International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

The Influence of Leadership Style and Work Environment on Organizational Commitment

Balya Iqbal[1], Umar Farouk[2], Sugiyanta[3], Jati Nugroho[4]

[1,2,3,4] Semarang State Polytechnic, Indonesia

Corresponding author: farouk.umar196@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to examine the correlation between leadership style and work environment with organizational commitment at PT Triangle Motorindo. The data collection methods utilized encompass surveys, interviews, observation, and literature review. The sampling approach employed is simple random sampling, computed using the Slovin formula, yielding a sample size of 75 respondents. The analytical tools used include instrument tests, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression, and hypothesis testing. The data was processed using SPSS. The multiple linear regression analysis yielded the regression equation: Y = 24.918 + 0.268 X1 + 0.406 X2 + e. The results suggest that both leadership style and work environment have a large and beneficial impact on organizational commitment, both individually and together. The combined impact of leadership style and work environment accounts for 64.4% of the variability in organizational commitment, while the remaining 35.6% is attributed to other variables not considered in the study. An effective leadership style and a pleasant work environment have the potential to enhance organizational commitment.

Keywords: Leadership Style, Work Environment, Organizational Commitment

INTRODUCTION

Organizational commitment is a critical factor influencing employee performance, retention, and overall organizational effectiveness. As organizations strive to remain competitive in an increasingly dynamic environment, understanding the antecedents of employee commitment has become more important than ever. Among the numerous factors that shape organizational commitment, leadership style and work environment are

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

consistently identified as central determinants. Leadership plays a pivotal role in shaping employee attitudes, behaviors, and levels of engagement. According to Bass and Avolio (1994), transformational leadership—characterized by inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and idealized influence—has been positively linked with higher organizational commitment. Leaders who engage and inspire their subordinates are more likely to foster a sense of belonging and alignment with organizational values (Yukl, 2013). Conversely, poor leadership may result in disengagement, low morale, and high turnover intentions. In addition to leadership, the work environment significantly affects employees' psychological attachment to their organization. A positive and supportive work environment—encompassing elements such as job security, organizational culture, physical conditions, and interpersonal relationships—can enhance employee satisfaction and foster commitment (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). When employees perceive their environment as safe, inclusive, and growth-oriented, they are more likely to develop emotional bonds with the organization (Robbins & Judge, 2019).

The interplay between leadership style and work environment also warrants attention, as effective leaders often cultivate healthy work environments that further reinforce organizational commitment (Alonderienė & Majauskaite, 2016). Therefore, investigating the combined influence of these variables offers valuable insights for both theory and practice in human resource management and organizational development.

Given this context, the present study aims to explore how leadership style and work environment impact organizational commitment, particularly within the scope of contemporary organizational settings. By identifying the key drivers of employee commitment, organizations can better design strategies to improve performance, reduce turnover, and achieve long-term success.

In the current era of increasingly competitive automotive industry, where many competitors with new brands have emerged, it has become a threat to PT Triangle Motorindo as the owner of the Viar Motor brand. PT Triangle Motorindo itself is experiencing internal problems regarding high fluctuating turnover rates and approaching the reasonable limit set at 5%. The following is a graph of employee turnover at PT Triangle Motorindo. Factors that influence employees to continue working or the desire to change jobs or turnover are organizational commitment (Colquitt et al., 2019). The instability of turnover rates at PT Triangle Motorindo indicates that organizational commitment to employees is still lacking. This is certainly a problem for the company, the instability of high employee turnover rates can have an impact on the speed of production

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

time and cause factory performance to decline. After conducting observations and conducting literature studies, there are two variables that are assumed to influence organizational commitment, namely leadership style and work environment. The right and good leadership style and a comfortable work environment can influence employee organizational commitment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership style

