. Organizational culture is important, because it is a habit – a habit that occurs in a hierarchical organization that represents the norm – norms of behavior that is followed by members of the organization, according to Koesmono (2003).

Another factor is leadership, leadership stays plays an important role in improving employee performance in achieving corporate goals. Leaders must be conditioned and supervise subordinates circumstances so as not to deviate from the goals of the organization. Leadership style adopted by a leader will affect the contribution to the organization. Because with the appropriate leadership style in the hope management subordinates will facilitate communication between leader and subordinates so that organizational goals can be easily achieved and lead to job satisfaction, according to Sugeng Mulyono & Zai Dani Almas (2009). And according to Supriadi and Ahmad (2007), the role of a leader’s leadership style is the main capital was crucial to the level of employee performance. Employee who rate it good discipline then the performance will be good, whereas a low level discipline, performance levels will be low anyway. So it is clear that the will and morale of employee still need encouragement and someone. This is the closest person was the leader with all the and effort and the factors that can lead to increased employee performance achievement.

The results of past research Sugeng Mulyono & Dani Zai Almas (2009) states authoritarian sytle of leadership, democratic, and laizzes-faire significant effect on employee satisfaction, in addition to an effect on job satisfaction, leadership style also affect employee performance in a study conducted Cecep Supriadi & ahmadi (2007). While organizational culture also influences job satisfaction and employee performance in research finding Fullchis Nurtjahani & Marseviatuti (2007).

Objectives to be achieved in this study are: 1) to determine how much influence the organizational culture, leadership style on job satisfaction simultaneously and partial; 2) to determine how much influence the organizational
culture, leadership style and job satisfaction to employee performance; based
approach SPSS vs LISREL.

THEORITICAL BASIS

According to Pearce and Robinson (2008) Organizational culture is a group
of important assumptions (often not clearly stated) are held together by the
members of an organization. Every organization has its own culture. Culture of an
organization similar to one’s personality, a theme that does not yet exist and
present tangible, provide meaning, direction and basis for action.

According Graffin (2002) organizational culture is a set of values, beliefs,
attitudes, habits, and attitudes that help a person in the organization’s members
understand what the organization adopted. How does the organization do
everything and what he thinks is important.

According to Robbins & Mary (2009) is the organizational culture and
belief system of shared meaning held by members of the organization that
determines, in large part, how employees behave.

Leadership styles according to Thota (2007) is the means used by a leader to
influence subordinates in order to want to carry out the duties and obligations as
expected in order to achieve predetermined goals. In conjunction with the
behavior of these leaders, there are some things that are usually carried out by the
leaders to subordinates or followers, ie, behavioral supports and leads.

Hasibuan (2007) states that employee satisfaction is an attitude emotional
fun and loved his work. This attitude is reflected by the morale, discipline and
work performance.

According Veithzal Jauvani Rivai and Ella (2009) mengemukkan that job
satisfaction is an evaluation that describes the feelings of his person happy or not
happy, satisfied or not satisfied at work. Based on the above theories can be
concluded that job satisfaction is a feeling of employee attitudes toward work.

According to Locke in Nurtjahjani & Mareviastuti (2007) defines job
satisfaction as an emotional state is wide enough to be positive or enjoyable as a
result of the assessment of one's job or work experience. Job satisfaction is the result of employee perceptions of the extent of his job to provide it - it is considered important. To see the relationship between organizational culture with job satisfaction, the one thing that became the basis of the influence of the essence of "value" in the organizational culture affects values, attitudes and behavior of members of the organization.

According to the Soedjono Handoko (2005) job satisfaction is a reflection of the feelings of employees towards their work. This is evident in the positive attitude towards the work facing the workers and the environment. Conversely, a disgruntled employee will be negative towards work and different forms different from one another.

According to the Soedjono Muchinsky (2005) job satisfaction can be seen from the level of absenteeism, employee turnover rate (turnover) and a decline in performance.

According Ratundo & Sackett (2010), defining the performance is an activity that includes all the actions or behaviors that are controlled by individuals and contribute to the achievement of corporate objectives.

According Wibowo (2008), the performance is a process of how the work progresses to achieve the work. However, the results of the work itself also shows the performance.

According Veithzal Jauvani Rivai and Ella (2009) mengemukkan that job satisfaction is an evaluation that describes the feelings of his person happy or not happy, satisfied or not satisfied at work. Based on the above theories can be concluded that job satisfaction is a feeling of employee attitudes toward work.

