

## The Influence of Organizational Behavior and Leadership on Employee Performance with Job Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable at the Sidikalang Sub-district Office, Dairi Regency

Isran Bintang<sup>1</sup>, Kiki Farida Ferine<sup>2</sup>, Abdi Sugiarto<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Medan, North Sumatra

Corresponding email: [gmsubayu@gmail.com](mailto:gmsubayu@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>,

Author email: [kikifaridaferine@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id](mailto:kikifaridaferine@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id)<sup>2</sup>, [abdi\\_sugiarto@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id](mailto:abdi_sugiarto@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id)<sup>3</sup>

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History

Submission : 09/06/2026

Received : 17/06/2026

Revised : 26/06/2026

Accepted : 01/07/2026

#### Keywords

leadership, organizational behavior, job satisfaction, employee performance.;

### ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the influence of Leadership and Organizational Behavior on Employee Performance with Job Satisfaction as an intervening variable in the Sidikalang District Office, Dairi Regency. This study uses a quantitative approach with the Structural Equation Modeling method based on Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS). Data was collected through the distribution of questionnaires to employees, then analyzed using SmartPLS software version 3.0. The results of the direct influence analysis showed that Leadership (X2) had a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y) with a path coefficient of 1.060, a T-Statistics value of 19.053 (> 1.96), and P-Values = 0.000. Meanwhile, Organizational Behavior (X1) had no significant effect on Employee Performance, with a path coefficient of 0.134, a T-Statistics value of 1.596 (< 1.96), and P-Values = 0.117. In addition, Leadership also has a positive and significant effect on Job Satisfaction (Z) with a path coefficient of 1.060, a T-Statistics value of 19.053, and P-Values = 0.000, while Organizational Behavior has no significant effect on Job Satisfaction, with a path coefficient of -0.110, a T-Statistics value of 1.585, and P-Values = 0.120. Furthermore, the results of the study show that Job Satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance, with a path coefficient of 1.118, a T-Statistics value of 4.911, and P-Values = 0.000. The results of the indirect influence analysis (mediation) showed that Job Satisfaction was able to significantly mediate the relationship between Leadership and Employee Performance, with a path coefficient of 1.185, a T-Statistics value of 4.340, and P-Values = 0.000. However, Job Satisfaction was not able to mediate the influence of Organizational Behavior on Employee Performance, with a path coefficient of -0.123, a T-Statistics value of 1.341, and P-Values = 0.186. Based on these findings, it is suggested that the Sidikalang District Office focus more attention on improving the quality of leadership and employee job satisfaction as an effort to improve employee performance. Improvements in the aspect of Organizational Behavior alone are not enough to have a significant impact on improving employee performance.

## Introduction

Organizational behavior is an important factor in determining the quality and effectiveness of employee performance. Organizational behavior includes the study of how individuals and groups act in the organization and its impact on performance (Sasongko & Anggiani, 2023). A comprehensive understanding of organizational behavior can help government agencies, such as sub-district offices, in managing human resources optimally. In the modern bureaucratic era, positive organizational behavior is the foundation for increasing employee productivity, loyalty, and professionalism (Prasetyo, 2022).

Employee performance in the public sector is closely related to how employees understand and apply organizational behavior in the implementation of daily tasks. Employee performance is defined as the results of work achieved by individuals or groups in accordance with the responsibilities and standards that have been set, both in terms of quality and quantity (Dewi, 2020; Murfat et al., 2019). Employee performance is influenced by internal factors such as motivation, discipline, and skills, as well as external factors that include leadership, organizational culture, and the work environment (Hulu et al., 2022; Candana, 2021; Hanafi et al., 2018; Harton, 2024). Employee performance indicators include work quality, work quantity, punctuality, effectiveness, and independence (Robbins, 2016:260 in Dewi, 2020).

At the Sidikalang District Office, even though employees try to carry out their duties in accordance with applicable regulations, various problems are still found such as low work discipline, lack of initiative, and weak coordination between employees. This condition shows that organizational behavior within the sub-district office environment is not fully optimal in supporting employee performance improvement.