Leadership style is widely recognized as a critical factor influencing individual, team, and organizational outcomes. It refers to the pattern of behavior a leader exhibits when guiding, motivating, and managing people within an organization. Over the years, researchers have developed various typologies of leadership styles to explain how leaders influence followers and shape workplace dynamics. One of the most influential models is the transformational and transactional leadership theory introduced by Bass and Avolio (1994). Transformational leadership emphasizes vision, inspiration, and intellectual stimulation. Leaders adopting this style are proactive and seek to transform the beliefs and motivations of their followers to align with organizational goals. Empirical studies consistently show a strong positive correlation between transformational leadership and employee outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Eisenbeiss et al., 2008). In contrast, transactional leadership is based on clear structures, rewards, and punishments. It focuses on exchanges between the leader and employees to achieve established goals. While it can be effective for short-term task completion, it often lacks the emotional engagement necessary for fostering deeper organizational commitment (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Another widely studied framework is Lewin's leadership styles, which categorize leadership into autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire styles. Autocratic leaders make decisions unilaterally, often resulting in low employee morale and limited innovation. Democratic leaders encourage participation and collaboration, often leading to higher satisfaction and engagement. Laissez-faire leadership, where the leader provides minimal guidance, is generally associated with ambiguity and lack of accountability (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). In recent years, servant leadership has gained traction as an ethical and people-oriented style. Greenleaf (1977) proposed that servant leaders prioritize the needs of their followers, aiming to empower and develop them. This style fosters trust, loyalty, and long-term commitment (Liden et al., 2008). Contextual factors such as culture, organizational structure, and employee characteristics also influence the

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

effectiveness of leadership styles. For instance, in collectivist cultures, participative leadership may yield stronger results, while in high power-distance settings, directive leadership may be more accepted (House et al., 2004).

Work Environment

The work environment is widely acknowledged as a key determinant of employee well-being, motivation, and organizational commitment. It encompasses both the physical conditions in which employees operate and the psychological atmosphere created by leadership, coworkers, and organizational policies. A positive work environment can significantly enhance job satisfaction, productivity, and long-term employee retention (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). According to McCoy and Evans (2005), the work environment consists of three major dimensions: physical, social, and organizational. The physical environment includes tangible aspects such as lighting, ventilation, ergonomics, workspace layout, and cleanliness. A well-designed physical environment can reduce fatigue, prevent injuries, and support employee concentration and efficiency (Vischer, 2007).

The social environment pertains to interpersonal relationships, support from colleagues and supervisors, trust, and collaboration. A culture of mutual respect and open communication contributes to psychological safety, which in turn encourages innovation and risk-taking (Edmondson, 1999). Similarly, perceived organizational support and fair treatment have been positively linked with organizational citizenship behavior and commitment (Eisenberger et al., 2002). The organizational environment refers to policies, leadership practices, career development opportunities, and work-life balance. When employees feel that the organization values their contributions and provides avenues for growth, they are more likely to remain loyal and engaged (Robbins & Judge, 2019). Conversely, toxic work environments characterized by high stress, unclear roles, or authoritarian management styles can lead to burnout, absenteeism, and high turnover (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Recent studies also highlight the role of psychological work climate employees' perception of their work environment in shaping organizational outcomes. According to Parker et al. (2003), a supportive and empowering climate fosters higher levels of job involvement, creativity, and affective commitment.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment refers to the psychological attachment and loyalty an employee has toward their organization. It has been widely studied in organizational

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

behavior and human resource management literature due to its critical role in influencing job performance, employee retention, and organizational effectiveness (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). The most influential model of organizational commitment is the three-component model proposed by Meyer and Allen (1991), which classifies commitment into: Affective commitment – emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization, Continuance commitment – awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization, Normative commitment – a sense of obligation to remain with the organization.

Affective commitment is considered the most desirable form, as employees with high affective commitment tend to be more motivated, innovative, and aligned with organizational goals (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Continuance commitment, while it may reduce turnover, is often associated with lower satisfaction and engagement, as it reflects a cost–benefit calculation rather than emotional attachment (Jaros et al., 1993). Several factors have been found to influence organizational commitment, including leadership style, work environment, organizational support, and career development opportunities (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Allen & Grisaffe, 2001). For instance, transformational leadership and supportive work environments have been consistently linked to stronger affective commitment (Lok & Crawford, 2004). Similarly, employees who perceive fairness, recognition, and opportunities for advancement are more likely to stay committed to the organization (Robbins & Judge, 2019).