According to the Soedjono Handoko (2005) job satisfaction is a reflection of the feelings of employees towards their work. This is evident in the positive attitude towards the work facing the workers and the environment. Conversely, a disgruntled employee will be negative towards work and different forms different from one another.
METHODS
The method used in this study are: 1) type of study is a hypothesis-testing research (quantitive); 2) research hypothesis testing used was research (associative): 3) the time dimension is the cross-sectional study; 4) the unit of analysis is the individual, namely the company’s employees; 5) sampling method is the population, ie the whole of corporate employees; 6) empirical model of path analysis with the aim to determine the role of direct and indirect set of independent variables to variables dependent with approach SPSS and LISREL.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
In this test reliability and validity performed on each variable using SPSS 16.0, ie when Conbach’s alpha > 0.600, then declared reliable data while declared invalid if the value $r_{cout}>r_{table}$ reliability test result below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabel 3. Reliability Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture ($X_1$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style ($X_2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction ($Y$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance ($Z$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Results of data processing (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabel 4. Validity Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture ($X_1$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style ($X_2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction ($Y$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5. The New Value After Transformation From Ordinal To Interval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option of The Answer (Ordinal)</th>
<th>New Value (Interval)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Results of data processing (2011)

Correlation analysis performed to determine the relationship between variables. Calculating of correlation coefficients performed using SPSS 16.0. where if the probability value greater than or equal 0.05 with a probability value sig or $[0.05 \geq \text{sig}]$, then a significant relationship and correlation processing results as follows:

### Table 6. Nature of the Relationship $X_1, X_2, Y$ dan $Z$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$ terhadap $Y$</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>Strong and significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$ terhadap $Y$</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>Strong and significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$ terhadap $Z$</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>Strong and significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$ terhadap $Z$</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>Strong and significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y$ terhadap $Z$</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>Strong and significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Results of data processing (2011)

Followed by the method of path analysis with the approach SPSS. Step testing path analysis is divided into two, where testing is done as a whole and individually for two structures were broken up into sub-structure 1 and the sub-structures 2. Here's a valve connection path between ($X_1$, $X_2$ and $Y$ to $Z$) and made in the structures equation as follows, namely:

\[
Y = \rho_{yX1}X_1 + \rho_{yX2}X_2 + \rho_{yepsilon}
\]  
(Equation Sub-Structure 1)

\[
Z = \rho_{zX1}X_1 + \rho_{zX2}X_2 + \rho_{zY}Y + \rho_{zepsilon}
\]  
(Equation Sub-Structure 2)
Testing Sub-Structural 1

a. Testing Simultaneously

Table 7. Model Summary Sub-Structure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.44183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Results of data processing (2011)

Magnitude of the influence of variables $X_1$ and $X_2$ simultaneously on $Y$ can be determined by looking at the value of R Square in Table 1.7 that the R Square = 0.586 = 58.6% influence of other variables that affect the value of variables $Y$ outside if the study was 41.4%. meanwhile, the magnitude of the coefficients for other variables that affect the outside of the study can be calculated through the formula as follows:

$$
\rho_{y1} = \sqrt{1 - R^2_{xy}} = \sqrt{1 - 0.586} = 0.643
$$
Table 8. Anova Sub-Structure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>14.341</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.171</td>
<td>36.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.151</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.492</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), X2, X1
b. Dependent Variable: Y
Sources: Results of data processing (2011)

From the test results in Table 8 Anova Significant sub-structure 1, the obtained sig for 0.000, when compared with α = 0.05, then sig is smaller than α (Sig ≤ α), namely 0.000 ≤ 0.05, which means Ho is rejected and Ha accepted, which indicates that there is influence or contribution between the variables Organizational Culture and Leadership style variable simultaneously and significantly to employee satisfaction variable company.

b. Testing Partial

Table 9. Coefficient Sub-Structure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>3.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>5.276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Y
Sources: Result of data processing (2011)

c. Testing Individually between X1 dan Y

Ho: Variable Organization Culture (X1) had not effect individually on job satisfaction variable (Y).
Ha: Variabel Organization Culture (X1) had effect individually on job satisfaction variable (Y).
Basis for decision making:

Test $t$:
1. $t_{count} < t_{table}$: Ho accepted (Ha rejected)
2. $t_{count} > t_{table}$: Ha accepted (Ho rejected)

Test Sig:
1. If the probability value less than or equal to the probability sig or ($0.05 \leq \text{sig}$), then Ho accepted and Ha rejected, it means not significant.
2. If the probability value is greater than or equal to the probability sig or ($0.05 \leq \text{sig}$), then Ho rejected and Ha accepted, that is significant.

