



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/dijms.v7i5.6556>
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

The Influence of Mutual Service Culture on Organizational Productivity Through Leadership Style at The National Narcotics Agency of The Province East Kalimantan

Rudi Hartono¹, Kemal Taufik², Sri Wahyuningsih³

¹ Management and Business Study Program, Mitra Bangsa University, Jakarta, Indonesia, email. cempakaguntaka@gmail.com

² Management and Business Study Program, Mitra Bangsa University, Jakarta, Indonesia, email. kemaltaufik.1007@gmail.com

³ Management and Business Study Program, Mitra Bangsa University, Jakarta, Indonesia, email. yuniwahyuningsih33@yahoo.com

Corresponding Author: cempakaguntaka@gmail.com¹

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to analyze the influence of a culture of mutual service on organizational productivity, analyze the influence of leadership style on organizational productivity, analyze the influence of a culture of mutual service and leadership style on organizational productivity, and analyze the influence of a culture of mutual service on organizational productivity through leadership style at the East Kalimantan Provincial Narcotics Agency (BNNP) The regression analysis results showed a t-value of 6.905 with a significance level of 0.000 (<0.05). A culture of mutual service has a positive and significant effect on leadership style at the BNNP in East Kalimantan. The test results showed a regression coefficient of 0.792 with a significance level of 0.000 (<0.05). Leadership style has a positive and significant effect on organizational productivity at the BNNP in East Kalimantan. The analysis results showed a t-value of 2.117 with a significance level of 0.037 (<0.05). Leadership style partially mediates the effect of a culture of mutual service on organizational productivity. The Sobel test results indicate a significant indirect effect of a culture of mutual service on organizational productivity through leadership style.

Keyword: Culture of Mutual Service, Leadership Style, Organizational Productivity.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational productivity is one of the main indicators of an institution's success, both in the public and private sectors. High productivity indicates an organization's ability to utilize existing resources effectively and efficiently to achieve its goals. However, many organizations in Indonesia still face the problem of low productivity. One factor believed to influence organizational productivity is the work culture implemented. The concept of a serving culture emphasizes the value that every member of the organization has a responsibility to serve others, including superiors, colleagues, and subordinates, with the ultimate goal of improving the organization's collective performance. This culture aligns with the concept of servant

leadership, which prioritizes service as the core of leadership and management. According to Liden et al. (2014), a serving culture can increase employee loyalty, cooperation, and job satisfaction, which ultimately has implications for increased organizational productivity. In addition to organizational culture, leadership style also plays an important role as a mediating variable that can strengthen the relationship between a serving culture and organizational productivity. Inclusive, participatory, and service-oriented leadership can be a catalyst for the realization of a harmonious work culture. Research conducted by Greenleaf (1977) on servant leadership demonstrated that a leadership style emphasizing service can increase employee engagement, job satisfaction, and team performance. The phenomenon at the East Kalimantan National Narcotics Agency (BNNP) can be seen in various organizational aspects, including the interconnected work culture, leadership style, and employee productivity. Based on the data, the following points can be explained:

First, from the perspective of a culture of mutual service, problems persist, including a lack of communication and coordination between sections. This indicates that the collaborative culture and servant leadership principles that should be fostered within the organization have not been fully internalized. Some employees demonstrate mutual support, but consistency in implementing shared values varies across work units.

Second, regarding leadership style, some leaders have attempted to implement a participatory leadership style, but not all have done so consistently. There is a tendency for leaders to emphasize an instructional approach rather than listening to the aspirations of their subordinates, resulting in employees feeling less involved in decision-making. This condition has resulted in a decreased sense of belonging among employees to the organization.

Third, in terms of organizational productivity, data shows that the performance of the East Kalimantan National Narcotics Agency (BNNP), particularly in drug abuse prevention and eradication programs, is less than optimal. While some activity targets have been achieved, implementation quality still faces obstacles such as limited human resources, high workloads, and a lack of innovation in the field. This reflects a gap between organizational potential and realized productivity.

METHOD

Types of research

The quantitative method was chosen so that research results could be measured objectively through numerical data obtained from questionnaires, then analyzed using inferential statistical techniques. A statement or question requires alternative answers: strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, and disagree, where each: strongly agree is given a score of 4, agree 3, somewhat agree 2, and disagree 1 (Sugiyono, 2022). Quantitative research distances the researcher from the object of study. Quantitative research uses formal, standardized, and measuring instruments.

