

Relationship between Corporate Culture, Leader Behavior and Personality with Employees' Environmental Performance

^aEndah Setyaningrum, ^bI Made Putrawan

^aStudent, State University of Jakarta, Indonesia

^bProfessor at State University of Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This research is aim at determining relationship between corporate culture, leader behavior and personality with employee's environmental performance at Jakarta Industrial Park. The method used was survey with a correlational study by involving 85 sample. There were four instruments which measured environmental performance (rel. .927), corporate culture (rel. .924), leader behavior (rel. .926), and personality (rel. .931). Data has been analyzed by two-way ANOVA. Research results revealed that there is positive and significant correlation among those variables, even though it has been controlled by second-order correlation, it is still significant among them. Therefore, it could be concluded that if employees environmental performance would be improved, then employees corporate culture, leader behavior, and personality should be taken into consideration.

KEYWORDS: corporate culture, leader behavior, employee's environmental performance

Introduction

Environmental destruction today is very alarming. Natural disasters such as floods, landslides, rainy seasons and drought in the dry season have become a common phenomenon seen and heard. In line with that proposed by Jing Zhang (2014: 19-28), The occurrence of the phenomenon of climate change (climate change) is a global issue that has led to a number of risks to the environment system (natural system) and human (social system). This will be exacerbated by the concomitant increase in human activity. Furthermore, according to Robertson and Barling (2013: 176), organizations also contribute significantly to climate change. Thus the need for the environmental performance of employees (employee's environmental performance) in raising awareness for each organization/corporation to contribute to minimizing environmental damage.

The previous research as a reference of research conducted by researchers is by Pascal Paile, Yang Chen, Olivier Boiral and Jiajie Jin (2013: 1-82). The results of research, that the environmental performance itself can be evaluated by setting indicators such as pollution prevention, waste minimization, recycling activities, and so forth. Furthermore, research by Bakker, Tims and Derks (2012: 1360-1361), states that some studies have revealed positive personalities in employees showing good job performance as well. Research conducted by Takashi Mino and Keisuke Hanaki (2013: 19-23), that the development of environmental leadership can holistically face the existing environmental problems. Environmental leaders promote the sustainability of

environmental issues to protect the natural environment in decision-making and action processes. The existence of this research is to examine employees' environmental performance, corporate culture, leader behavior, and personality.

Based on some of the International Journal mentioned above, the novelty in this research on employee's environmental performance which is related to corporate culture, leader behavior and personality. This is based on an institution or organization that cares about the environment around it is highly dependent on how leaders have commitment and leadership in positioning themselves as top managers in the implementation of management functions, , So as to improve the environmental performance of the institution (Boiralet.al., 2014: 177).Although environmental leadership is generally regarded as a prerequisite for environmental improvement in greening institutions, few studies focus on management systems and the ability to influence sustainability commitments. So in improving employee's environmental performance, leaders need to be oriented toward sustainable environmental awareness.

In an integrated model of organizational or institutional behavior, according to (Colquitt et al, 2011), leaders and employees as individuals can be assessed from individual outcomes of job performance or behavior that contributes to good or bad and organizational commitment (organizational performance) is strong or weak individual desires in the organization or institution. There are several factors affecting individual achievement (individual outcomes) within an organization. Individual characteristic factors are personality and group mechanisms, one of which is leadership behaviors.

Colquitt, et.al (2017) says that, *“employees' environmental performance is value of a set of employee's behavior related to how they perceive in contributing positively toward their desire to preserve the environment”*. So employee's environmental performance is the value of a set of employee behaviors related to how they view in making a positive contribution to their desire to preserve the environment. According to Vecchio (2006: 342), *“organization culture as a philosophy that underlies as organization's policy and as the shared values and norms that exist in an organization and that taught to incoming employees”*. So corporate culture is a philosophy that underlines an organizational policy and things that are normative.

According to Robbins and Judge (2013: 368-371), leadership is the ability to influence a group of people in achieving a vision or set of goals. In the Trait theories of leadership, one's leadership is seen in one's quality and character. Whereas in behavioral theory of leadership, subordinates see the leader from the aspect of initiating structure is how far the leader explains the plan and the role of the subordinate and the attention (consideration), that is how far the leader builds friendship relationship with the staff to trust each other (mutual trust), attention to the ideas of subordinates (respect for employee's). From some research, 66% of staff are motivated by the attention of the leadership.

According to Ahmad, Ather and Hussain (2014: 572-574), personality traits can be understood as a description of a person based on psychological factors that vary in degree. There are five basic studies of big five personality, namely conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness and openness. Based on the description, the researcher is interested in conducting research on the relationship between corporate

culture, leader behavior and personality with employees' environmental performance, correlational study on employees at East Jakarta Industrial Park (EJIP) Cikarang in 2016.