In addition to organizational behavior, leadership is also a key factor that affects the effectiveness of employees' work (Sembiring & Sitanggang, 2022). Leadership is defined as the ability to influence, direct, and motivate others in achieving organizational goals (Umami, 2022; Mulyono, 2018). Effective leadership is able to shape work culture, influence employee behavior, and determine the extent to which employees feel valued and supported in carrying out their duties (Nuhalm et al., 2023; Addurorul Muntatsiroh, 2024). Leadership indicators include analytical skills, communication skills, courage, listening skills, and assertiveness (Kartono, 2017 in Umami, 2022). On the other hand, less effective leadership often has an impact on decreased motivation, unclear work direction, and low employee commitment to the organization (Sastra et al., 2021; Nikodimnus, 2023).

One of the factors that can strengthen the relationship between organizational behavior and employee performance, as well as being influenced by leadership style, is job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is an employee's positive attitude or feelings towards their work, which is influenced by working conditions, wage levels, relationships with colleagues and superiors, and career development opportunities (Robbins & Coulter, 2016; Nasrul et al., 2021; Anwar, 2023). Employees who have a high level of job satisfaction

tend to show greater motivation, loyalty, and commitment to the organization (Ilahi, 2017; Sugiarto & Ramadhan, 2021; Putri et al., 2022). Job satisfaction plays a role as an intervening variable that can increase work morale, reduce stress levels, and improve interactions between individuals in the workplace (Wijonarko et al., 2022; Aprilia et al., 2022; Diasmoro, 2017). Indicators of job satisfaction include supportive working conditions, fair compensation, and support from colleagues (Robbins & Coulter, 2016).

At the Sidikalang District Office, the level of employee job satisfaction still shows variations. Some employees feel that they do not receive attention related to career development, while other employees complain about the limited work facilities. In addition, inconsistency in leadership in providing direction and rewards also affects employees' attitudes in carrying out their duties. This condition has the potential to hinder the achievement of optimal performance as expected by the organization.

Previous research results show that positive organizational behavior can improve employee performance if supported by a high level of job satisfaction (Kurnia et al., 2023). However, empirical findings still show inconsistencies between sectors. Some studies have found a strong direct relationship, while others emphasize that job satisfaction plays a role as a variable that amplifies the influence. The same thing also happens with the leadership variable, where leadership effectiveness often depends on the level of employee job satisfaction.

Based on this description, this study aims to analyze the influence of organizational behavior and leadership on employee performance with job satisfaction as an intervening variable at the Sidikalang District Office, Dairi Regency. The results of this study are expected to contribute both theoretically and practically in improving organizational effectiveness through strengthening organizational behavior, effective leadership, and increasing employee job satisfaction.

## Method

This study uses an associative quantitative approach, which aims to test the relationship between two or more variables (Sugiyono, 2018). In this study, the exogenous variable consists of Organizational Behavior (X1) and Leadership (X2), while the endogenous variable is Employee Performance (Y), with Job Satisfaction (Z) as the intervening variable. The research was carried out at the Sidikalang District Office, Dairi Regency, which is located at Jl. Merdeka No. 02, Sidikalang, North Sumatra, Indonesia, from October 2025 to January 2026.

The population in this study is all employees of the Sidikalang District Office which totals 47 people and all have the status of State Civil Apparatus (ASN). Given the relatively small population, the sampling technique used is a saturated sampling technique, where all members of the population are used as research respondents as many as 47 people (Sugiyono, 2017).

The operational definition of variables in this study is as follows: Organizational behavior is the study of how individuals, groups, and organizational structures influence behavior in an organization to increase organizational effectiveness (James W. & Elston D., 2019). Indicators of organizational behavior include motivation, leader behavior and power, interpersonal communication, group structure and processes, development of attitudes and perceptions, change processes, conflict and negotiation, and work design (Robbins, 2016 in James W. & Elston D., 2019). Leadership is defined as the ability to influence, direct, and motivate others in achieving organizational goals (Umami, 2022), with indicators that include analytical abilities, skills, courage, listening ability, and assertiveness (Kartono, 2017 in Umami, 2022). Job satisfaction is a positive feeling or attitude that employees have towards their work, which is influenced by working conditions, salary, relationships with colleagues and superiors, and opportunities for self-development (Robbins & Coulter, 2016). Indicators of job satisfaction include supportive working conditions, fair compensation, and harmonious working relationships. Employee performance is the result of work achieved by individuals or groups in accordance with the authority, responsibility, and standards that have been set, with indicators including work quality, work quantity, punctuality, effectiveness, and independence (Dewi, 2020; Robbins, 2016:260 in Dewi, 2020).