$t_{table}$ significant level seen at 0.05 where $df$ = number of samples – the number of variables = $55 - 2 = 53$. $T_{table}$ on df $53 = 1.67$, whereas in Table 9. $t_{count}$ unknown magnitude of $X_1$ and Y is 3.221 which means $t_{count} > t_{table}$ ($3.221 > 1.67$), then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted meaning of organization culture affect the individual on job satisfaction. From Table 9, it is known that the $X_1$ has a sig for 0.002, which is then compared with a probability of 0.05, was sig probability value is smaller than the probability value of 0.05 ($0.002 < 0.05$), then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted, that is significant and the magnitude Beta (path coefficient) $X_1$ on $Y$ is 0.332 ($pYX_1$).

d. Testing Individually between $X_2$ dan Y

Hipotesis:
Ho: Variable Leadership Style ($X_2$) had not effect individually on job satisfaction variable (Y).

Ha: Variables Leadership Style ($X_2$) had effect individually on job satisfaction variable (Y).

Basis of decision making:

Test $t$:
1. $t_{count} < t_{table}$: Ho accepted (Ha rejected)
2. $t_{count} > t_{table}$: Ha accepted (Ho rejected)

Test Sig:
1. If the probability value less than or equal to the probability sig or ($0.05 \leq \text{sig}$), then Ho accepted and Ha rejected, it means not significant.
2. If the probability value is greater than or equal to the probability sig or (0.05 ≤ sig), then Ho rejected and Ha accepted, that is significant.

\( t_{\text{table}} \) significant level seen at 0.05 where \( df = \) number of samples – the number of variables = 55 – 2 = 53. \( t_{\text{table}} \) on df 53 = 1.67, whereas in Table 9, \( t_{\text{count}} \) unknown magnitude of \( X_2 \) and \( Y \) is 5.276 which means \( t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} \) (5.276 > 1.67), then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted meaning of leadership style affect the individual on job satisfaction. From Table 9, it is known that the \( X_2 \) has a sig for 0.000, which is then compared with a probability of 0.05, was sig probability value is smaller than the probability value of 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted, that is significant and the magnitude Beta (path coefficient) \( X_2 \) on \( Y \) is 0.544 (\( \rho_{YX_2} \)).

**Figure 2. Sub-Structure 1**

![Diagram](image)

Sources: Result of Data Processing (2011)

From these tests, the obtained equation sub-structural 1 as follows:

\[
Y = \rho_{yx_1}X_1 + \rho_{yx_2}X_2 + \rho_Y e_i
\]

\[
Y = 0.332X_1 + 0.544X_2 + 0.643e_i
\]
Testing Sub-Structural 2

a. Testing Simultaneously

Tabel 10. Model Summary Sub-Structural 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.29430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Y, X1, X2
b. Dependent Variable: Z

Sources: Result of Data Processing (2011)

Magnitude of the influence of variables X1, X2, and Y simultaneously on Z can be determined by looking at the value of R Square in Table 10. that the R Square = 0.861 = 86.1%. influence of other variables that affect the value of variables Z outside if the study was 13.9%. meanwhile, the magnitude of the coefficients for other variables that affect the outside of the study can be calculated through the formula as follows:

\[
\rho_{xy} = \sqrt{\frac{1 - R^2_{xy}}{1 - 0.861}} = 0.372
\]

Tabel 11. Anova Sub-Structural 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>27.386</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.129</td>
<td>105.397</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.803</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Y, X1, X2
b. Dependent Variable: Z

Sources: Result of Data Processing (2011)

From the test results in Table 11. Anova Significant sub-structure 2, the obtained sig for 0.000. when compared with \( \alpha = 0.05 \), then sig is smaller than \( \alpha \) (Sig \( \leq \alpha \)), namely 0.000 \( \leq \) 0.05, which means Ho is rejected and Ha accepted, which indicates that there is influence or contribution between the
variables Organizational Culture, Leadership style and employee satisfaction variabel Simultaneously and significantly to employee performance variable company.

b. Testing Partial

Tabel 12. Coefficient Sub-Structural 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>-2.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>2.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>5.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>6.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Z

Sources: Results of Data Processing (2011)

c. Testing Individually between $X_1$ dan $Z$

Ho: Variable Organization Culture ($X_1$) had not effect individually on employee performance variable ($Z$).