Research Methodology

The purpose of the research to find a positive relationship between corporate culture with employee's environmental performance; between leader behavior and employee's environmental performance; between personality and employee's environmental performance; and between corporate culture, leader behavior, and personality together with the employee's environmental performance.

This research used survey method. Sampling is done by simple random sampling. The method used was survey with a correlational study by involving 85 sample. The technique of validity testing of grains is done by determining the correlation coefficient between grain score and total score. Determination was using product moment correlation formula. While to determine the coefficient of instrument reliability is calculated by using cronbach alpha formula. There were four instruments which measured environmental performance (rel. .927), corporate culture (rel. .924), leader behavior (rel. .926), and personality (rel. .931). Testing requirements analysis consisting of normality test and homogeneity test. Normality test in this research is Lilliefors test. Homogeneity test is done to see the degree of difference or variation of individual data values that exist in the data set. Homogeneity test was done by Bartlett.

Data analysis in this research is done by descriptive statistic and inferential statistic. Descriptive statistics are used to describe data of research variables, among others, in the form of mean, median, mode, range, and standard deviation. Descriptively, data is also displayed in the form of frequency distribution and histogram. Inferential statistics are used to test hypotheses using correlation and regression techniques.

Testing the first, second and third hypotheses each performed with a simple correlation and regression technique is the product moment of Pearson. Meanwhile, the fourth hypothesis testing is done by correlation and multiple regression techniques. In addition to testing the hypothesis, in the analysis is also done testing the correlation coefficient by controlling certain independent variables in stages to other independent variables called partial correlation coefficient.

Research Findings and Discussion

The shape of the relationship between corporate culture (CC) with employees environmental performance (EEP) could be seen in the regression equation which generates the direction of regression coefficients and constants $b = .601 = 54.743$. To determine the degree of significance (level of significance). The F was subsequently tested, as shown in the following table 1.:

Table 1
ANOVA Table of Regression Model
 $\hat{Y} = 54.743 + .601X_1$

Source of Variances	degrees of freedom (df)	Sum of Square (SS)	Means Square (MS)	F _{cal.}	F _{table}

Total	84				.05	.01
Coefficient (a)	1					
Regretssion (b/a)	1	10761.806	10761.806	37.357**	2.72	4.03
Residual	83	23910.500	288.078			
Deviation from linearity	49	12909.117	263,451	.814 ^{ns}	1.70	2.14
Error	34	11001.383	323.570			

** P < .01 ^{ns} = Non significant

According to the table above, it shows that, the resulting regression equation was significant with a regression model $\hat{Y} = 54.743 + .601X_1$. Therefore there was a positive relationship between employees variable environmental performance (EEP) with the corporate culture (CC) which was very significant. Next a large correlation coefficient between corporate culture(CC) with employee’s environmental performance (EEP) was found, as shown in the following table 2.

Table 2
Test of Coefficient Correlation (r_{y1})

Sample (n)	correlation coefficient	determination coefficient	t_{cal}	t_{table}	
				.05	.01
85	.557	.31	6.11**	1.98	2.63

There is highly significant correlation between the corporate culture and employee’s environmental performance. The variation of employee’s environmental performance is determined by 31 % of the corporate culture variation through the regression model $\hat{Y} = 54.743 + .601X_1$

The shape of the relationship between leader behavior (LB) with employees environmental performance (CEP) could be seen in the regression equation which generated the direction of regression coefficients and constants $b = .598 = 52.750$. To determine the degree of significance (level of significance). F was next tested , as shown in the following table 3.:

Table 3
Y Linear regression ANOVA Table on X_2
($\hat{Y} = 52.750 + .598X_2$)

Source of Variances	degrees of freedom (df)	Sum of Square (SS)	Means Square (MS)	$F_{cal.}$	F_{table}	
					.05	.01
Total	84				.05	.01
Coefficient (a)	1					
Regretion (b/a)	1	9915.749	9.915.749	33.244**	2.72	4.03
Residual	83	24756.557	298.272			
Linearity	45	9721.590	216.035	.546 ^{ns}	1.72	2.14
Deviation Error	38	15034.967	395.657			

** P<.01 ^{ns} = Non significant

According to the table above, it showed that, the resulting regression equation to be significant with a regression model $\hat{Y} = 52.750 + .598 X_2$. Therefore there was a positive relationship between the employee's variables Eenvironmental Pperformance with Leader Behavior which were very significant. Next, a large correlation coefficient between leader behavior (LB) with employees' environmental performance (EEP) was found, as shown in the following table 4.:

Table 4
Test of Coefficient Correlation (r_{y2})

Sample (n)	correlation coefficient	determination coefficient	t_{cal}	t_{table}	
				.05	.01
85	.535	.28	5.76**	1.98	2.63

There is highly significant correlation between the leader behavior and employee's environmental performance. The variation of employee's environmental performance is determined by 28.62% Of the leader behavior variation through the regression model $\hat{Y} = 52.750 + 0.598X_2$

The shape of the relationship between personality (P) with employee's environmental performance (EEP) could be seen in the regression equation which generated the direction of regression coefficients and constants $b = .429 = 87.874$. To determine the degree of significance (level of significance). The F was subsequently tested as shown in the following table 5.:

Table 5
Linear Regression ANOVA Table Y on X_3
($Y = 87.874 + .429X_3$)

Source of Variances	degrees of freedom (df)	Sum of Square (SS)	Means Square (MS)	$F_{cal.}$	F_{table}	
					.05	.01
Total	84				.05	.01
Coefficient (a)	1					
Regretion (b/a)	1	4993.115	4.993.115	13.964**	2.72	4.03
Residual	83	29679.191	357.581			
linearity	41	15010.275	366.104	1.048 ^{ns}	1.69	2.05
Deviation						
Error	42	14668.917	349.260			

** P<.01 ^{ns} = Non significant

According to the table above, the resulting regression equation demonstrated that it was significant with a regression model $\hat{Y} = 87.874 + .429 X_3$. Therefore there was a positive relationship between the variables with Ppersonality to Eemployee's Environmental Performance which was very significant. A large correlation coefficient between personality (P) with employee's environmental performance (EEP) could be

seen in the following table 6:

Table 6
Test of Coefficient Correlation (r_{y3})

Sample (n)	correlation coefficient	determination coefficient	t_{cal}	t_{table}	
				.05	.01
85	.535	.28	5.76**	1.98	2.63

There is highly significant correlation between the personality and employee's environmental performance. The variation of employee's environmental performance is determined by 14.36 % Of the personality variation through the regression model

$$\hat{Y} = 87.874 + .429X_3$$

The shape of the relationship between corporate culture, leader behavior, personality with employees environmental performance could be seen in the regression equation which produced a directions regression coefficient = .399 b_1 , $b_2 = .284$, $b_3 = .253$, and the constant = 22.460. To determine the degree of significance (level of significance). The F was tested, as shown in the following table 7.:

Table 7
ANOVA Multiple Regression Table
 $\hat{Y} = 22.460 + .399X_1 + .284X_2 + .253X_3$

Source of Variances	degrees of freedom (df)	Sum of Square (SS)	Means Square (MS)	$F_{cal.}$	F_{table}	
Total Direduksi	84				.05	.01
Regresi	3	14781.107	4927.036	20.064**	2.72	4.03
Sisa	81	19891.199	245.570			

** $p < .01$

According to the table above, the resulting regression equation showed it was significant with a regression model $\hat{Y} = 22.460 + .399X_1 + .284X_2 + .253X_3$. Therefore, there was a positive relationship between employees variable environmental performance (EEP) with the corporate culture (CC), leader behavior (LB) and personality (P) which was very significant.

A large correlation coefficient between corporate culture (CC), leader behavior (LB), and personality (P) with employee's environmental performance (EEP) could next be seen, as shown in the following table 8.:

Table 8
Table of Relationship between Corporate Culture, Leader Behavior, and Personality with Employees Environmental Performance

Sample (n)	correlation coefficient	determination coefficient	F_{cal}	F_{table}	
				.05	.01
85	.653	.42	20.05**	2.72	4.03

42.64 % of the employee's environmental performance variation determined together with the variations of the corporate culture, leader behavior and personality through the

linear regression model, as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 22.460 + .399X_1 + .284X_2 + .253X_3.$$

Based on table above, the value of the correlation coefficient between CC, LB and personality with EEP of $r_{y_{123}} = .653$. The higher the corporate culture, leader behavior and personality, the higher was the environmental performance of employee's.

Results of testing the first hypothesis, suggested that corporate culture was positively related to the environmental performance of employees. The shape of the positive relationship indicated by the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 54.743 + .601X_1$ with $t_{cal} > t_{table}$ and the strength of the relationship $r_{x_1y} = .557$ with a coefficient of determination of 6.11. The success of the performance of a company was determined by its culture in the form of values and norms that bind members of the company. The corporate culture in the study included the atmosphere of togetherness, of sportsmanship in high competitiveness, the spirit of achieving profitability, a strong motto, vision and mission of the same perceived by members of the company, and the anticipation of the threat of competitors.

