THE INFLUENCE OF DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP STYLE, WORK MOTIVATION, AND WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT PT. MATAHARI DEPARTMENT STORE GRAND MALL BEKASI.

THESIS

Submitted as one of the requirements for obtaining a Master of Management degree

APLONIA KARTINI MALI

4308961101005

MASTER OF MANAGEMENT STUDY PROGRAM
SPECIALTY OF HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
MULIA PRATAMA HIGH SCHOOL OF ECONOMIC SCIENCES BEKASI BEKASI

2023

ABSTRACT

Name   : *Aplonia Kartini Mali*
Study Program   : *Master of Management*
Title   : *The influence of democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance at P.T. Matahari Department Store Grand Mall Bekasi*

Human resources are a central factor in managing an organization. Achieving an organization requires human resources as system managers. Competent human resources with good performance can support business success. Incompetent human resources and poor performance are competitive problems that can put a company at a loss. Pt. Matahari Department Store Grand Mall Bekasi is a retail company in Indonesia that is very competent in creating human resources that have good performance and support the company's success.

In SPSS 26 used by researchers, with multiple linear analysis test results with the regression coefficient value to get the equation model as follows: $Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + b3X3$, which means $Y = 4,963 + 0.229 X1 + 0.263 X2 + 0.465 X3$. The results of the coefficient of determination test (R^2) with the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) are   0.757 or 75.7% of employee performance variables, which can be explained by the three independent variables. Results of the t

statistical test were compared with the calculated t value with the t table on variables. The t-table value is 1.999. Because the calculated t value of X1 = 2.588 and amounting to
The conclusion from the study This is from results test F states that democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment together have a significant effect on employee performance, and the magnitude of the influence of these three variables can be seen on results test coefficient determination(R 2) is as big as 75.7%, whereas 24.3% influenced by factor other outside study This.

Keywords: *democratic leadership style, work motivation, work environment, and employee performance.*

1.1   BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Human resources are a central factor in managing an organization. Achieving an organization requires human resources as system managers. Competent human resources with good performance can support business success. Incompetent human resources and poor performance are competitive problems that can put a company at a loss. Performance in an organization is the answer to the success or failure of the organizational goals that have been set. Kartono (2013: 86) also said that democratic leadership is leadership that is human-oriented and provides efficient guidance to its followers. There is work coordination for all subordinates, emphasizing internal responsibility (to oneself) and good cooperation. The success or failure of an organization, whether business or public-oriented, is usually perceived as the success or failure of the leader.

Work motivation is the most determining factor for an employee at work. Motivation is an employee's response to a number of statements regarding the overall business that arise from within the employee in order to grow the urge to work so that the desired goals can be achieved. Work motivation plays a very important role in providing employee enthusiasm in order to provide maximum results for the company based on the performance produced by these employees.

The work environment is also a factor that influences employee performance. According to S Turismo (2009), the definition of work environment is the entire work facilities and infrastructure around employees who are doing work, which can influence the implementation of work, including the workplace, facilities, cleanliness, lighting, peace, and work relationships between people involved. is in that place. The physical work environment that exists in the company today, fresh air temperature, a spatial layout that provides space for movement, and comfort for employees when serving customers will increase employee performance. The non-physical work environment, such as the relationship between employees and the relationship between employees and leaders, which has been formed into a team that is always united with a democratic type of leadership style, really supports improving employee performance. Employee performance that continues to increase by always achieving the targets given by management will have a good impact on the continuation of the company's life.

From several factors that have been studied by the researchers above, it can be seen that there are employees who have good performance, but there are still many employees who have low work morale and do not have creative ideas in achieving the targets given by the leadership. The following is one of the targets of Matahari Grand Mall Bekasi, namely the monthly online sales target given by the leadership:

Based on the background of this problem, the researcher wants to examine this problem in research entitled: " THE INFLUENCE OF DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP STYLE, WORK MOTIVATION AND WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT PT. MATAHARI DEPARTMENT STORE GRAND MALL BEKASI."

