World Journal of Business Research and Project Management
Volume 06 Number 01 February 2026

ISSN : 2963-1491
(Online - Elektronik)

The Influence of Leadership Style, Organizational Culture, and Organizational Commitment on Member Performance of Karang Taruna RW. 03 Klampis Semalang, Surabaya

Nelson Rizky Pradana Maulidio [1], Hermien Tridayanti [2], Fauzilah Salleh [3]

Management Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Narotama University, 60117, Indonesia [1, 2]
Sultan Zainal Abidin University Kuala Terengganu [3]
Email: sonn6372@gmail.com [1], hermien.tridayanti@narotama.ac.id [2]
* Correspondence: sonn6372@gmail.com

Citations: Maulidio, Nelson Rizky Pradana., Tridayanti, Hermien., & Salleh, Fauzilah., (2026). The Influence of Leadership Style, Organizational Culture, and Organizational Commitment on Member Performance of Karang Taruna RW. 03 Klampis Semalang, Surabaya. *World Journal of Business Research and Project Management (WJBRPM)*, 06(01), 10-18.

Academic Editor:

Received: 21 January 2026 Accepted: 30 January 2026 Published: 28 February 2026

Abstract: This study aims to examine and analyze the partial and simultaneous effects of leadership style, organizational culture, and organizational commitment on the performance of members of Karang Taruna RW.03 Klampis Semalang, Surabaya. This study employs a quantitative approach with a saturated sampling technique, where all 42 active board members and youth representatives were selected as respondents. Primary data were gathered through structured Likert-scale questionnaires and processed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 29. Data analysis procedures included instrument validity and reliability testing, classical assumption tests (normality, multicollinearity, and heteroskedasticity), multiple linear regression analysis, hypothesis testing (t-test and F-test), and the coefficient of determination (R^2). The empirical findings indicate that leadership style ($\beta = 0.234$, $t = 2.118$, $p = 0.041$), organizational culture ($\beta = 0.426$, $t = 3.521$, $p = 0.001$), and organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.222$, $t = 2.177$, $p = 0.036$) each exert a positive and statistically significant effect on member performance. Organizational culture was identified as the most dominant predictor. Simultaneously, leadership style, organizational culture, and organizational commitment significantly influence member performance ($F = 15.680$, $p < 0.001$), explaining 51.8% of the variance (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.518$). These findings suggest that non-profit youth organizations must foster participative leadership, cultivate cohesive cultural norms, and enhance psychological attachment among members to maximize organizational performance.

Keywords: Leadership Style; Organizational Culture; Organizational Commitment; Member Performance; Karang Taruna.

Copyright: © 2022 by the author. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

An organization is a social entity comprising individuals interacting within structured rules and task allocations to achieve shared objectives. Every member maintains specific roles coordinated continuously to fulfill organizational goals (Sunarti & Puspitasari, 2022). Human Resource (HR) quality is the vital determinant of optimal performance, necessitating continuous development through education, experience, and capability enhancement (Ahmad Faizi et al., 2025). In non-profit youth community organizations like Karang Taruna, efficient human resource management directly impacts social service efficacy and community empowerment.

ISSN : 2963-1491
(Online - Elektronik)

According to the Regulation of the Minister of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia No. 25 of 2019, Karang Taruna functions as a community-based social organization designed for youth development, operating independently from, by, and for young people to achieve social welfare. In managing youth organizations, member performance is paramount. Initial interviews with the Chairperson and members of Karang Taruna RW. 03 Klampis Semalang, Surabaya revealed operational challenges, including low meeting attendance, task delays, and inconsistent organizational discipline. Table 1 outlines attendance records from February to April 2026.