The basic theoretical reference used in explaining variables that affect performance such as corporate culture using the theory Integrative Model of Organizational Behavior from Colquitt, et.al (2017). In addition, according to the results of the study according to Paile, Chen, Boiral and Jin which define the environmental performance as the company's effectiveness in meeting and exceeding people's expectations of concern for the natural environment. Environmental performance alone can be evaluated by setting the indicators such as pollution prevention, waste minimization, recycling activities, and so on. Thus environmental performance is the company's effectiveness on environmental concerns that can be evaluated through pollution prevention measures, including the cycling waste that are expected to enable the company to meet people's expectations of environmental concerns. Freedman and Jaggistated that the company's environmental performance is based on the response of environmental problems to the management such as how management actions in the process of using natural resources efficiently and effectively.

The results of testing the second hypothesis, suggested that leader behavior was positively related to the environmental performance of employees. The shape of the positive relationship indicated by the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 52.750 + .598X_2$ with $t_{cal} > t_{table}$ and the strength of the relationship $r_{x_2y} = .535$ with a coefficient of determination of 5.76. The success of the performance of a company was determined by the behavior of a company leader. Leader behavior in the study included the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure.

The basic theoretical reference used in describing the variables affecting performance such as leader behavior using the theory of Responsible Behavior Models to the Environment adapted by Blaikie & Ward (1993) from Model Hines, et.al (1986/1987). According to Robbins and Judge (2013), leadership is the ability to influence a group of people in achieving a vision or set of goals. In the theory of leadership character (Trait theories of leadership), one's leadership is seen in one's quality and character. Whereas in behavioral theory of leadership, subordinates see the leader from the aspect of initiating structure (ie the extent to which the leader explains the plan and the role of the subordinate and the concern (consideration), namely the extent to which leaders build

friendships with staff (mutual trust) and the attention of the subordinates' ideas (respect for employees). From some research, 66% of staff share motivated by the attention from their leaders.

The third hypothesis testing results, showed that personality was positively related to the environmental performance of employees. The shape of the positive relationship indicated by the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 87.874 + .429X_3$ with $t_{cal} > t_{table}$ and the strength of the relationship $r_{x_3y} = .379$ with a coefficient of determination of 3.73. The success of the performance of a company was determined by the personalities of its employee's. Personality in the study included the factors of conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness and extraversion.

Bakker, Tim and Darks stated that several studies have revealed that positive personality in employees shows good job performance as well. Where, because of the positive environmental impact of the company, it facilitates the employment involvement of the personality outcome. Therefore the management may influence the work of the employees and the resulting resources. It is important for employees to demonstrate proactive behavior and optimize their own work environment.

Results of testing the fourth hypothesis, suggested that corporate culture, leader behavior, and personality together were positively and significantly associated with the environmental performance of employees. The shape of the positive relationship shown through regression equations $\hat{Y} = 22.460 + .399X_1 + .284X_2 + .253X_3$ with $t_{cal} > t_{table}$ and the strength of the relationship $r_{x_{123}y} = .653$ with a coefficient of determination of 20.05. The success of the performance of a company was shown to be determined by its culture, leader behavior, and personality of the employees. The corporate culture in the study included the atmosphere of togetherness, of sportsmanship in high competitiveness, the spirit of achieving profitability, a strong motto, vision and mission of the same perceived by members of the company, and the anticipation of the threat of competitors. Leader behavior included the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure. Personality factors included conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness and extraversion.

This is in line with Redekop's opinion, when each individual accepted and supported by the organization, they are likely to respond with increased commitment and performance by increasing the diversity of ideas applied to the leadership process. Therefore, leadership is very important. Activities will relate to the level of sincere commitment shown to the employee's, which will minimize negative impacts and facilitate effective collaboration for these performance improvements.

Conclusions

Based on those research findings, it could be concluded that if employees environmental performance would be improved, then corporate culture, leaders behavior, and personality, could be taken into consideration. Those independent variables are also empirically used as a predictor for employees environmental performance. In this case, there are some implications as a result of these research findings. Those are policy implication which could be put leader behavior to be more positive in consideration

dimension and for theoretical implication could be more paid attention on the role of personality in building employees environmental performance. Therefore, in maintaining the strength of employees environmental performance, the researchers could be able to search more relevant variables to be involved in next research.