1.2   Formulation of the problem

Based on the background that has been described, the author makes several problem formulations as follows:
a.   Is there an influence of democratic leadership style on employee performance?
b.   Is motivation influenced by employee performance?

    c.   Is the work environment influenced by employee performance?
    d.   Is there an influence of democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment together on employee performance?

1.3   Research purposes

Based on the problem formulation, this research aims to:

    a.   To analyze whether democratic leadership style influences Matahari Department Store Grand Mal Bekasi employee performance.

    b.   To analyze whether work motivation influences employee performance at Matahari Department Store Grand Mal Bekasi.

    c.   To analyze whether the work environment influences employee performance at Matahari Department Store Grand Mal Bekasi.

    d.   To analyze whether there is an influence of democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance at Matahari Department Store Grand Mal Bekasi.

1.4   Benefits of research

The expected benefits from the results of this research are:

a.   For writers

    This research is useful for developing knowledge and increasing insight to improve employee performance based on democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment.

b.   For companies

    This research is expected to provide companies useful information to improve employee performance.

c.   For readers

    It is hoped that this research will serve as input and reference material for readers and as a reference for future researchers.

1.5   Scope of problem

Researchers limited the problem to this research, which was only conducted at Matahari Department Store Grand Mal Bekasi.

1.6   Systematics of Thesis Writing

This writing systematic consists of 5 (five) CHAPTERS consisting of:

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION in this CHAPTER, the author provides an explanation of the background of the problem, limitations of the problem, formulation of the problem, aims and benefits of research, and systematic writing.

CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL BASIS in this CHAPTER, the author explains the meaning of democratic leadership style, work motivation, work environment, prior research, theoretical framework, and research hypotheses.

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY in this CHAPTER, the author explains research variables, operational definitions, research instruments, and time and place of research.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION in this CHAPTER, the author provides

Explain the research object, a general description of the company, a general description of respondents, data analysis, and a discussion.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS in this CHAPTER, the author outlines the conclusions from the results of data analysis as well as suggestions for obtaining good results.

2. THEORETICAL BASIS

2.1   Democratic Leadership Style
2.1.1   Understanding Democratic Leadership Style

Democratic leadership focuses on basic humanity and upholds the status and dignity of the people it leads. (Suradji & Martono, 2014). Kartono (2013) argues that democratic leadership is human-oriented and provides efficient guidance to its followers. There is work coordination for all subordinates, emphasizing internal responsibility (to oneself) and good cooperation.

From several opinions according to the experts above, the researcher concludes that the democratic leadership style is a leadership model where leaders tend to include employees in making decisions and consider subordinates as colleagues so that leaders do not hesitate to develop and transfer knowledge to subordinates. Democratic leaders tend to involve employees in making decisions, delegate authority, encourage participation in deciding work methods and goals, and use feedback as an opportunity to train employees.

2.1.2 Indicators of Democratic Leadership Style

The following are indicators of a democratic leadership style:

1. Decisions are made together.
2. Developing the potential of each subordinate.
3. Each field.
4. Listen to suggestions and criticism from subordinates.
5. Collaborating with his subordinates.

2.2 Work motivation

2.2.1 Understanding Work Motivation

Siagian (2008), this scientist believes that work motivation is the driving force that will make employees want to improve their ability to carry out their duties and responsibilities. Steiner and Berelson in Sastrohadiwiryo (2002) argue that work motivation is a condition that can influence an individual in improving, directing, and maintaining behavior that is related to the world of work. From the definition of work motivation, according to the experts above, researchers can conclude that work motivation is a driving force or driving force with a set of energy forces originating from within or outside the individual, which can encourage and direct the behavior of other people to carry out related actions. With work, while maintaining behavior that is related to the world of work, they are willing to work together to achieve their goals.

2.2.2 Work Motivation Indicators

The indicators of work motivation are as follows:

1. Physiological Needs
2. The need for security
3. The need for social acceptance
4. Reward needs
5. Self-actualization

2.3 Work environment

2.3.1 Understanding the work environment

Sedarmayanti (2017) defines the work environment as the totality of tools and materials encountered, the surrounding environment where a person works, work methods, and work organizers both as individuals and as a group.From the definition of the work environment according to the experts above, researchers can conclude that the work environment is everything that exists around employees, both physical and non-physical, which can influence work activities every day so that it can provide comfort, safety and tranquility at work. The physical work environment includes buildings, temperature, spatial layout, and distance between home and workplace. The non-physical work environment is in the form of social relationships in the workplace, between fellow employees, between employees and leaders, and between employees and customers so that it can determine whether an employee is comfortable or uncomfortable with the company.