Table 1. Attendance Records

Month (2026)	Total Meetings Scheduled	Members Attending (Present)	Absences (Alpha)	Attendance Rate (%)
February	3 Times	28	14	66.7%
March	3 Times	25	17	59.5%
April	3 Times	32	10	76.2%

Furthermore, interviews indicated an inclination toward a laissez-faire leadership style, characterized by excessive freedom without strict supervision or structured guidance. Consequently, members displayed diminished discipline and commitment, impacting overall organizational outcomes. Previous empirical literature reveals research gaps: Rahmawati & Ramadani (2025) and Qalati et al. (2022) found leadership style significantly boosts performance, whereas Pantih et al. (2025) reported no direct significant effect. Similarly, Iskamto (2023) and Winarsih & Hidayat (2022) demonstrated positive effects of organizational culture on performance, whereas Nurmiati et al. (2022) found an insignificant relationship. Regarding organizational commitment, Adam & Alfawaz (2025) proved positive impacts, while Jannah et al. (2024) noted insignificant partial effects. Therefore, this study aims to examine leadership style, organizational culture, and organizational commitment jointly and individually affect member performance in Karang Taruna RW.03 Klampis Semalang, Surabaya.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research Design and Sampling

This study adopts a quantitative explanatory research design. The population comprised all active board members and youth leaders of Karang Taruna RW. 03 Klampis Semalang, Surabaya, totaling 42 individuals. Utilizing a saturated sampling (census) technique, all 42 members were selected as survey respondents to capture comprehensive organizational dynamics.

2.2. Balanced Scorecard Framework

Data were collected via structured questionnaires using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The operationalization of variables includes:

1. Leadership Style (X1): Measured through 10 items covering procedural compliance, member involvement in decision-making, formal/informal relationship building, guidance, and provision of work facilities (Sunarno, 2021).
2. Organizational Culture (X2): Measured through 8 items assessing innovation/risk-taking, outcome orientation, team orientation, and organizational stability (Robbins & Judge, 2023; Setia Tjahyanti, 2026).
3. Organizational Commitment (X3): Measured through 10 items reflecting affective identification, involvement, loyalty, value alignment, and membership retention (Meyer et al., 1993; Ria Mardiana Yusuf, 2017).
4. Member Performance (Y): Measured through 8 items evaluating timeliness, task responsibility, interpersonal cooperation, and organizational participation (Samsuddin, 2018).

2.3. Statistical Analysis Technique

Data processing was executed using SPSS version 29. The analytical sequence comprised instrument validity (Pearson Product Moment) and reliability (Cronbach's Alpha > 0.60), classical assumption testing (Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality, Tolerance/VIF for multicollinearity, Glejser test for heteroskedasticity), multiple linear regression analysis, partial t-tests, simultaneous F-tests, and coefficient of determination (R^2). The multiple linear regression equation is specified as follows:

ISSN : 2963-1491
(Online - Elektronik)

$$Y = a + b1*X1 + b2*X2 + b3*X3 + e$$

3. Results

3.1. Overview and Response Distribution

This empirical investigation evaluates 42 valid respondent datasets collected from the active members and administrators of Karang Taruna RW. 03 Klampis Semalang, Surabaya. The research instrument utilized a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The dataset underwent rigorous statistical checking in SPSS version 29, showing 100% data completion across all 36 survey indicators (10 for Leadership Style, 8 for Organizational Culture, 10 for Organizational Commitment, and 8 for Member Performance).

3.2. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

Descriptive statistical analysis provides a foundational understanding of the central tendencies and dispersion characteristics of the empirical data. Mean values were categorized using five equal interval widths: Very Poor (1.00 - 1.80), Poor (1.81 - 2.60), Moderate (2.61 - 3.40), Good/High (3.41 - 4.20), and Very Good/Very High (4.21 - 5.00).