The data analysis in this study uses a quantitative method with a Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) approach based on Partial Least Squares (PLS) through SmartPLS software version 3.3.3. The analysis was carried out in two stages, namely testing the measurement model (outer model) and the structural model (inner model). The measurement model is used to test the validity and reliability of the instrument. The validity test aims to ensure that the questionnaire item is able to measure the construct in question, while the reliability test measured through Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values is used to assess the consistency of the instrument, with a value above 0.7 declared reliable (Sekaran, 2014).

The structural model analysis aims to test the hypothetical relationship between exogenous and endogenous constructs (Hair et al., 2017). The bootstrapping technique in SmartPLS was used to obtain the values of the path coefficient, t-statistics, R-square, predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ), and fit model. The R-square value is used to assess the magnitude of the influence of independent latent variables on dependent latent variables (Ghozali, 2016). The  $Q^2$  value is used to test the predictive relevance of the model, where a value above zero indicates that the model has good predictive capabilities (Ghozali & Latan, 2015). Hypothesis testing was carried out based on t-statistics values with a significance limit of 1.96 at a significance level of 5% (Ghozali & Latan, 2015). The path coefficient indicates the direction and strength of the relationship between variables, where a positive value indicates a unidirectional relationship and a negative value indicates an opposite-directional relationship. Furthermore, the evaluation of model suitability was

carried out using the Normed Fit Index (NFI), where a value close to 1 indicates a good level of model suitability (Ghozali, 2018).

**Results and Discussion**

**Results**

*Convergent Validity Test Results*

The convergent validity of reflective indicators in the measurement model is evaluated through the correlation between the score of each indicator and the latent construct score it measured. An indicator is declared valid if it has an *outer loading* value above 0.70. However, in development research, an *outer loading* value between 0.50 to 0.60 is still acceptable. Based on the results of the *outer loading*, there are several indicators that are below 0.60 and are not significant. The results of *outer loading* are presented in the following table.

**Table 1. Outer Loading**

Indicator	Outer Loading	Remarks
Organizational Behavior (X1)		
<b>PO1</b>	0,859	Valid
<b>PO2</b>	0,857	Valid
<b>PO3</b>	0,774	Valid
<b>PO4</b>	0,850	Valid
<b>PO5</b>	0,814	Valid
<b>PO6</b>	0,786	Valid
<b>PO7</b>	0,909	Valid
<b>PO8</b>	0,807	Valid
Leadership (X2)		
<b>KPM1</b>	0,916	Valid
<b>KPM2</b>	0,906	Valid
<b>KPM3</b>	0,779	Valid
<b>KPM4</b>	0,900	Valid
<b>KPM5</b>	0,715	Valid
Job Satisfaction (Z)		
<b>KEP. K1</b>	0,910	Valid
<b>KEP. K2</b>	0,922	Valid
<b>KEP. K3</b>	0,842	Valid
Employee Performance (Y)		
<b>KP.1</b>	0,900	Valid

<b>KP.2</b>	0,913	Valid
<b>KP.3</b>	0,757	Valid
<b>KP.4</b>	0,894	Valid
<b>KP.5</b>	0,900	Valid

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

Based on the table above, all indicators in each variable have an *outer loading* value above 0.70, so it can be concluded that each indicator is able to reflect its construct well and meet the criteria for convergent validity. The Organizational Behavior Indicator (X1) PO1–PO8 has an *outer loading* value ranging from 0.774 to 0.909. The Leadership Indicator (X2) KPM1–KPM5 is in the range of 0.715 to 0.916, which still meets the minimum limit of convergent validity. Job Satisfaction Indicator (Z) KEP. K1–KEP. K3 shows a very strong correlation to its construct, which is between 0.910 to 0.922. Furthermore, the KP.1-KP.5 Employee Performance indicator (Y) has an *outer loading* value between 0.757 to 0.913. Thus, all indicators are declared valid and suitable for further analysis.