2.3.2 Work Environment Indicators

The work environment indicators, according to Sedarmayanti (2004), are as follows:

1. Work relationship.
2. Job security
3. Work facilities
4. Comfortable work space

2.4 Employee performance

2.4.1 Understanding Employee Performance

According to W bowl (2007), performance is the implementation of the planning that has been prepared, and the implementation of performance is carried out by human resources who have the ability, competence, motivation, and interests According to S. Edarmayanti (2011), employee performance is the result of a person's work as a whole, which is demonstrated by concrete evidence. From the definition of employee performance according to the experts above, researchers can conclude that employee performance is the achievement of employee results in the process of carrying out tasks with ability, competence, and motivation, according to the responsibilities given. Improving employee performance will positively impact the company so that employees have a good and optimal level of performance to help realize company goals by showing concrete evidence of real results. Performance is said to be good and satisfactory if the goals are achieved according to predetermined standards.

2.4.2 Employee performance indicators
Employee performance indicators that can be seen are as follows:
1. Quality
2. Quantity
3. Punctuality
4. Work effectiveness
5. Independence

2.5 Research Hypothesis
1. It is suspected that the democratic leadership style positively and significantly affects employee performance.
2. Work motivation is suspected to have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.
3. It is suspected that the work environment positively and significantly affects employee performance.
4. It is suspected that democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment together have a significant influence on employee performance

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Variables and Operational Definitions
3.1.1 Research variable
    a. Dependent Variable (dependent)

The dependent Variable is a variable that is influenced or results from an independent variable's existence. The dependent Variable contained in this research is employee performance (Y). Employee performance is the result an employee achieves in carrying out the tasks assigned to him by showing concrete evidence.

    b. Independent variable (free)

An independent variable is a variable that influences or is the cause of changes or the emergence of a dependent (dependent) variable. The independent variables in this research are democratic leadership style (X1), work motivation (X2), and work environment (X3).

3.2 Method of collecting data
3.2.1 Library Research
Data collection techniques are carried out through reading materials, including literature, books, magazines, and various other reading materials that are relevant and related to the researcher's title that the author has compiled.

3.2.2 Field Research
Field Research is further research carried out in more depth by directly observing the research object. The field survey consists of: Observation, Interview, Questionnaire.

3.3 Data Analysis Methods
3.3.1 Qualitative Analysis

To find out how much influence democratic leadership style work motivation, and the work environment have on employee performance, the author uses several theoretical approaches, including: Validity test, Reliability Test.

3.3.2 Classic assumption test
1. Multicollinearity Test
2. Autocorrelation Test.
3. Heteroscedasticity tes.
4. Normality test

3.3.3 Multiple Linear Analysis
Multiple regression analysis is an analysis to see the extent of the influence of democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance. Multiple regression analysis uses the equation formula, namely:

$$Y = a\ b_1X_1 +\ b_2X_2++b_3X_3$$

Note: Y   = employee performance
      a   = constant
      b1   = regression coefficient of variable X1
      X1   = democratic leadership style
      b2   = regression coefficient of variable X2
      X2   = Work motivation
      b3   = regression coefficient of variable X3
      X3   = Work environment

3.3.4 *Goodness Of Fit* Test
A. Determination Coefficient Test (R^2)
B. Hypothesis Test T-test
C. Hypothesis Test F-t

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Description General Respondent
Description General Respondent Based on Type Gender
Based on the number of respondents, 65 people, in the sample in this research, the distinction is made between type gender respondents. There were 24 respondents or 24.62%, and the respondents were female; as many as 49 were respondents or 75.38 %.

Description General Respondent Based on Age
On the number of respondents, 65 people were included in the study, distinguishing between age and respondents. The respondents based on age , age <19 – 25 year = 30.76 %(20 people), age 26 – 30 years = 33.84%(22 people), age 31– 35 years =20%(13 person), ages 36–40 year = 10.7%(7 person), whereas age >40 year = 34.61% (3 people).