Sample population

According to Sugiyono (2019), the definition of population is a generalization area consisting of objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics that are determined by researchers to be studied and then conclusions drawn. The population in this study was all permanent employees of the East Kalimantan BNNP, totaling 120 people spread across several divisions, such as the production division, marketing division, administration division, and technical division. The determination of the number of samples was carried out using the Slovin formula, which was 92 respondents.

Method of collecting data

Techniques are methods for searching for and obtaining data on variables in the form of notes, reports, and documentation. According to Sugiyono (2020), there are two main factors

that influence the quality of research data: the quality of the research instrument and the quality of the results. In this study, the data collection technique used is the field research technique, carried out by going directly to the field using a questionnaire data collection tool which is distributed to respondents.

The data collection techniques used in this study are as follows:

1. Questionnaire

A questionnaire was given to respondents to determine the influence of organizational culture and leadership on work productivity through work discipline at the Intelligence and Security Agency (Baintelkam) of the Republic of Indonesia Police.

Assessment of a series of research questionnaire statements that have been answered by respondents using the following research norms:

A question is positive if the answer is:

- a) Strongly Agree Score 5
- b) Agree Score 4
- c) Quite Agree Score 3
- d) Disagree Score 2
- e) Strongly Disagree Score 1

Likert scale. The Likert scale is used to measure an individual's or group's attitudes, opinions, and perceptions about social events or phenomena. In this research, these social phenomena have been specifically defined by the researcher, and are hereinafter referred to as research variables.

2. Research Instruments

research instrument is the variable of Mutual Service Culture (X_1), namely an organizational culture that emphasizes an attitude of mutual assistance, support, and service among employees to create harmonious collective performance. Leadership Style Variable (Z) is the leader's behavioral pattern in influencing, directing and motivating subordinates to achieve organizational goals and organizational productivity. The dependent variable (Y) is the organization's ability to produce optimal output through the effectiveness and efficiency of its resources.

Analysis Method

The analysis technique used in this study was quantitative analysis using statistics. Furthermore, to obtain and expedite data input, statistical software was used to support this research. The software used to support this research was SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solutions) version 29. In SPSS, raw data that had been processed into numbers was input into SPSS, making it easier for the author to conduct this research.

Validity Testing

The basis for decision making in validity testing is as follows:

- a) If the r value is positive and the r_{result} is $> r_{\text{table}}$, then the item or variable is valid.
- b) If the r value is negative and $r_{\text{result}} < r_{\text{table}}$ or r_{result} is negative $> r_{\text{table}}$ then the item or variable is invalid.

A questionnaire is declared valid if the r value obtained from the calculation results (r_{xy}) is greater than the table r value (5%).

Instrument Reliability Test

According to Arikunto (2020), reliability refers to the degree to which an instrument is sufficiently reliable to be used using the Cronbach's Alpha formula. The basis for decision making in the reliability test in this study is as follows:

- a) If the r alpha value is positive and $r_{\text{alpha}} > r_{\text{table}}$, then the item or variable is reliable.

- b) If the r alpha value is negative and r alpha < r table or r alpha is negative > r table , then the item or variable is not reliable.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Sugiyono (2019) proposed multiple linear regression analysis used to make predictions, how the value of a variable changes dependent if the value of the independent variable is increased or decreased. This analysis is used by involving two or more independent variables between the dependent variable (Y) and the independent variables (X₁ and X₂), This method is used to determine the strength of the influence between several factors. independent variables simultaneously with the dependent variable.

$$\mu_{Y/X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n} = A + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + \dots + B_nX_n$$

Technique used in this study was multiple linear regression. The analysis was conducted computerized using the computer program Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) Version 29 for Windows.

Coefficient of Determination

The definition of the coefficient of determination according to Supangat (2018) is: "The coefficient of determination is a quantity to show the level of strength of the relationship between two or more variables in the form of a percentage (showing how much percentage of the diversity of y can be explained by the diversity of x), or in other words how much x can contribute to y."

Kuncoro (2021), according to him, the coefficient essentially measures the extent to which a model is able to explain variations in the dependent variable. The value of the coefficient of determination is between zero (0) and one (1). A small r² value means that the ability of the independent variables to explain the variable's variation is very limited. If the value is close to one, it means that the independent variables provide almost all the information needed to predict variations in the dependent variable.