### **Results of the Discriminant Validity Test**

The discriminant validity test is carried out to ensure that reflective indicators are able to measure their constructs precisely, with the principle that an indicator must have a higher correlation to its own construct than to other constructs. The results of *the cross loading test* are presented in the following table.

**Table 2. Discriminating Validity (Cross Loading)**

Indicator	Leadership (X2)	Job Satisfaction (Z)	Employee Performance (Y)	Organizational Behavior (X1)
<b>KEP. K1</b>	0,916	0,910	0,900	0,666
<b>KEP. K2</b>	0,936	0,922	0,913	0,673
<b>KEP. K3</b>	0,779	0,742	0,757	0,538
<b>KP1</b>	0,916	0,910	0,920	0,666
<b>KP2</b>	0,906	0,922	0,932	0,673
<b>KP3</b>	0,779	0,842	0,857	0,538
<b>KP4</b>	0,734	0,751	0,894	0,650
<b>FP5</b>	0,737	0,759	0,900	0,643
<b>KPM1</b>	0,916	0,910	0,900	0,666

<b>KPM2</b>	0,926	0,922	0,913	0,673
<b>KPM3</b>	0,879	0,842	0,757	0,538
<b>KPM4</b>	0,900	0,818	0,759	0,667
<b>KPM5</b>	0,715	0,582	0,595	0,762
<b>PO1</b>	0,658	0,570	0,624	0,807
<b>PO2</b>	0,777	0,725	0,700	0,859
<b>PO3</b>	0,656	0,594	0,621	0,857
<b>PO4</b>	0,554	0,547	0,579	0,774
<b>PO5</b>	0,560	0,519	0,593	0,850
<b>PO6</b>	0,596	0,547	0,532	0,814
<b>PO7</b>	0,581	0,523	0,516	0,786
<b>PO8</b>	0,701	0,636	0,647	0,909

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

The results of *cross loading* showed that each indicator had the highest correlation value on the construct it measured compared to other constructs. Thus, it can be concluded that all constructs in this study have met the criteria for discriminant validity.

### **Composite Reliability Test Results**

Composite reliability tests are used to measure the consistency of indicators in a construct. The construct is declared reliable if the *composite reliability* value and Cronbach's Alpha are greater than 0.70. The results of reliability tests are presented in the following table.

**Table 3. Reliability and Validity of Constructs**

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
<b>Organizational Behavior (X1)</b>	0,937	0,948	0,694
<b>Leadership (X2)</b>	0,899	0,926	0,718
<b>Job Satisfaction (Z)</b>	0,871	0,921	0,795
<b>Employee Performance (Y)</b>	0,922	0,942	0,765

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

Based on the table, all variables have an AVE value above 0.50 and a *composite reliability* value and Cronbach's Alpha above 0.70. Thus, all constructs are declared reliable and meet the criteria of discriminant validity.

### **Evaluation of Structural Models (Inner Model)**

Coefficient of Determination Test (R<sup>2</sup>)

The  $R^2$  value is used to measure the magnitude of the influence of an independent latent variable on a dependent latent variable. The results of the  $R^2$  test are presented in the following table.

**Table 4. R Square Value**

Variable	R Square	Adjusted R Square
<b>Employee Performance (Y)</b>	0,956	0,954
<b>Job Satisfaction (Z)</b>	0,030	0,006

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

The Adjusted  $R^2$  value in the Employee Performance variable (Y) of 0.954 shows that Organizational Behavior (X1), Leadership (X2), and Job Satisfaction (Z) are simultaneously able to explain 95.4% of the variation in employee performance, which is classified as a very high category. Meanwhile, 4.6% of the variation in employee performance was influenced by other factors outside the research model. The  $R^2$  value of Job Satisfaction (Z) of 0.030 (Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.006$ ) indicates that Organizational Behavior and Leadership have a very small influence on job satisfaction, which reinforces the role of job satisfaction as an intervening variable.

### **Goodness of Fit Test**

The *Goodness of Fit test* aims to assess the extent to which the research model is in accordance with empirical data. An NFI value close to 1 indicates a good model.