Description General Respondent Based on Working Period.
Based on the number of respondents 65 people were sampled in study This, done distinction to the duration of the respondent's working time.The respondents based on forever work : 1 – 5 years = 63.07% (41 people), 5 – 10 year = 20 %(13 people), 11– 15 years =7.69% (5 people), 16–20 year = 6.15%(2 people), whereas above 20 years = 6.15% (4 people).

4.2 Analysis Data And Discussion
Test Validity, Tests Were used to determine significance or no significance, and the results showed a coefficient correlation with Pearson. The importance of each item question was limited to the total score construct. The r table value is taken using the formula df = n – 2, namely, df = 65-2 = 63, with a significance of 0.05, so the r table is 0.244.

Test Reliability, To find out whether an instrument is declared reliable, according to Nunnally, 1994 in Ghozali. 2016, stated that "an instrument is reliable if the reliability coefficient is at least 0.60". Based on this opinion, so can is known that something instrument stated reliable If mark Alpha = 0.60, whereas something instrument stated No reliable If mark Alpha < 0.60. All variable own

coefficient alpha inabove 0.60 so it can be said that all measurement concepts are each variable from each questionnaire is reliable.

4.3 Test Assumption Classic

4.3.1 Test Normality
Test normality is carried out to determine whether data can be distributed normally or not. Normalcy distribution: Data must be fulfilled if you want to analyze statistics (this is analysis regression simple or multiple). Base deciding test normality: If the significant value (sig.) is greater than 0.05, then the data research is usually distributed, and if the considerable value (sig.) is smaller than 0.05, then the data study is not distributed normally. Significant limp. Sig (2-tailed) of 0.200 is greater than 0.05 (0.200 > 0.05), then it is by the basic decision making in the kolmogorov-smirnov normality test, can concluded that data is usually distributed.

4.3.2 Test Multicollinearity
The multicollinearity test aims to determine whether there is a significant relationship between independent variables. And the tolerance values for the three variables free (democratic leadership style: 0.499, work motivation 0.205, and work environment: 0.197) more significant than the specified limit value is 0.10 and the VIF value of each independent variable (democratic leadership style: 2.005, work motivation: 4.888, and work environment: 5.088) smaller than 10, then it can be concluded that there are no symptoms of multicollinearity between variable free in this research.

4.3.3 Test Heteroscedasticity
Heteroscedasticity is something in circumstances where the variant from error bully is not constant. For all marks, it is variable-fr
ee. Test This aims to determine whether there is an inequality of variance from residuals or one other observation in the regression model. To detect it, see dot, dot, dot, Which spread in on And in lower number 0 on the axis Y graph Scatterplots. The data is spread above and below or around number 0, dot, dot, dot No gather only in on or in lower just, And spread dot, dot, dot data No patterned, so that can conclude that variable democratic leadership style, work motivation, And work environment No happen Heteroscedasticity.

4.3.4 Test Autocorrelation
The Autocorrelation Test tests assumptions in regression where the dependent variables are not correlated. Durbin-Waston (d) as big as 1,817, which is more significant than the upper limit (du), which is 1.696 and less than (4-du) 4-1.696= 2.304. In other words, the Durbin Waston value is 1.817; based on this, Durbin Waston counts among them -2 and 2, which is $-2 \leq 1.817 \leq 2$. So, as the decision in the test Durbin Waston, it can concluded that no there is a problem or autocorrelation symptoms.