The magnitude of the relationship between the variables "X₁" and "X₂" with the variable "Y" can be determined by using the coefficient of determination analysis, which is obtained by squaring the correlation coefficient. Based on the definition above, the coefficient of determination is part of the total diversity of the dependent variable that can be calculated by the diversity of the independent variable calculated with the coefficient of determination with the basic assumption that other factors outside the variable are considered fixed or constant. To determine the value of the coefficient of determination, it can be calculated using the formula:

$$K_d = r^2 \times 100\%$$

Information:

- Kd = Value of coefficient of determination
- r = Correlation coefficient value

Hypothesis

The calculations or analysis in this study utilize the SPSS computer program for Windows 29.0. The test statistics used are:

- a. F test

The F test statistic is used to determine simultaneously (multiple) the influence between the Culture of Mutual Service (X₁) and Leadership (X₂) on Work Productivity (Y), with the test results being:

- 1) H_0 is accepted if $F_{count} < F_{table}$.
 - 2) H_0 is rejected if $F_{count} > F_{table}$.
- b. t-test

To determine the influence of the independent variable individually (partially) on the dependent variable, the decision is to use a partial test (t-test) with the test decision being:

- 1) H_0 is accepted if $t_{count} < t_{table}$.
- 2) H_0 is rejected if $t_{count} > t_{table}$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The quantitative data that has been compiled, through the distribution of questionnaires or surveys that the researcher has conducted, becomes the average value of variable X_1 (Culture of mutual service), variable X_2 (leadership style) and variable Y (work productivity) and is analyzed using parametric statistics with the program SPSS Release 29.00 For Windows, namely to find out whether each variable studied has a positive influence on work motivation or vice versa. The data was analyzed using the regression analysis command (option) found on the SPSS main menu. The values in each SPSS output are described as follows:

a. Multiple Linear Regression Test

Table 1. Results of the Regression Equation Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	-.528	3,461		-.153	.879
Culture of Mutual Service (X1)	.777	.113	.676	6,905	.000
Leadership Style (X2)	.227	.107	.207	2,117	.037

a. Dependent Variable: organizational productivity (Y)

Based on the SPSS output results in the *coefficients table* in above, it can be identified that the multiple linear regression equation is as follows:

$$Y = 0.528 + 0.777.X_1 + 0.227.X_2$$

- 1) The constant value $a = 0.528$ can be interpreted that if the culture of mutual service and leadership style has a value of zero, then employee performance has a positive value of 0.528.
- 2) The regression coefficient of the culture of mutual service $b_1 = 0.528$ can be interpreted that if the value of the culture of mutual service increases by one, the value of organizational productivity will also increase by 0.528.
- 3) Leadership style regression coefficient $b_2 = 0.227$ can be interpreted that if the leadership style increases by one, the organizational productivity value will also increase by 0.227.

c. Coefficient of Determination

Based on the calculations in the table below The influence test was carried out for the three variables, and based on the Model Summary table which produced an Adjusted R Square value of 0.727, this shows that 72.7% of the variables of mutual service culture (X), leadership style (Z) have a simultaneous (together) influence on the organizational productivity variable (Y) and the remaining 27.3% is influenced by other factors . which was not examined in this study.

c. Hypothesis Testing

1) t test

- a) The Influence of Organizational Culture (X_1) on Work Productivity (Y)
The t-test value of the variable of mutual service culture (X_1) with a calculated t of 15.287 and significance of 0.000. Because the calculated t is greater than the table t ($15.287 > 1.99$) and significance is less than 5% (0.000) then H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected, it can be stated that the culture of mutual service (X) has a significant effect on organizational productivity (Y).
- b) The influence of leadership style (X_2) on organizational productivity (Y).
The t-test value of the leadership style variable (X_2) with a calculated t of 11.482 and significance of 0.000. Because the calculated t is greater than the t table ($11.482 > 1.998$) and the significance is less than 5% (0.000) then H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected, it can be stated that leadership style (X_2) has a significant effect on organizational productivity (Y).