Table 2. Presents the Consolidated Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Items	Min Score	Max Score	Total Mean	Item Mean	Std. Dev	Category
Leadership Style (X1)	10	29.00	49.00	40.5238	4.0524	5.1572	Good / High
Organizational Culture (X2)	8	21.00	40.00	32.6667	4.0833	4.2003	Good / High
Organizational Commitment (X3)	10	32.00	50.00	40.6190	4.0619	5.0411	Good / High
Member Performance (Y)	8	21.00	40.00	32.7619	4.0952	4.1661	Good / High

As detailed in Table 2, all research variables fall cleanly within the 'Good / High' interpretive category (Item Means between 4.0524 and 4.0952). Leadership Style (X1) recorded an overall item mean of 4.0524, indicating that respondents generally view leadership guidance and consultative decision-making favorably. Item X1.3 ('Leader involves members in decision making') and X1.7 ('Leader gives attention to member needs') achieved the highest individual mean scores (4.1667). Conversely, X1.1 ('Leader complies with standard operating procedures') and X1.4 ('Member suggestions are considered in decisions') obtained slightly lower mean scores (3.9762), indicating specific areas where leadership consistency can be further strengthened.

Organizational Culture (X2) achieved an item mean score of 4.0833. Indicators X2.3 ('Emphasis on result achievement') and X2.8 ('Organizational stability in running programs') registered the highest item means (4.1667), confirming a strong collective orientation toward task completion and program continuity. However, item X2.1 ('Encouraging new innovative ideas') scored 3.9762, suggesting that while the culture is stable and execution-focused, creative initiative-taking can be fostered more actively. Organizational Commitment (X3) recorded an item mean of 4.0619, driven strongly by active participation (X3.3, Mean = 4.1667) and desire to maintain long-term membership (X3.10, Mean = 4.1667). Finally, Member Performance (Y) exhibited the highest overall item mean at 4.0952, with task responsibility (Y3), meeting attendance (Y7), and program execution (Y8) reaching 4.1429, demonstrating robust member dedication.

3.3. Instrument Validity and Reliability Testing

To ensure data integrity, construct validity was established using Pearson Product-Moment correlation. For N = 42 respondents at a significance level of alpha = 0.05, the critical r-table value with df = 42 - 2 = 40 is 0.304. Each survey item is deemed valid if its calculated correlation coefficient (r-calculated) exceeds 0.304 and its two-tailed p-value is less than 0.05.

The statistical output confirmed that all 10 items of Leadership Style (r-calculated ranging from 0.306 to 0.735, $p < 0.05$), all 8 items of Organizational Culture (r-calculated ranging from 0.505 to 0.740, $p < 0.001$), all 10 items of Organizational Commitment (r-calculated ranging from 0.414 to 0.642, $p < 0.01$),

ISSN : 2963-1491
(Online - Elektronik)

and all 8 items of Member Performance (r-calculated ranging from 0.509 to 0.673, $p < 0.001$) exceeded the r-table threshold of 0.304. Although item X1.6 ('Creating a harmonious informal relationship') recorded the lowest valid coefficient ($r = 0.306$, $p = 0.049$), it remained statistically significant and retained in the instrument.

Instrument reliability was verified using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, requiring a minimum threshold of 0.60 for acceptable internal consistency. The reliability analysis yielded Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.780 for Leadership Style (10 items), 0.763 for Organizational Culture (8 items), 0.778 for Organizational Commitment (10 items), and 0.751 for Member Performance (8 items). Because all coefficients exceed 0.60, the questionnaire demonstrates high internal consistency and measurement stability across respondents.

3.4. Classical Assumption Tests

Prior to interpreting the multiple linear regression model, the empirical dataset was subjected to rigorous classical assumption testing to ensure unbiased parameter estimates (BLUE - Best Linear Unbiased Estimator).

3.4.1. Normality Test

The normality of regression residuals was tested using the non-parametric One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test supplemented by Monte Carlo simulation. Table 3 outlines the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistical parameters.