Ha: Variabel Organization Culture ($X_1$) had effect individually on employee performance variable ($Z$).

Basis of Decision Making:

Test $t$:
1. $t_{count} < t_{table}$ : Ho accepted (Ha rejected)
2. $t_{count} > t_{table}$ : Ha accepted (Ho rejected)

Test Sig:
1. If the probability value less than or equal to the probability sig or (0.05 ≤ sig), then Ho accepted and Ha rejected, it means not significant.
2. If the probability value is greater than or equal to the probability sig or (0.05 ≤ sig), then Ho rejected and Ha accepted, that is significant.

$t_{table}$ significant level seen at 0.05 where df = number of samples – the number of variables = 55 – 2 = 53. $T_{table}$ on df 53 = 1.67, whereas in Table 12.
t_{count} unknown magnitude of X₁ and Z is 2.284 which means \( t_{count} > t_{table} \) (2.284 > 1.67), then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted meaning of organization culture affect the individual on employee performance. From Tabel 12, it is known that the X₁ has a sig for 0.027, which is then compared with a probability of 0.05, was sig probability value is smaller than the probability value of 0.05 (0.027 < 0.05), then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted, that is significant and the magnitude Beta (path coefficient) X₁ on Y is 0.151 (pZX₁).

d. Testing Individually between X₂ dan Z

Hipotesis:

Ho: Variable Leadership Style (X₂) had not effect individually on employee performance variable (Z).

Ha: Variabel Leadership Style (X₂) had effect individually on employee performance variable (Z).

Basis of Decision Making:

Test t :
1. \( t_{count} < t_{table} \) : Ho accepted (Ha rejected)
2. \( t_{count} > t_{table} \) : Ha accepted (Ho rejected)

Test Sig:

1. If the probability value less than or equal to the probability sig or \((0.05 \leq \text{sig})\), then Ho accepted and Ha rejected, it means not significant.
2. If the probability value is greater than or equal to the probability sig or \((0.05 \leq \text{sig})\), then Ho rejected and Ha accepted, that is significant.

\( t_{table} \) significant level seen at 0.05 where \( df = \) number of samples - the number of variables = 55 - 2 = 53. \( t_{table} \) on df 53 = 1.67, whereas in Table 12. \( t_{count} \) unknown magnitude of X₂ and Z is 5.401 which means \( t_{count} > t_{table} \) (5.401 > 1.67), then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted meaning of organization culture affect the individual on employee performance. From Tabel 12, it is known that the X₂ has a sig for 0.000, which is then compared with a probability of 0.05, was sig probability value is smaller than the probability
value of 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), then Ho rejected and Ha accepted, that is significant and the magnitude Beta (path coefficient) X₂ on Z is 0.403 (pZX₂).

**e. Testing Individually between Y dan Z**

**Hypothesis:**

Ho: Variable Job Satisfaction (Y) had not effect individually on employee performance variable (Z).

Ha: Variabel Job Satisfaction (Y) had effect individually on employee performance variable (Z).

**Basis of Decision Making:**

**Test t:**

1. \( t_{\text{count}} < t_{\text{table}} \): Ho accepted (Ha rejected)
2. \( t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} \): Ha accepted (Ho rejected)

**Test Sig:**

1. If the probability value less than or equal to the probability sig or \( (0.05 \leq \text{sig}) \), then Ho accepted and Ha rejected, it means not significant.
2. If the probability value is greater than or equal to the probability sig or \( (0.05 \leq \text{sig}) \), then Ho rejected and Ha accepted, that is significant.

\( t_{\text{table}} \) significant level seen at 0.05 where df = number of samples – the number of variables = 55 – 2 = 53. \( t_{\text{table}} \) on df 53 = 1.67, whereas in Table 12. \( t_{\text{count}} \) unknown magnitude of Y and Z is 6.089 which means \( t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} \) (6.089 > 1.67), then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted meaning of job satisfaction affect the individual on employee performance. From Table 12, it is known that the Y has a sig for 0.000, which is then compared with a probability of 0.05, was sig probability value is smaller than the probability value of 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), then Ho rejected and Ha accepted, that is significant and the magnitude Beta (path coefficient) Y on Z is 0.494 (pZY).
From these tests, the obtained equation sub-structural 2 as follows:

\[ Z = \rho_{x1}X_1 + \rho_{x2}X_2 + \rho_{y}Y + \rho_{e2} \]

\[ Z = 0.151X_1 + 0.403X_2 + 0.494Y + 0.372e_2 \]

Followed by the method of path analysis with approach LISREL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Solution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA</td>
<td>X1 X2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standardized Indirect Effects of X on Y
X1   X2
      -------  -------
Y    --     --
Z  0.164   0.268

Standardized Total Effects of Y on Y
Y   Z
      -------  -------
Y    --     --
Z  0.494   --

PSI
Note: This matrix is diagonal.