2) F test

From the results of the analysis in the table above, namely the test ANOVA obtained a calculated F value of 123.564 while the F_{table} ($\alpha 0.05$) for $n = 93$ is 2.70. So the calculated F is $>$ from the F_{table} ($\alpha 0.05$) or $123.564 > 2.70$, with a significance level of 0.000 because $0.000 < 0.05$, it can be said that the culture of serving each other (X_1) and leadership style (X_2) together have an influence on organizational productivity (Y).

CONCLUSION

1. The culture of mutual service has a positive and significant impact on organizational productivity at the BNNP East Kalimantan. The results of the regression analysis showed a calculated t value of 6.905 with a significance level of 0.000 (< 0.05).
2. Leadership style has a positive and significant influence on organizational productivity at the BNNP East Kalimantan. The results of the analysis showed a calculated t value of 2.117 with a significance level of 0.037 (< 0.05).
3. Leadership style partially mediates the influence of a culture of mutual service on organizational productivity. The results of the Sobel test show that the indirect influence of a culture of mutual service on organizational productivity through leadership style is significant.

REFERENCE

- Achmad S. Ruky. 2019, Sistem Manajemen Kinerja, Jakarta : PT. Gramedia. Pustaka utama.
- Ambar Teguh Sulistiyani dan Rosidah, 2019, Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia,. Graha Ilmu: Yogyakarta
- Arfida. 2020. Ekonomi Sumber Daya Manusia. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Arifin, Johar dan A. Fauzi. 2017. Aplikasi Excel dalam Aspek Kuantitatif. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Jakarta: PT Elex Media.
- Armstrong, M. 2020. Performance Management. Clays, Ltd. St. Ives Ple, England.
- Armstrong, Michael. 2019. A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice. 10 th. Edition. London: Kogan Page.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19–31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S)
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage Publications.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. Harper & Row
- Darsono & Siswandoko, Tjatjuk. 2021. Sumber Daya Manusia Abad 21. Nusantara Consulting:

- Jakarta.
- Dessler, 2019, *Manajemen Personalialia*, Edisi Ketiga, Erlangga, Jakarta
- Erni Trisnawati, Sule. 2022. *Pengantar Manajemen*, Jakarta. Kencana.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Prentice Hall
- Gouzali Saydam. (2021). *Manajemen Sumber daya Manusia: Suatu pendekatan*. Mikro. Jakarta: Djambaran.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press
- Handoko T. Hani (2019), *Manajemen*; Edisi Kedua, Cetakan Ketigabelas. Yogyakarta : BPF. E.
- Hasibuan, S.P. Malayu, 2021. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, cetakan ketujuh Penerbit PT. Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- Henry Simamora. 2019. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Edisi Ke-3. STIE YKPN.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (4th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (2013). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (10th ed.). Pearson Education
- House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 81–97.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161–177.
- Mahmudi. (2010). *Manajemen kinerja sektor publik*. UPP STIM YKPN.
- Mangkunegara, A.A.P. (2021). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Miraza, Bachtiar, 2019. *Manajemen Bisnis*, ISEI, Bandung.
- Mondy. R., Wayne dan Robert M. Noe 2019. *Human Resource Management*. New York : Allyn and Bacon.
- Muchdarsyah Sinungan, (2020), *Produktivitas apa dan Bagaimana*. Jakarta: Bumi.
- Ravianto, J, 2019, *Produktivitas dan Manajemen*, Jakarta: Lembaga Sarana.
- Rivai, Veithzal dan Ella Jauvani Sagala (2019) *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (dari teori ke praktik)* Edisi 2. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada: Jakarta.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson Education
- Samsudin, sadili. (2019), *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, cetakan ke-1. Bandung : Pustaka Setia
- Sedarmayanti. 2021. *Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Bandung: Mandar Maju.
- Siagian, Sondang (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (cetakan 15)*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Sink, D. S. (1985). *Productivity management: Planning, measurement, and evaluation, control and improvement*. Wiley.
- Spears, L. C. (1995). *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sumanth, D. J. (1994). *Total productivity management: A systemic and quantitative approach to compete in quality, price, and time*. St. Lucie Press.
- Sutrisno, Edi. 2019. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Edisi pertama*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Tjutju Yuniarsih dan Suwatno. 2019. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Alfabeta. Bandung.
- Werther, William B. & Keith Davis. 2020. *Human Resources And Personal Management*. International Edition. McGraw-Hill, Inc., USA.