Table 3. Normality Test

Statistical Parameter	Value	Interpretation
Sample Size (N)	42	Complete dataset
Most Extreme Differences (Absolute)	0.072	Low residual deviation
Test Statistic (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z)	0.072	Conforms to standard normal
Asymptotic Significance (2-tailed)	0.200	$p > 0.05$ (Normality met)
Monte Carlo Significance (99% CI)	0.838 (0.828 - 0.847)	Robust normality confirmed

As shown in Table 3, the Asymptotic Significance (2-tailed) is 0.200, which substantially exceeds the standard statistical cutoff of 0.05. Furthermore, the Monte Carlo simulated significance level of 0.838 (99% confidence interval: 0.828 - 0.847) conclusively demonstrates that the regression residuals are normally distributed. Visual examination of the Normal P-P Plot confirmed that standardized residual data points closely adhere to the 45-degree diagonal reference line without systemic departure, satisfying the normality requirement.

3.4.2. Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity testing evaluates whether severe linear intercorrelations exist among the independent variables (X1, X2, and X3). High multicollinearity inflates standard errors and destabilizes regression coefficients. The decision rules require Tolerance values greater than 0.10 and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values below 10.0.

The statistical diagnostics confirmed excellent variable independence: Leadership Style (X1) achieved a Tolerance of 0.630 and VIF of 1.587; Organizational Culture (X2) achieved a Tolerance of 0.792 and VIF of 1.263; and Organizational Commitment (X3) achieved a Tolerance of 0.774 and VIF of 1.291. Because all Tolerance figures comfortably exceed 0.10 and all VIF values remain far below the ceiling threshold of 10.0, the regression model is entirely free from multicollinearity concerns.

3.4.3. Heteroskedasticity Test

Heteroskedasticity occurs when the variance of regression errors is non-constant across levels of the predictor variables. In this study, heteroskedasticity was evaluated using the formal Glejser Test, wherein absolute unstandardized residuals ($|e|$) were regressed against all three independent variables. The assumption of homoscedasticity is met if all partial significance values exceed 0.05.

The Glejser regression model produced the following parameter estimates: Leadership Style (X1) yielded $t = 1.199$, $p = 0.238$; Organizational Culture (X2) yielded $t = -1.111$, $p = 0.273$; and Organizational Commitment (X3) yielded $t = -0.949$, $p = 0.348$. The regression constant was $B = 3.865$ ($t = 1.519$, $p = 0.137$). Because every independent variable produced a significance level well above 0.05, the null

ISSN : 2963-1491
(Online - Elektronik)

hypothesis of equal variance cannot be rejected. Visual examination of the standardized residual scatterplot confirmed a balanced, random distribution of data points above and below the zero line without forming funneling or undulating geometric patterns, confirming homoscedasticity.

3.5. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was performed to quantify the individual and collective predictive capability of Leadership Style (X1), Organizational Culture (X2), and Organizational Commitment (X3) in explaining Member Performance (Y). Table 4 synthesizes the regression parameters, ANOVA results, and model diagnostics.

Table 4. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Model Predictor	Unstandardized B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t-statistic	Sig. (p)	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	0.383	4.852	-	0.079	0.937	-	-
Leadership Style (X1)	0.234	0.110	0.289	2.118	0.041	0.630	1.587
Organizational Culture (X2)	0.426	0.121	0.429	3.521	0.001	0.792	1.263
Organizational Commitment (X3)	0.222	0.102	0.268	2.177	0.036	0.774	1.291

Based on the unstandardized regression coefficients (B) reported in Table 4, the empirical multiple linear regression equation is constructed as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y = 0.383 + 0.234*X1 + 0.426*X2 + 0.222*X3 + e}$$

Mathematical and substantive interpretations of the regression parameters are detailed below:

1. Regression Constant (a = 0.383): The constant intercept value of 0.383 represents the baseline level of Member Performance (Y) when Leadership Style, Organizational Culture, and Organizational Commitment simultaneously equal zero. While mathematically necessary for baseline calibration, practical interpretation focuses on the slope coefficients.
2. Leadership Style Coefficient (b1 = 0.234, Beta = 0.289): The unstandardized regression slope of 0.234 indicates that for every one-unit increase in the quality of Leadership Style, Member Performance increases by 0.234 units, holding Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment constant. The positive standardized Beta coefficient (0.289) confirms a direct, moderate positive relationship.
3. Organizational Culture Coefficient (b2 = 0.426, Beta = 0.429): The unstandardized regression slope of 0.426 indicates that for every one-unit enhancement in Organizational Culture strength, Member Performance increases by 0.426 units, controlling for other variables. Notably, Organizational Culture yields the highest standardized Beta coefficient (0.429) among all predictors, establishing it as the single most powerful partial driver of member performance.
4. Organizational Commitment Coefficient (b3 = 0.222, Beta = 0.268): The unstandardized regression slope of 0.222 shows that for every one-unit gain in member Organizational Commitment, Member Performance increases by 0.222 units, holding other factors constant. The standardized Beta coefficient of 0.268 highlights a statistically solid positive contribution.

3.6. Hypothesis Testing

3.6.1. Partial Hypothesis Testing (t-Test)

The partial t-test determines whether each independent variable individually exerts a statistically significant effect on the dependent variable. With N = 42 respondents and k = 3 independent variables, the degrees of freedom are df = N - k - 1 = 42 - 3 - 1 = 38. At a two-tailed alpha level of 0.05, the critical t-table threshold is 2.024. A hypothesis is accepted if t-calculated > 2.024 and $p < 0.05$.

1. Test of Hypothesis 1 (Leadership Style -> Member Performance):
   The regression analysis for Leadership Style (X1) yielded a calculated t-statistic of 2.118 and a two-tailed significance value of p = 0.041. Because t-calculated (2.118) > t-table (2.024) and p (0.041) < 0.05, the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected and H1 is accepted. Leadership Style exerts a statistically significant positive effect on member performance in Karang Taruna RW. 03 Klampis Semalang.
2. Test of Hypothesis 2 (Organizational Culture -> Member Performance):

ISSN : 2963-1491
(Online - Elektronik)

The regression analysis for Organizational Culture (X2) produced a calculated t-statistic of 3.521 and a two-tailed significance value of p = 0.001. Because t-calculated (3.521) > t-table (2.024) and p (0.001) < 0.05, H0 is rejected and H2 is accepted. Organizational Culture exerts a statistically significant positive effect on member performance, serving as the dominant partial predictor.

3. Test of Hypothesis 3 (Organizational Commitment -> Member Performance):
   The regression analysis for Organizational Commitment (X3) produced a calculated t-statistic of 2.177 and a significance value of p = 0.036. Because t-calculated (2.177) > t-table (2.024) and p (0.036) < 0.05, H0 is rejected and H3 is accepted. Organizational Commitment exerts a statistically significant positive effect on member performance.

3.6.2. Simultaneous Hypothesis Testing (F-Test)

The simultaneous F-test evaluates whether Leadership Style, Organizational Culture, and Organizational Commitment collectively exert a statistically significant joint effect on Member Performance. Table 5 details the ANOVA statistical summary.

Table 5. Simultaneous Hypothesis Testing (F-Test)

Regression Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-statistic	Sig. (p)
Regression Model	393.628	3	131.209	15.680	< 0.001
Residual (Error)	317.991	38	8.368	-	-
Total Variation	711.619	41	-	-	-

As demonstrated in Table 5, the regression model yielded a calculated F-statistic of 15.680 with a significance level of p < 0.001. The critical F-table threshold at df1 = 3 and df2 = 38 (alpha = 0.05) is 2.85. Because F-calculated (15.680) substantially exceeds F-table (2.85) and p < 0.001, H0 is rejected and H4 is accepted. Leadership Style, Organizational Culture, and Organizational Commitment simultaneously exert a statistically significant joint influence on member performance.