4.4 Analysis Regression Linear Multiple

Table 4.13 Results Analysis Regression Linear Multiple

Coefficients ª						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4,963	6,093		0.814	0.419
	DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP STYLE (X1)	0.229	0.088	0.231	2,588	0.012
	WORK MOTIVATION (X2)	0.263	0.134	0.273	1,957	0.055
	WORK ENVIRONMENT (X3)	0.465	0.152	0.437	3,067	0.003
a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE (Y)						

Source: SPSS 26 test results

Based on Table 4.13, there is mark coefficient regression, with the results on table coefficients in column unstandardized in column B, in sub. This column contains a constant value, with a constant

value of 4.963, while the regression coefficient value for democratic leadership style (X1) = 0.229, work motivation (X2) = 0.263, and work environment: 0.465. The regression equation model is as follows following:

$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3$

$Y = 4,963 + 0.229\ X1 + 0.263\ X2 + 0.465\ X3$

Where :   Y   = employee performance
            a   = constant value
            X1   = democratic leadership style
            X2   = work environment
            X3   = work motivation

Explanation equality on that is :

1. Mark constant as big as 4,963. This means that if the democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment are ignored or the value is 0, then employee performance will be poor. P.T. Matahari Department Store Grand Mall Bekasi has a positive value.

2. The regression coefficient value for the democratic leadership style variable is a positive value, i.e., 0.229, which means every increase in democratic leadership style by one unit will increase employee performance by 0.229 units. If the democratic leadership style experiences a decline in One unit so, employee performance decreases by 0.229 with the assumed variables others remain

3. The regression coefficient value of the work motivation variable is positive, i.e., 0.263, which means every increase in work motivation in one unit will increase employee performance by 0.263 units. If work motivation experience declines by One unit so, employee performance decreases by 0.263 with the assumed variables others remain.

4. Regression coefficient value for work environment variables positive value, ie 0.465 means every improvement in the work environment one unit, it will increase employee performance by 0.465 units. If the work environment experiences a decline, One unit of employee performance decreases by 0.465 with the assumed variables, and others remain.

5. The magnitude of the influence can be seen as follows: democratic leadership style (22.9%), work motivation (26.3%), and work environment (46.5%). So, it can be drawn that the variable With the most dominant influence on Employee performance is the work environment because it has the most significant unit value compared to democratic leadership style and work motivation. This is because in the retail world, such as P.T. Matahari department store, comfort at work is essential because employees directly deal with customers. One of them is room temperature. A cool room temperature will create a comfortable atmosphere and give employees freedom when taking goods to the warehouse.

4.5   Test Goodness of Fit
4.5.1 Coefficient Determination (R^2)
To find out how big the ability of the   independent variable isexplain dependent variable.

Table 4.14 Results Coefficient Determination

Model Summary [b]				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,870 [a]	0.757	0.745	4,615
a. Predictors: (Constant), WORK ENVIRONMENT (X3), DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP STYLE (X1), WORK MOTIVATION (X2)				
b. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE (Y)				

Source: SPSS 26 test results

Table 4.14 shows that the coefficient of determination ($R2$) is 0.757 or 75.7 %. Employee performance variables can be explained by a third independent variable, namely democratic

leadership style, work motivation, and work environment. Whereas the rest, 24.3%, explained by causes Which other in outside study This.

4.5.2 Test t

Test t is used To know if variables are independent, partially or individually, have a natural effect on the variable, or are not dependent.

Table 4.15 t test results

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Q	Sig.
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4,963	6,093		0.814	0.419
	DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP STYLE (X1)	0.229	0.088	0.231	2,588	0.012
	WORK MOTIVATION (X2)	0.263	0.134	0.273	1,957	0.055
	WORK ENVIRONMENT (X3)	0.465	0.152	0.437	3,067	0.003
a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE (Y)						

Source: SPSS 26 test results

Based on the table above we can see the following explanation:
The influence of democratic leadership style on employee performance

1. To prove that the democratic leadership style (X1) positively affects employee performance (Y), this is done through the t-test by comparing the calculated t value with the t table. Based on the test results above for the democratic leadership style variable, the calculated t is 2.588. The t distribution table is searched for the value α = 5% with the formula $\alpha / 2 = 0.05 / 2$, namely 0.025 with degrees of freedom (df) = n – k or 65 –3 = 62, n is the number of respondents, and k is the number of variables independent. The value 0.025; 62 can be seen in the distribution of t table values, so the t table value is 1,999. Because the calculated t value of 2.588 is more significant than > t table 1.999, it can be concluded that H.O. is rejected and H1 is accepted, which means that it partially states "There is a significant influence between democratic leadership style on employee performance"