**Table 5. Model Fit**

Criteria	Saturated Model	Estimated Model
<b>SRMR</b>	0,109	0,109
<b>d_ ULS</b>	2,764	2,764
<b>d_ G</b>	2,453	2,453
<b>Chi-Square</b>	759,436	759,436
<b>NFI</b>	0,783	0,783

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

The NFI value of 0.783 which is close to 1 indicates that the research model has a fairly good level of suitability and is suitable for hypothesis testing.

### **Hypothesis Testing**

Direct Impact Test Results

**Table 6. Path Coefficient (Direct Influence)**

Variable Relationships	Original Sample	T-Statistics	P-Values	Verdict
<b>X1 → Z</b>	-0,110	1,585	0,120	Rejected
<b>X1 → Y</b>	0,134	1,596	0,117	Rejected
<b>X2 → Z</b>	1,060	19,053	0,000	Accepted
<b>X2 → Y</b>	-0,254	0,884	0,381	Rejected
<b>Z → Y</b>	1,118	4,911	0,000	Accepted

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

The test results showed that Organizational Behavior (X1) did not have a significant effect on Job Satisfaction (Z) and Employee Performance (Y). Leadership (X2) has a positive and significant effect on Job Satisfaction (Z), but does not have a direct effect on Employee Performance (Y). Job Satisfaction (Z) has been proven to have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y).

*Indirect Influence Test Results (Intervening Variables)*

*Table 7. Indirect Influence*

Variable Relationships	Original Sample	T-Statistics	P-Values	Verdict
<b>X1 → Z → Y</b>	-0,123	1,341	0,186	Rejected
<b>X2 → Z → Y</b>	1,185	4,340	0,000	Accepted

Source: SmartPLS Output, 2025

Based on these results, Job Satisfaction (Z) plays a role as a partial intervening variable. Job satisfaction is able to mediate the relationship between Leadership (X2) and Employee Performance (Y), but it is unable to mediate the relationship between Organizational Behavior (X1) and Employee Performance (Y). In the context of the Sidikalang District Office, improving employee performance is more effectively achieved through improving the quality of leadership which has an impact on employee job satisfaction, while improving organizational behavior has not had a significant indirect influence on employee performance.

**Discussion**

The results of the direct influence analysis show that Leadership (X2) has a positive and significant influence on Employee Performance (Y), which is shown by the high and statistically significant value of the path coefficient. These findings indicate that effective leadership, which is reflected in the ability of leaders to provide direction, example, decision-making, and support to employees, plays an important role in improving employee performance. Employees who are led clearly and participatively tend to show more optimal performance because they have clarity of tasks, work motivation, and adequate organizational support. The results of this study are in line with the findings of

previous research which stated that leadership is one of the main determinants of employee performance in public organizations.

Furthermore, the results of the analysis show that Organizational Behavior (X1) does not have a significant effect directly on Employee Performance (Y). These findings indicate that organizational behavior reflected through norms, work habits, and interaction patterns between employees has not been directly able to drive performance improvement. This condition shows that even though organizational behavior has been formed, its influence on performance still requires other supporting factors to have a real impact. These results are in line with previous research that states that organizational behavior is often contextual and does not always have a direct impact on performance if it is not followed by a strong managerial and leadership system.

The results of the direct influence test also showed that Leadership (X2) had a positive and significant effect on Job Satisfaction (Z). These findings indicate that a good leadership style is able to create a sense of comfort, security, and value for employees, thereby increasing job satisfaction levels. Communicative and supportive leadership encourages employees to feel more satisfied with their work, both in terms of psychology and the work environment. These results support previous studies that affirm that leadership has a strategic role in shaping employee job satisfaction.

In contrast, Organizational Behavior (X1) did not show a significant influence on Job Satisfaction (Z). This indicates that the existing behavior patterns and work culture are not fully able to meet the expectations and needs of individual employees. Employee job satisfaction is more influenced by leadership factors, leadership policies, and reward systems than by general organizational behavior. These findings are in line with research that states that job satisfaction is more influenced by leadership factors and organizational policies than work norms or habits alone.