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study, the targeted population consisted of 299 employees and staff of PT Triangle Motorindo. The sample calculation used the Slovin formula with an error rate of 10%, resulting in a sample of 75 people. The quantitative method of multiple linear regression was used in this study to determine the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable and to evaluate the accuracy of the regression model. The classical assumption test to test the feasibility of the data before being studied and the validity and reliability test of the data collection instrument. Hypothesis testing was conducted to determine whether or not the hypothesis was accepted by conducting the t-test, F-test, and R-Square test. The t-test aims to identify the partial significance of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The F-test is used to measure the feasibility of the regression model and how much the independent variable is able to influence the dependent variable.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

DISCUSSION

Validity Test

The results of the validity test are determined using r table with df = 73 and a significance level of 5% or 0.05, the r table value is 0.2272. The output results show that all statements in each indicator variable X1, X2, and Y have an r-count exceeding the r table value, therefore it can be said that all items of each indicator variable used are valid.

Reliability Test

The reliability test is measured by applying the Cronbach Alpha method. A reliability test can be said to be trusted or reliable if the Cronbach Alpha value obtained exceeds 0.70. The results of the reliability test reveal that Leadership Style has a value of α = 0.957, Work Environment α = 0.948 and Organizational Commitment has a value of α = 0.890 which exceeds the minimum value of 0.70. Based on these results, all items of each indicator in the questionnaire are declared reliable.

Linearity Test

Table 1. Linearity Test

Variabel	Sig. Deviation from Linearity	Standar Sig. α=5%	Hasil
Gaya Kepemimpinan(X1)	0,063	0,05	Linear
Lingkungan Kerja(X2)	0,674	0,05	Linear

Model	R	R-Square	R-square disesuaikan	Estimasi Standar Error	Durbin-Watson
1	,802a	,644	,634	3.927	2.304
a. Prediktor: (Konstanta), X2, X1					
b. Variabel terikat: Y					

Source: Primary Data processed, 2024.

Autocorrelation Test

Based on these results, it shows that both independent variables have a sig. deviation from linearity value exceeding the standard sig. value of the 5% error rate, which is 0.05, so that the data of the two variables are said to have a linear relationship with the Y variable.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Normality Test

Table 2. Normality Test

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error		Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	24.918	3.945	.000		
	X1	.268	.063	.000	.591	1.693
	X2	.406	.075	.000	.591	1.693

		Residu Tidak Standar
N		75
Parameter Normal[a,b]	Rata-rata	.0000000
	Std. Deviasi	3.87379153
Most Extreme Differences	Absolut	.069
	Positif	.069
	Negatif	-.045
Uji Statistik		.069
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200[c,d]
a. Uji distribusi normal.		
b. Dihitung berdasarkan data.		
c. Koreksi Signifikansi Lilliefors.		
d. Ini batasan bawah dari signifikansi yang sebenarnya.		

Source: Primary Data processed, 2024.

The findings of this study underscore the significant influence of both leadership style and work environment on organizational commitment. These results are consistent with previous literature, reinforcing the notion that organizational commitment is not merely a product of individual traits but is heavily shaped by external organizational factors. Leadership style emerged as a crucial determinant of organizational commitment. Transformational leadership, in particular, has been shown to positively impact employees' affective commitment by fostering trust, motivation, and a shared vision (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Leaders who demonstrate empathy, communicate effectively, and inspire innovation often create a stronger psychological bond between employees and the organization. This aligns with Meyer and Allen's (1991) framework, which suggests that affective commitment—emotional attachment to the organization—is more likely to develop in environments where employees feel valued and inspired by leadership. On the other hand, authoritarian or transactional leadership styles, although effective for operational control, may fail to promote long-term loyalty if they lack personal

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

engagement and development opportunities (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). The present findings support the view that leadership behavior sets the tone for employee engagement and can either strengthen or weaken organizational loyalty. In parallel, the work environment was found to be another significant contributor to organizational commitment. A conducive work environment—characterized by safety, supportive interpersonal relationships, and well-structured organizational policies—enhances employee well-being and promotes a sense of belonging. These results are consistent with the findings of Raziq and Maulabakhsh (2015), who emphasized that environmental factors such as workspace design, management practices, and work-life balance have a profound impact on employee satisfaction and commitment. Moreover, the interaction between leadership and work environment cannot be overlooked. Effective leaders not only guide and motivate but also shape the workplace climate. A leader who cultivates an inclusive and empowering environment helps reinforce employees' normative and affective commitment (Liden et al., 2008). This integrated perspective aligns with the view that organizational commitment is fostered when leadership and environmental factors operate synergistically. The implications of these findings are both theoretical and practical. Theoretically, they validate the integration of social exchange theory and the three-component model of commitment. Practically, they suggest that organizations seeking to enhance employee retention and performance must invest in developing leadership capabilities and improving work environments simultaneously. Policies that encourage participative leadership, provide professional development, and improve workplace conditions are likely to generate higher levels of employee commitment and reduce turnover intentions.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that leadership style and work environment play a pivotal role in shaping organizational commitment among employees. Transformational leadership, which emphasizes vision, motivation, and personal development, has a particularly strong positive influence on employees' emotional attachment to the organization. Leaders who demonstrate empathy, integrity, and inclusiveness foster trust and inspire a sense of shared purpose, thereby enhancing affective commitment.