2. The influence of work motivation on employee performance
   The work motivation variable (X 2) does not significantly affect employee performance (Y), which is carried out through the t-test by comparing the calculated t value with the t table. Based on the test results above for the work motivation variable, the computed t-value is 1.957. The t distribution table is searched for the value α = 5% with the formula $\alpha / 2 = 0.05 / 2$, namely 0.025 with degrees of freedom (df) = n – k or 65 –3 = 62, n is the number of respondents, and k is the number of variables independent. The value 0.025: 62 can be seen in the distribution of t table values, so the t table value is 1.999. Because the calculated t value of 1.957 is smaller < t table 1.999, it can be concluded that H.O. is accepted and H2 is rejected, which means that it partially states "there is no significant influence between democratic leadership style and employee performance."

3. To prove that the work environment (X3) positively affects employee performance (Y), this is done through the t-test by comparing the calculated t value with the t table. Based on the test results above for the work environment variable, the calculated t is 3.067. The t distribution table is searched for the value α = 5% with the formula $\alpha / 2 = 0.05 / 2$, namely

0.025 with degrees of freedom (df) = n – k or 65 –3 = 62, n is the number of respondents, and k is the number of variables independent. The value 0.025; 62 can be seen in the distribution of t table values, so the t table value is 1,999. Because the calculated t value of 3.067 is more significant than t table 1.999, it can be concluded that H.O. is rejected and H3 is accepted, which means that it partially states "there is a significant influence between the work environment on employee performance"

4.5.3 Test F

Test F is used to know if the variable is independent in a way that significantly affects the dependent variable, and what is the hypothesis of whether the variable is independent to dependent, accepted, or rejected? The Mark significance used is 0.05.

<div align="center">Table 4.16 T test results</div>

ANOVA [a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4043,900	3	1347,967	63,295	,000 [b]
	Residual	1299,084	61	21,296		
	Total	5342,985	64			
a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE (Y)						
b. Predictors: (Constant), WORK ENVIRONMENT (X3), DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP STYLE (X1), WORK MOTIVATION (X2)						

<div align="center">*Source: SPSS 26 test results*</div>

1. Based on the F test results
   From .16 shows that the calculated F value of = 63.295 exceeds the table F value. The F distribution table is searched for the value α = 5% or 0.05 with the degrees of freedom (df) formula or table T = k: n - k or 3 : 65 - 3 = 3:61, n is the number of respondents, and k is the number independent variable. The value 3: 61 can be seen in the distribution of F table values, so the value is 2.755. So the calculated F value is greater than the table F value: (63.295 > 2.755) , so based on the decision making in the f test, it can be concluded that the hypothesis is accepted or, in other words, democratic leadership style, work motivation and, work environment

2. Based on significant value
   The significant value of 0.000 is smaller than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), thereby concluding that the hypothesis is accepted, Which means democratic leadership style (X1), work motivation (X2), and employee performance (X3) in a way simultaneous (together) influence on employee performance (Y).

4.6 Discussion

Based on research data obtained using the method measurement scale Likert And analyzed with the use help of the SPSS method, the received results from the coefficient of determination ($R2$) is 0.757 or 75.7 % of employee performance variables can be explained by the third variable independent, namely democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment. Whereas the rest 24.3% explained by causes Which other in outside study This.

4.6.1 The influence of democratic leadership style (X1) on employee performance (Y) .

Based on the t-test, compare the calculated t value with the t table on the variable democratic leadership style (X1), namely: the calculated t value of 2.588 is more significant than > t table 1.999, so it can be concluded that H.O. is rejected and H1 is accepted, which means that partially it states "There is a significant influence between democratic leadership style on employee performance. Based on the considerable value of the democratic leadership style variable, it is 0.012, which is

smaller than 0.05 (0.012 < 0.05), thereby can concluded that the hypothesis accepted, Which means democratic leadership style (X1) has a significant effect on employee performance (Y).