In the next path, the results of the analysis show that Job Satisfaction (Z) has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y). The Effect of Job Satisfaction (Z) on Employee Performance (Y) shows a path coefficient value of 1.118 with a T-Statistics value of  $4.911 > 1.96$  and P-Values of  $0.000 < 0.05$ , so it can be concluded that job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. A high coefficient value shows that job satisfaction has a very strong role in improving performance, where employees who feel satisfied with their work—both in terms of work environment, awards, working relationships, and leadership support—tend to show more optimal performance. Thus, the higher the level of employee job satisfaction, the more performance is produced, so that the hypothesis that job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on employee performance is accepted.

In the analysis of indirect influences (mediation), the results of the study showed that Job Satisfaction (Z) was able to mediate the relationship between Leadership (X2) and Employee Performance (Y) significantly. These findings indicate that good leadership not only has a direct impact on performance, but also indirectly improves performance through

increased employee job satisfaction. Thus, job satisfaction plays a role as an intervening variable that strengthens the influence of leadership on employee performance.

On the other hand, the results of the analysis showed that Job Satisfaction (Z) did not mediate the relationship between Organizational Behavior (X1) and Employee Performance (Y). This shows that organizational behavior is not able to improve employee performance through a job satisfaction mechanism. The influence of organizational behavior on performance tends to be weak and insignificant, both directly and indirectly. These findings show that improving organizational behavior alone is not enough to improve employee performance without effective leadership support and a supportive work system.

The results of this study confirm that Leadership is a key factor that directly and indirectly affects Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction, while Organizational Behavior has not shown a significant role in improving employee performance. The managerial implication of these findings is that improving employee performance within government organizations should be focused on strengthening leadership quality and efforts to improve employee job satisfaction, through effective communication, fair rewards, and the creation of a conducive work environment.

## Conclusion

Based on the results of the analysis of the structural model (inner model) using the SEM-PLS approach and the discussions that have been carried out, several conclusions can be drawn as follows:

1. Leadership has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance. The test results showed a T-Statistics value of  $> 1.96$  and P-Values  $< 0.05$ , so the hypothesis was accepted. A high path coefficient value indicates that leadership has an important role in improving employee performance. This indicates that the ability of leaders to provide direction, motivation, example, and appropriate decision-making is able to encourage employees to work more optimally in achieving performance targets at the Sidikalang Sub-district Office, Dairi Regency.
2. Organizational Behavior does not have a significant effect on Employee Performance. The test results showed a T-Statistics value of  $< 1.96$  and P-Values  $> 0.05$ , so the hypothesis was rejected. These findings show that organizational behavior reflected in norms, work habits, and interaction patterns between employees has not been able to directly improve employee performance. Thus, organizational behavior requires the support of other factors in order to have a real impact on improving performance.
3. Leadership has a positive and significant effect on Job Satisfaction. The results of the analysis showed a T-Statistics value of  $> 1.96$  and P-Values  $< 0.05$ , so the hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that effective leadership is able to create a sense of comfort, security, and value for employees, thereby increasing job

satisfaction levels. High job satisfaction reflects the success of leaders in managing human resources in a fair and participatory manner.

4. Organizational Behavior has no significant effect on Job Satisfaction. The T-Statistics value  $< 1.96$  and the P-Values  $> 0.05$  indicate that the hypothesis is rejected. These findings indicate that existing organizational behavior has not fully been able to meet the expectations and needs of employees in creating job satisfaction. Employee job satisfaction is more influenced by leadership factors and leadership policies than by organizational behavior in general.
5. Job Satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance. The test results showed a T-Statistics value of  $> 1.96$  and P-Values  $< 0.05$ , so the hypothesis was accepted. This shows that employees who have a high level of job satisfaction tend to show better performance. Job satisfaction encourages employees to work more responsibly, committed, and oriented towards achieving optimal work results.
6. Job Satisfaction mediates the relationship between Leadership and Employee Performance. The results of the indirect influence test showed a T-Statistics value of  $> 1.96$  and P-Values  $< 0.05$ , so the hypothesis was accepted. Thus, Job Satisfaction plays an intervening variable in the relationship between Leadership and Employee Performance. This shows that good leadership not only has a direct impact on performance, but also indirectly improves performance through increasing employee job satisfaction.
7. Job Satisfaction does not mediate the relationship between Organizational Behavior and Employee Performance. The T-Statistics value  $< 1.96$  and the P-Values  $> 0.05$  show that the indirect influence of Organizational Behavior on Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction is not significant. Thus, Job Satisfaction does not function as an intervening variable in the relationship.