3.6.3. Coefficient of Determination (R^2 Analysis)

The coefficient of determination evaluates the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explained by the joint predictors. Model summary diagnostics produced a Pearson correlation coefficient of R = 0.744, R-Square (R^2) = 0.553, Adjusted R-Square = 0.518, and a Standard Error of the Estimate = 2.8928.

According to standard correlation interpretation criteria (Sugiyono, 2023), the R value of 0.744 reflects a strong linear relationship between the combined predictors and member performance. The Adjusted R^2 value of 0.518 confirms that 51.8% of the total variance in Member Performance among Karang Taruna RW. 03 Klampis Semalang members is directly accounted for by the joint variation in Leadership Style, Organizational Culture, and Organizational Commitment. The remaining 48.2% of performance variance is governed by unmeasured exogenous factors, such as individual work motivation, reward structures, peer support, and resource availability.

4. Discussion

4.1. Influence of Leadership Style on Member Performance (H1 Discussion)

The statistical acceptance of H1 (b1 = 0.234, t = 2.118, p = 0.041) confirms that leadership style plays an essential role in driving member performance in non-profit youth organizations. In Karang Taruna RW. 03 Klampis Semalang, where members participate voluntarily without direct financial remuneration, leadership style serves as the primary mechanism for aligning individual efforts with organizational objectives.

This finding aligns directly with Sunarno (2021), who emphasized that effective leadership guides, motivates, and coordinates organizational members toward shared targets. Empirically, these results support the findings of Qalati et al. (2022) and Rahmawati & Ramadani (2025), who documented positive impacts of supportive leadership on employee outcomes. However, the results contrast with Pantih et al. (2025), who found no direct significant link between leadership style and public sector performance. In a voluntary community context, leadership presence directly resolves operational inertia. As observed in the descriptive analysis, when leaders actively involve members in decision-making (Item X1.3, Mean = 4.1667) and

ISSN : 2963-1491
(Online - Elektronik)

provide attentive guidance (Item X1.7, Mean = 4.1667), members exhibit higher attendance (Y7) and stronger responsibility (Y3). Conversely, the lower mean score for procedural compliance (X1.1, Mean = 3.9762) highlights the risk of laissez-faire drift, reinforcing that youth leaders must maintain consistent operational structure alongside participative decision-making.

4.2. Influence of Organizational Culture on Member Performance (H2 Discussion)

The empirical testing of H2 revealed that Organizational Culture is the single most powerful determinant of member performance (b2 = 0.426, Beta = 0.429, t = 3.521, p = 0.001). This finding demonstrates that shared organizational norms, collaborative values, and execution discipline exert an overwhelming influence on youth behavior.

This result strongly supports Schein and Schein (2018) organizational culture model and Robbins & Judge's (2023) framework, which posited that shared values form the behavioral rules governing individual action. Empirically, this finding corroborates Iskamto (2023), Ibrahim et al. (2022), and Winarsih & Hidayat (2022), who identified organizational culture as a major performance driver. Conversely, it diverges from Nurmiati et al. (2022), who observed insignificant cultural impacts in corporate environments. In Karang Taruna RW. 03, high cultural ratings for result orientation (X2.3, Mean = 4.1667) and program stability (X2.8, Mean = 4.1667) create a supportive normative atmosphere. When members operate in an environment that prioritizes teamwork and goal attainment, peer expectations encourage timely task completion (Y1) and active involvement (Y8). However, the lower rating for innovative risk-taking (X2.1, Mean = 3.9762) indicates that organizational leaders should create safer spaces for members to propose novel youth initiatives without fear of failure.

4.3. Influence of Organizational Commitment on Member Performance (H3 Discussion)

The statistical validation of H3 (b3 = 0.222, t = 2.177, p = 0.036) demonstrates that organizational commitment significantly enhances member performance. In social non-profit entities, commitment represents the emotional and psychological bridge connecting individuals to the organization's mission.