4.6.2 The influence of work motivation (X2) on employee performance (Y).

Based on the t-test, compare the calculated t value with the t table on the variable work motivation (X2), namely: the calculated t value of 1.957 is smaller < t table 1.999, so it can be concluded that H.O. is accepted and H2 is rejected, which means that partially it states "there is no significant influence between work motivation and employee performance. Based on the considerable value of the work motivation variable, namely 0.055, more excellent than 0.05 (0.055 > 0.05) with thereby can concluded that hypothesis rejected, Which It means work motivation (X2) does not have a significant effect on employee performance (Y).

4.6.3 The influence of the work environment (X3) on employee performance (Y)

Based on the t test, compare the calculated t value with the t table on the variable work environment (X3), namely: the calculated t value of 3.067 is more excellent> t table 1.999, so it can be concluded that H.O. is rejected and H3 is accepted, which means that partially it states "there is a significant influence between the work environment on employee performance. Based on the substantial value in the work environment variable, it is 0.003, which is smaller than 0.05 (0.003 < 0.05), thereby concluding that the hypothesis is accepted, Which means that in the work environment (X3), there is a significant effect on employee performance (Y)

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSION

This conclusion was made based on the results of the analysis in the previous chapter, which are as follows:

1. The influence of democratic leadership style on employee performance
   Leadership style has a significant influence on employee performance, namely 22.9%.
2. The influence of work motivation on employee performance
   Work motivation does not significantly influence employee performance.
3. The influence of the work environment on employee performance
   The work environment has a significant influence on employee performance, namely 46.5%.
4. The influence of democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance
   The variables leadership style (X1), employee performance (X2), and work environment (X3), together or simultaneously, have a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y), namely 75.7%, while the rest 24.3%, explained by causes Which other in outside study This.

SUGGESTION

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion, researchers will provide the following suggestions:

1. Democratic leadership style at P.T. Matahari Department Store can be further improved, because this variable positively influences employee performance. Examples of types of motivation that can be given include: primary motivator, semi-main motivator, non-material motivator. Motivation can also be achieved through various approaches, namely the traditional, human relations, human resources, and contemporary approaches.
2. The work environment is one of the variables that has the most significant influence on employee performance, which can be seen in the multiple linear regression analysis test results, namely 46.5%. This means that if the work environment at Matahari Department Store Grand Mall Bekasi can be given more attention, especially in terms of room temperature and company facilities, it will significantly influence employee performance.

3. It is hoped that future researchers who conduct research at P.T. Matahari Department Store Grand Mall Bekasi should consider other factors besides democratic leadership style, work motivation, and work environment on employee performance because other variables may need to be studied for their influence on employee performance

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AA Anwar Prabu Mangkunegara. 2017. Corporate Human Resources Management, Bandung: Rosdakarya Youth

Adha Risky Nur, Nurul Qomariah, Achmad Hasan Hafidzi. 2019. The Influence of Work Motivation, Work Environment, Work Culture on the Performance of Jember Regency Social Service Employees. Science and Technology Research Journal. Vol. 4 No. 1.

Afandi. 2018. Human Resource Management (Theory, Concepts and Indicators). Nusa Media. Yogyakarta.

Afandi. 2018. Human Resource Management (Theory, Concepts and Indicators). Nusa Media. Yogyakarta.

Agus, Dharma. 2003. Supervision Management: Practical Guidelines for Supervisors. Revised I Edition. Fifth printing. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.

Alex S. Nitisemito, 2016, Personnel Management (Human Resource Management, Fifth Edition, Fourteenth Printing, Ghalia.

Wake up, Wilson. 2012. "Human Resource Management". Jakarta: Erlangga

Danang Sunyoto. 2014. Basic Concepts of Marketing Research & Consumer Behavior. Yogyakarta : CAPS.

Danusaputra, Munadjat, Environmental Law Book I: General, .(Bandung: Binabuat, 2006).

Fahmi. Irham. (2016). Introduction to Human Resource Management Concepts and Performance. Media Discourse Partners: Jakarta

Ghozali, Imam. 2016. Multivariate Analysis Applications with the IBM SPSS 23 Program (Edition 8). Printing VIII. Semarang: Diponegoro University Publishing Agency.

Hasibuan, Malayu SP 2010. Human Resource Management. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.