The results of this study conclude that Leadership is the variable that has the most influence on Employee Performance, both directly and through Job Satisfaction, while Organizational Behavior has not shown a significant influence on Employee Performance, either directly or indirectly. This finding confirms that improving employee performance at the Sidikalang Sub-district Office, Dairi Regency is more effective through strengthening leadership quality and increasing employee job satisfaction.

### References

- Addurorul Muntatsiroh, S. H. (2024). Types of leadership types in an organization. *Economic Edu*, 4(2), 172–178.
- Anwar, D. H. P. (2023). WORK CULTURE, WORK MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION TO WORK COMMITMENTS. *International Journal of*

- Technology*, 47(1), 100950.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2019.01.002>  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cstp.2023.100950>  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.04.007>  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2021.102816>  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2020.03.015>  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j>
- Aprilia, A. L., Hartono, E., & Wibowo, S. N. (2022). The Effect of Conflict and Work Stress on Employee Job Satisfaction at Pt Pg Rajawali II Psa Palimanan Unit. *Scientific Journal of Business Economics*, 27(2), 274–288. <https://doi.org/10.35760/eb.2022.v27i2.4871>
- Candana, D. M. (2021). Determination of Work Performance and Job Satisfaction: Work Ethic and Work Discipline (A Review of Human Resource Management Literature). *Journal of Applied Management Sciences*, 2(4), 544–561. <https://doi.org/10.31933/jimt.v2i4.471>
- Darim, A. (2020). Organizational Behavior Management in Realizing Competent Human Resources. *Munaddhomah*, 1(1), 22–40. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v1i1.29>
- Dewi, A. D. (2020). The Effect of Training and Work Motivation on the Performance of Employees of Surya Solar Market Regional Companies. *University of Surabaya, July*, 1–23. [https://repository.um-surabaya.ac.id/3995/3/BAB\\_II.pdf](https://repository.um-surabaya.ac.id/3995/3/BAB_II.pdf)
- Diasmoro, O. (2017). The Relationship of Interpersonal Communication with Early Adult Employee Job Satisfaction in the Production Department of Pt. Gangsar Tulungagung. *Scientific Journal of Applied Psychology*, 05(01), 2301–8267.
- Ferine, K. F., Aditia, R., Rahmadana, M. F., & Indri. (2021). An empirical study of leadership, organizational culture, conflict, and work ethic in determining work performance in Indonesia's education authority. *Heliyon*, 7(7), e07698. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07698>
- Fitriadi, Y., Susanto, R., Irdam, & Wahyuni, R. (2022). The Contribution of Work Involvement to Employee Performance: The Role of Job Satisfaction Mediation. *Journal of Ecobistek*, 11, 448–453. <https://doi.org/10.35134/ekobistek.v11i4.446>
- Ghozali. (2018). *Application of Multivariate Analysis with IBM SPSS Program 25*. Publishing Agency of Diponegoro University.
- Ghozali & Latan. (2015). *Concepts, Techniques, and Applications Using Smart PLS 3.0 for Empirical Research*. BP Undip. SemarangHarnanto. 2017. *Cost Accounting: Historical Cost Systems*. BPFE.
- Ghozali, I. (2016). *Multivariate Analysis Applications with IBM SPSS 23 Program (8th Edition)*. Print VII. Publishing Agency of Diponegoro University.

- Hair, J.F., et al. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. SAGE Publications.
- Hamsyah, A. I., Hakim, L., & Razak, R. (2020). The Influence of Organizational Structure on the Quality of Public Services. *Journal of Public Administration, 1*, 1–6. <https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/kimap/index%0Adi>
- Hanafi (Syah Kuala University), A. S., Almy (Management and Science University), C., & Siregar (APP Polytechnic), M. T. (2018). The Influence of Leadership Style and Work Motivation on Employee Performance. *Journal of Industrial and Logistics Management, 2*(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.30988/jmil.v2i1.71>