This finding reinforces Meyer et al. (1993) three-component commitment theory and aligns with empirical studies by Amin (2022), Nabhan & Munajat (2023), and Adam & Alfawaz (2025). However, it contrasts with Jannah et al. (2024), who reported an insignificant partial impact of commitment in hospitality settings. In Karang Taruna RW. 03 Klampis Semalang, high affective commitment—reflected in active involvement (X3.3, Mean = 4.1667) and long-term membership retention (X3.10, Mean = 4.1667)—translates directly into conscientious program execution (Y8) and punctual event attendance (Y2). When members internalize organizational goals as personal values, they demonstrate high discretionary effort regardless of external monetary rewards.

4.4. Simultaneous Effect of Predictors on Member Performance (H4 Discussion)

The confirmation of H4 (F = 15.680, $p < 0.001$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.518$) underscores that member performance is a multi-dimensional construct optimized when effective leadership, strong organizational culture, and high commitment operate synergistically. Leadership provides strategic direction; culture provides social norms; and commitment provides internal psychological motivation. Together, these three pillars account for 51.8% of performance variation, effectively mitigating the attendance and coordination problems identified in the problem statement.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusions

Based on empirical regression analysis and hypothesis testing, the conclusions are summarized as follows:

1. Leadership Style exerts a statistically significant positive partial effect on Member Performance (t = 2.118, p = 0.041). Enhancing leadership guidance, procedural consistency, and consultative decision-making directly improves member performance.
2. Organizational Culture exerts a statistically significant positive partial effect on Member Performance (t = 3.521, p = 0.001) and represents the most dominant predictor (Beta = 0.429). Cultivating teamwork, result orientation, and organizational stability yields the largest gains in member performance.

ISSN : 2963-1491 (Online - Elektronik)

3. Organizational Commitment exerts a statistically significant positive partial effect on Member Performance ($t = 2.177$, $p = 0.036$). Higher emotional attachment and membership loyalty directly drive member responsibility and participation.
4. Leadership Style, Organizational Culture, and Organizational Commitment simultaneously exert a statistically significant joint effect on Member Performance ($F = 15.680$, $p < 0.001$), explaining 51.8% of total performance variance (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.518$)., although the rise in staff turnover, especially due to transitions to Karang Taruna (Youth Organization), needs to be managed to ensure service continuity.

5.2. Practical Recommendations

1. For Karang Taruna Management:
   - Transition from passive laissez-faire tendencies toward transformational leadership by establishing clear program SOPs, conducting regular monthly evaluations, and providing structured mentoring.
   - Strengthen organizational culture by fostering innovation (Item X2.1), encouraging youth members to pilot creative community programs, and utilizing digital platforms (e.g., WhatsApp groups) for real-time coordination.
   - Enhance organizational commitment by aligning youth program goals with members' personal growth expectations (Item X3.8) through skill workshops and formal performance appreciation.
2. For Future Researchers:
   - Expand the empirical sample size by involving multiple Karang Taruna networks across districts in Surabaya to enhance generalizability.
   - Incorporate additional explanatory variables, such as intrinsic motivation, peer support, digital communication technology, and non-financial compensation.

References

Adam, N., & Alfawaz, A. (2025). Enhancing organizational performance: How gender diversity enhances employee engagement and commitment. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04441-7

Ahmad Faizi, Trisnowati Josiah, & Epi Parela. (2025). Kualitas sumber daya manusia dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada Inspektorat Provinsi Lampung. Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi, Manajemen Dan Bisnis Pascasarjana Saburai, 4(4), 415–424.