References

- [1] Barrow, Christopher J. "*Environmental Management for Sustainable Development 2nd Ed*".Canada: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group. 2006.
- [2] Colquitt, LePine and Wesson. *Organizational Behavior*. New York: Mc-Graw Hill, 2015.
- [3] Cook dan Curtis W and Phillip L.Hunsaker. *Management and Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001.
- [4] Feist, Jess Gregory J. Feist dan Tomi-Ann Roberts.*Theories of Personality*. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 2013.
- [5] Freedman Martin and Bikki Jaggi."*Sustainability, Environmental Performance and Disclosures*".UK: Emerald Group Publishing. 2010.
- [6] Griffin Ricky W. and Gregory Moorhead.*Organizational Behavior, Managing People and Organizations*.New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 2014.
- [7] Heckhausen, Jutta., Heinz Heckhausen. *Motivation and Action*. Irvine: University of California,1988.
- [8] Hoy, Wayne K. and Cecil G. Miskel. *Education Administration (Theory, Research and practice)*.New York: Mc-Graw Hill, 2013.
- [9] Ivancevich, John M. et.al.*Organizational Behavior & Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education, 2014.
- [10] Jennifer, M. George and Gareth R. Jones.*Understanding and Management Organizational Behavior*, Sixth Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2012.
- [11] Kreitner, Robert and Angelo Kinicki. *Organizational Behavior*. New York: Mc-Graw Hill, 2014.
- [12] Larsen, Randy J. and David M. Buss. *Personality Psychology. Domain of Knowledge Human Nature*.Fifth Edition. New York: McGraw Hill Education, 2014.
- [13] Locke, Edwin A. *Handbook of Principles of Organizational Behavior*.United States of America: Gale Cengage Learning. 2009.
- [14] Luthans,Fred.*Organizational Behavior Eleventh Edition*.Singapore: McGraw-Hill International Edition. 2008.
- [15] Luthans, Fred *Organizational Behavior,An Evidence-Based Approach* New York: Mc-Graw Hill, 2005.
- [16] Milfont, Taciano L. and Chirs G. Sibley. The big five personality traits and environmental engagement: Associations at the individual and societal level, *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 2012.
- [17] Mullins, Laurie J. *Management &Organisational Behavior*. Ninth Edition, Great Britain: Prentice Hall, 2010.
- [18] Nelson dan, Debra L., James Campbell Quick.*Organizational Behavior*:

- Foundations, Realities & Challenges*. USA: Thomson. 2006.
- [19] Newstrom, John W. *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 2011.
- [20] Paile, Pascal, Yang Chen, Olivier Boiral and Jiajie Jin. "The Impact of Human Resource Management on Environmental Performance: An Employee Level Study". *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2013.
- [21] Parks, Laura dan Russell P. Guay. Personality, Values and Motivation. *Internasional Journal of Leadership Studies*. Vol. 4 Iss. 2, h. 202. 2009.
- [22] Putrawan, I Made. *Konsep Dasar Ekologidalamberbagai Aktivitas Lingkungan*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2014.
- [23] Putrawan, I Made, Leadership and Self Efficacy: Its Effect on Employees motivation, *Advanced Science Letters*, Vol. 23 (1), pp. 173-176, 2017.
- [24] Robbins, Stephen T. Judges. *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey, USA: Prentice-Hall international, Inc, 2007.
- [25] Robertson, Jennifer L. and Julian Barling. "Greening Organization Through Leaders- Influence on Employees-Pro-environmental Behaviors". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2013.
- [26] Rohiat, *Kecerdasan. Emosional Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah*. Bandung: Refika Aditama, 2008.
- [27] Rothwell, William J. and H.C. Kazanas. *The Strategic Development of Talent: A Fram Work for Using Talent to Support Your Organizational Strategy*, Second Edition. USA: HRD Press Inc. 2003.
- [28] Solino, Mario and Begona A. Farizo. Personal Traits Underlying Environmental Preferences: A Discrete Choice Experiment. *Journal of Open Access Plus One*. 2014.
- [29] Sputtek, Rebekka. "Opening the Black Box The Role of Personality and Anger in Executives Decision Making and Leadership". Springer Gabler : 2012.
- [30] Yukl, Gary. *Leadership in Organizational*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 2010.
- [31] Zhang Jing, Jianming Niua, Alexander Buyantuevd and Jianguo Wu. "A multilevel analysis of effects of land use policy on land-cover change and local land use decisions", *Journal of Arid Environments*, 2014, hh.19-28.
- [32] Zoogah, David B. dan Morgan. Cultural Value Orientation, Personality, and Motivational Determinants of Strategic Leadership in Afrika. *Journal homage: www. Elsevier.com*. 2, h. 675. 2009.