Similarly, a supportive and well-structured work environment contributes significantly to employees' psychological attachment and loyalty. Factors such as interpersonal relationships, physical conditions, safety, and organizational culture collectively create a workplace where employees feel valued and engaged. When

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

employees perceive their work environment as positive and growth-oriented, they are more likely to exhibit commitment to organizational goals.

Furthermore, the interaction between leadership style and work environment suggests that effective leadership not only guides behavior but also cultivates a healthy organizational climate. Organizations that integrate strong leadership with a positive work environment are better positioned to retain talent, improve job satisfaction, and sustain high performance.

In conclusion, strengthening organizational commitment requires a holistic approach that focuses on developing transformational leadership competencies and investing in a conducive work environment. These efforts will not only enhance employee retention and satisfaction but also drive long-term organizational success.

Limitations

While this study provides valuable insights into the relationship between leadership style, work environment, and organizational commitment, several limitations should be acknowledged to contextualize the findings.

First, the cross-sectional design of the research limits the ability to establish causal relationships between variables. While associations were identified, it cannot be conclusively stated that leadership style and work environment cause changes in organizational commitment over time. Longitudinal studies are recommended to examine these relationships more dynamically.

Second, the data collection relied primarily on self-reported questionnaires, which may be subject to common method bias and social desirability bias. Respondents may have overestimated positive perceptions or underreported negative experiences to align with perceived expectations. Incorporating multiple data sources, such as supervisor evaluations or organizational performance metrics, could enhance validity in future research.

Third, the study's sample may be limited in geographical and sectoral scope, potentially affecting the generalizability of the findings. Cultural and organizational contexts—such as power distance, communication styles, and industry-specific dynamics—may influence how leadership and work environments are perceived and how they affect commitment. Future studies should consider a more diverse sample across regions and industries.

Fourth, the research focused only on two independent variables—leadership style and work environment—while other potential influencing factors, such as organizational

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

justice, personality traits, or career development opportunities, were not explored. These variables may also significantly impact organizational commitment and should be incorporated in future models.

Lastly, the measurement instruments, although adopted from validated scales, may still have contextual limitations depending on cultural relevance and organizational maturity. It is important to continuously adapt and test measurement tools to ensure they reflect the nuances of the local context.

Suggestions for Future Research

Based on the findings and limitations of this study, several directions are recommended for future research: Longitudinal Studies: Future research should employ longitudinal designs to better understand how leadership style and work environment influence organizational commitment over time. This approach would allow researchers to assess causal relationships and track changes in employee attitudes and behaviors more accurately. Inclusion of Additional Variables: Future studies could expand the current model by including other organizational and psychological factors that may affect commitment, such as organizational justice, job autonomy, perceived organizational support, employee engagement, and personality traits. This would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the determinants of organizational commitment.

Qualitative Approaches: To complement quantitative findings, qualitative methods such as interviews or focus group discussions could be employed. These approaches would provide deeper insights into employees' lived experiences and perceptions regarding leadership practices and the work environment. Comparative and Cross-Cultural Research: Future studies should explore differences across cultural, regional, and organizational contexts. For example, comparing how leadership styles impact commitment in collectivist versus individualist cultures or in public versus private sector organizations may yield meaningful insights.

Moderating and Mediating Variables: Researchers are encouraged to investigate potential mediators (e.g., job satisfaction, trust in leadership) and moderators (e.g., gender, age, tenure, organizational culture) that could influence the strength or direction of the relationship between leadership, work environment, and commitment. Sector-Specific Studies: Future research can focus on specific sectors such as education, healthcare, manufacturing, or technology to assess how industry characteristics may shape the leadership–commitment relationship. Such studies would support the development of more tailored human resource strategies. Use of Mixed Methods:

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Combining quantitative and qualitative methods in future research can provide a richer, more nuanced understanding of how leadership and environmental factors influence organizational commitment.