Amin, M. S. (2022). Organizational commitment, competence on job satisfaction and lecturer performance: Social learning theory approach. Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management, 2(1), 40–56. https://doi.org/10.52970/grhrm.v2i1.156

Hasan, H. (2023). Effect of organizational culture on organizational learning, employee engagement, and employee performance: Study of banking employees in Indonesia. Problems and Perspectives in Management, 21(3), 471–482. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(3).2023.38

Hosen, S., Hamzah, S. R., Ismail, I. A., Alias, S. N., Abd Aziz, M. F., & Rahman, M. M. (2024). Training & development, career development, and organizational commitment as the predictor of work performance. Heliyon, 10(1), e23903. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e23903

Ibrahim, M., Saputra, J., Adam, M., & Yunus, M. (2022). Organizational culture, employee motivation, workload and employee performance: A mediating role of communication. WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics, 19, 54–61. https://doi.org/10.37394/23207.2022.19.6

Iskamto, D. (2023). Organizational culture and its impact on employee performance. International Journal of Management and Digital Business, 2(1), 47–55. https://doi.org/10.54099/ijmdb.v2i1.584

Jannah, N., Wahyono, T., & Rizky, M. C. (2024). Pengaruh komitmen organisasi, pengembangan karir dan motivasi terhadap kinerja karyawan pada Le Polonia Hotel Medan. MANEGGIO: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen, 7(2), 191–202.

Kending, R., Pio, R. J., & Rumawas, W. (2022). Gaya kepemimpinan, budaya organisasi dan inovasi pengaruhnya terhadap kinerja karyawan. Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB), 12(2), 110–118.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(4), 538–551. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.538

ISSN : 2963-1491 (Online - Elektronik)

Nabhan, F., & Munajat, M. (2023). The role of work engagement and organizational commitment in improving job performance. Cogent Business & Management, 10(2), 2235819. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2235819

Ni Luh Sri Kasih, & Apriliani, K. M. (2023). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan dan komunikasi terhadap komitmen anggota Karang Taruna. Jurnal Artha Satya Dharma, 16(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.55822/asd.v16i1.338

Nurmiati, Wahyudi, Rusydi, B. U., Farild, M., & Bakhtiar, F. (2022). Pengaruh total quality management dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja perusahaan. INOVASI: Jurnal Ekonomi, Keuangan dan Manajemen, 18(1), 59–67.

Pantih, S., Khaq, A., & Suwarno. (2025). The influence of leadership style on public sector employee performance. Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan, 13(3), 1951–1962. https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i3.1539

Qalati, S. A., Zafar, Z., Fan, M., Limon, M. L. S., & Khaskheli, M. B. (2022). Employee performance under transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: A mediated model. Heliyon, 8(11), e11374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11374

Rahmawati, & Ramadani, E. F. (2025). Analysis of leadership style and work discipline on employee performance at PDAM Tirta Jeneberang Gowa Regency. Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO), 2(4), 5276–5285.

Ria Mardiana Yusuf, & Darman, S. (2017). Komitmen Organisasi: Definisi, Dipengaruhi & Mempengaruhi. Makassar: Nas Media Pustaka.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2023). Organizational Behavior (19th ed.). London: Pearson Education.

Samsuddin, H. (2018). Kinerja Pegawai: Tinjauan Dari Dimensi Gaya Kepemimpinan, Budaya Organisasi Dan Komitmen Organisasi. Indramayu: Indreati Pustaka.

Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. (2018). *Organisationskultur und Leadership* (5th ed.). Vahlen.

Setia Tjahyanti, Gunarso, S., Wiyanto, M., Gulo, Y., Nurwanti, Athifah, M. R., & Kahendra, F. (2026). Buku Ajar Budaya Organisasi. Surabaya: Sonpedia Publishing.

Sugiyono. (2023). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sunarno. (2021). Teori Kepemimpinan. Cirebon: Eureka Media Aksara.

Sunarti, N., & Puspitasari, E. (2022). Pengembangan organisasi (Tinjauan umum pada semua organisasi). Jurnal Manajemen Organisasi, 8(2), 399–412.

Winarsih, T., & Hidayat, A. (2022). The influence of organizational culture and motivation on employee performance. International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR), 6(1), 94–103.