Hasibuan. 2013. Human Resources Management. Seventeenth Printing. Jakarta: PT. Literary Earth

Hidayat, A. (2018). Analysis of the Influence of Leadership Style on Employee Performance in the East Jakarta City Administration Cleaning Department. Management Science Research,

Isyandi, B, 2004. Human Resource Management in a Global Perspective. Pekanbaru, Unri Press.

Kartono, Kartini, 2008: Leaders and Leadership. Jakarta : PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Nawawi, Hadari. 2015. "Human Resource Management: For Competitive Business". Gajah Mada University Press, Yogyakarta.

Rineka Cipta. Rivai, Veithzal. 2004. Human Resource Management for Companies. Jakarta:Grafindo.

RM. Gatot Soemartono, Regarding Indonesian Environmental Law, Sinar Graphics, Jakarta, 1991.

Robbins, S., & Coulter, M. (2002). Management. Jakarta: Gramedia

Robbins, S. P. (2003). Organizational Behavior 10th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Sastrohadiwiryo, B. Siswanto (2002). Indonesian Workforce Management: Administrative and Operational Approaches. Jakarta: Bumi Literacy

Sedarmayanti. 2011. Human Resource Management. Bureaucratic Reform and Management of Civil Servants, Fifth Edition, PT Refika Aditama, Bandung.

Sondang Siagian, 2008, Human Resources Management, Bumi Aksara, Indonesia, Jakarta,

Suradji, G., & Martono, E. (2014). The Science and Art of Leadership. Bandung: Reka Cipta Library

Sutrisno, Edi. 2009. Human Resource Management First edition. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group

Sutrisno, Edy. 2016. Human Resources Management. Eighth Printing. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.

Suwarto. 2010. Organizational Behavior. Yogyakarta: Ata Jaya University Yogyakarta

Suwatno & Priansa, D. 2011. HR Management in Public and Business Organizations. Bandung: Alphabeta

Thoha Miftah., (2010), Organizational Development, innovation and intervention processes, Leadership Management. Yogyakarta, Gava Media.

Wibowo. 2007. Performance Management. Second Edition. Publisher PT. Raja Grafindo Persada. Jakarta.

Afia Ferawati Business Management Program, Management Study Program, Petra Christian University 2017. https://publication.petra.ac.id/index.php/manajemen-bisnis/article/view/5321 .

Arfiliyah Nur Pratiwi. (2019). FACTORS INFLUENCING THE REGULARITY OF PAYING CONTRIBUTIONS IN NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE (JKN) PARTICIPANTS IN THE INDEPENDENT PARTICIPANT CATEGORY (Case Study of Inpatients at Dr. Soebandi Hospital, Jember Regency). In Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling (Vol. 53). https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Gunawan Laliasa Muh. Nur, Rince Tambunan. STIE Enam-Six Kendari, Indonesia 2022. https://www.journal.stie-66.ac.id/index.php/sigmajeb/article/view/29 .

Lalisa, Gunawan. (2018). The Influence of Democratic Leadership Style, Work Environment and Work Motivation on the Performance of Southeast Sulawesi Province Plantation and Horticulture Service Employees. Sigma: Journal of Economics and Business. ISSN 2599-2007 (Print), ISSN 2614-140X (Online). Journal homepage http://journal.stie66.ac.id/index.php/sigmajeb

Pieter Leunupun, Gwenn Louida Lee Pattinama, Desianus Leunupun Faculty of Economics and Business, Indonesian Christian University, Maluku, 2021. https://ojs.ukim.ac.id/index.php/peluang/article/viewFile/722/531 .

Mardona's son, Evi Marlina Faculty of Economics and Business, Muhammadiyah University of Riau 2016. https://smartlib.umri.ac.id/assets/uploads/files/0dbbd-abstract-prosiding-celcitech-ver-3-final.pdf .

Risky Nur Adha, Nurul Qomariah, Achmad Hasan Hafidzi Faculty of Economics, Muhammadiyah University of Jember 2019. http://repository.unmuhjember.ac.id/8110/1/Artikel.pdf .

Sandy Martha, Muhammad. 2015. "Job Characteristics and Performance of Outstanding Lecturers at UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung: Organizational Commitment as a Moderating Variable." Thesis at Widayatama University Bandung.