REFERENCES

Allen, N. J., & Grisaffe, D. B. (2001). Employee commitment to the organization and customer reactions: Mapping the linkages. Human Resource Management Review, 11(3), 209–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00049-8

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49(3), 252–276. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043

Alonderienė, R., & Majauskaite, M. (2016). Leadership style and job satisfaction in higher education institutions. International Journal of Educational Management, 30(1), 140–164. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2014-0106

Aqila, S., Suroija, N., & Nugroho, J. (2023). Influence of Perceived Quality and Brand Image towards Purchase Decision of Indomilk UHT Milk in Pedurungan.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

Cohen, A. (2007). Dynamics between occupational and organizational commitment in the context of flexible labor markets: A review of the literature and suggestions for a future research agenda. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9(4), 281–300.

Diasta, M. P., Hasyim, F., & Setyawan, N. A. (2023). Employee Management System and Customer Relation on Business Performance of Etos National Company. AFEBI Management and Business Review, 8(2), 118-124.

Eisenbeiss, S. A., van Knippenberg, D., & Boerner, S. (2008). Transformational leadership and team innovation: Integrating team climate principles. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93(6), 1438–1446. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012716

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. Paulist Press.

Hernando, H., & Nugroho, J. (2022). Kualitas pengiriman dan loyalitas pelanggan GoFood: Peran mediasi kepuasan pelanggan. Jurnal Manajemen Maranatha, 22(1), 17”“26. https://doi.org/10.28932/jmm.v22i1.4886

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies. Sage.

Jaros, S. J., Jermier, J. M., Koehler, J. W., & Sincich, T. (1993). Effects of continuance, affective, and moral commitment on the withdrawal process: An evaluation of eight structural equation models. Academy of Management Journal, 36(5), 951–995.

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

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. Journal of Social Psychology, 10(2), 271–299.

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– Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Burnout: A multidimensional perspective. Psychology Press.

McCoy, J. M., & Evans, G. W. (2005). Physical work environment. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), Handbook of work stress (pp. 219–245). Sage Publications.

Nugroho, J. (2021). Gopay User Satisfaction Analysis in Semarang City during the Covid-19 Pandemic. Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis.

Parker, S. K., Axtell, C. M., & Turner, N. (2003). Designing a safer workplace: Importance of job autonomy, communication quality, and supportive supervisors. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8(2), 111–127. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.8.2.111

Qonitah Iffah, R., Farouk, U., & Nugroho, J. (2022). Influence of Influencer Marketing Strategy and Online Customer Reviews on Purchase Intention of Sociolla Customer (Case Study on AB Students at Polines 2018–2019). Jurnal JOBS, 8(2).

Ramandha, S., Astuti, R. D., Nugroho, J., & Widyanti, D. V. (2023). Pengaruh brand trust dan service quality terhadap keputusan pembelian produk Mulia Ultimate pada PT Pegadaian Cabang Purworejo. JBM: Jurnal Bisnis Mahasiswa, 3(4), 381-393

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. Procedia Economics and Finance, 23, 717–725. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00524-9

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). Organizational behavior (18th ed.). Pearson.

Setyawan, N. A., Utami, H., Sadriatwati, S. E., Pratiwi, M. I., & Eviyanti, N. (2025). Elaboration of Green Supply Chain Management to Improve Green Process Innovation Performance in UMKM Batik Lasem. Admisi dan Bisnis, 26(2), 105-118.

Setyawan, N. A., Wibowo, B. Y., Ayuwardani, M., Kartika, V. S., & Eviyanti, N. (2023). The Impact of Big Data Analytics Capabilities on Sustainable Performance: an Application to Culinary and Fashion SME's. Asian Journal of Management, Entrepreneurship and Social Science, 3(04), 731-746.

Vischer, J. C. (2007). The effects of the physical environment on job performance: Towards a theoretical model of workspace stress. Stress and Health, 23(3), 175–184. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1134 177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006

Wibowo, B. Y., & Setyawan, N. A. (2024). The Sustainability of Lasem Batik in Terms of Green Marketing and Brand Quality. Calitatea, 25(198), 284-291.

Yukl, G. (2013). Leadership in organizations (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.