Y   Z
      -------  -------
   0.414   0.139

Based BETA matrix, it can be seen that the magnitude of influence between variables Y and Z are for 0.494 or account for 24.40%.

Based on GAMMA matrix, it can be seen the degree of influence between the variables X1 and Y is equal to 0.332 or account of 11.20% and the magnitude of path coefficients between variables X1 and Z are directly amounted to 0.151 or contributed by 2.28%. While the influence between the X2 and Y variables are for 0.544 or account for 29.59% and the magnitude of the path coefficients between the variables X2 and Z is 0.403 or directly contributed to a 16.24%.

Based on Indirect Standardized matrix of X and Y, it can be seen the degree of influence between variables X1 and Z indirectly amounted to 0.164 or contributed to a 2.38% and X2 and Z indirectly amounted to 0.268 or account for 6.24%.

Based on the matrix of total effects of X on Y, can be known magnitude of the path coefficients between X1 and Z are the total that is equal to 0.314 or a contribution of 9.85%, while X2 and Z is the total that is equal to 0.617 or a contribution of 38.06%.
Based on the PSI matrix, it can be seen that the magnitude of the effect of other variables that affect the value of $Y$ is equal to 0.414. The magnitude of path coefficients of other variables that affect the value $Y (\varepsilon_y) = \sqrt{0.414} = 0.643$. Otherwise, it is known also that the magnitude of the effect of other variables that affect the value of $Z$ is equal to 0.139, while the magnitude of path coefficients of other variables affect the value $Z (\varepsilon_z) = \sqrt{0.139} = 0.372$.

By this means the analysis has been completed, then it can be completely described the structure of relations, namely $X_1$, $X_2$, $Y$ and $Z$ which have the Structural Equation:

$$Y = 0.332X_1 + 0.544X_2 + 0.643\varepsilon_1$$

$$Z = 0.151X_1 + 0.403X_2 + 0.494Y + 0.372\varepsilon_2$$

![Figure 4. Structure $X_1$, $X_2$, $Y$ and $Z$](image)

Based on these results, the following some implication are as follow:

1. Processing and data analysis based on comparison of SPSS and LISREL approach showed similar results, that the organization culture of a strong relationship exists that is equal to 0.603 and have a significant effect for the 0.322 or 11.20% of the company's employee job satisfaction.

2. Processing and data analysis based on comparison of SPSS and LISREL approach showed similar results, that the leadership style of a strong
relationship exists that is equal to 0.709 and have a significant effect for the 0.544 or 29.59% of the company's employee job satisfaction.

3. Processing and data analysis based on comparison of SPSS and LISREL approach showed similar results, that the organization culture of a strong relationship exists that is equal to 0.649 and have a significant effect for the 0.151 or 2.28% of the company's employee performance.

4. Processing and data analysis based on comparison of SPSS and LISREL approach showed similar results, that the leadership style of a strong relationship exists that is equal to 0.828 and have a significant effect for the 0.403 or 16.24% of the company's employee performance.

5. Processing and data analysis based on comparison of SPSS and LISREL approach showed similar results, that the job satisfaction of a strong relationship exists that is equal to 0.870 and have a significant effect for the 0.494 or 24.40% of the company's employee performance.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the discussion and analysis of the previous chapter on the influence of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and employee performance impact on the company, then the conclusion drawn. The results of analysis, showed that each of the variables studied had a significant effect.

Some advice that can be given to the company:

1. Doing socialization and internalization to all members of employees of the company in order to have the same views and goals.

2. The company management need to pay attention to what the need of employee and seek to provide support to the work of such employees regular training, briefing, providing consultation time.

3. Involving employee in decision making and provide feedback in decision making.

4. Giving trust and responsibility to employee to complete its obligations.
5. Establish a leadership application that has a working relationship
communication between superiors and subordinates are more friendly, to be
able to motivate more employees to perform well.
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