

Leadership and organizational culture as dual levers of work ethic in local government: Evidence of indirect – only and complementary mediation via job satisfaction at Kecamatan Pasar Rebo, Jakarta

Lidiana Endah Viefrien Rahayu

Master of Management, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Kusuma Negara, Jl. Raya Bogor KM No.24 Pasar Rebo, RT.3/RW.4, Cijantung, Jakarta Timur, Jakarta 13770, Indonesia
e-mail: lidiana@stiekusumanegara.ac.id

Received 29 December 2024

Revised 20 January 2025

Accepted 02 February 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines how leadership and organizational culture shape civil servants' work ethic in a Jakarta sub-district office, with job satisfaction specified as a mediating mechanism. Using a cross-sectional survey and hypothesis-testing design, we validated multi-item measures for leadership (supportive, directive, participative, achievement-oriented behaviors), organizational culture (shared values and routines), job satisfaction (pay/benefits, supervision, work content, opportunities), and work ethic (punctuality, diligence, adaptability). Measurement screening indicated satisfactory reliability and item validity. Regression/SEM results show that leadership and organizational culture both positively predict job satisfaction ($R^2 \approx .43$). In the work-ethic model, organizational culture and job satisfaction exhibit positive, significant effects, while the direct leadership effect is non-significant; model fit explains a meaningful share of variance in work ethic ($R^2 \approx .20$). Indirect-effect computations indicate an "indirect-only" mediation for leadership (leadership $\rightarrow$ satisfaction $\rightarrow$ work ethic) and "complementary" mediation for culture (direct + indirect paths in the same direction). Substantively, leader behaviors elevate employees' felt fairness, clarity, and recognition, which translate into ethical diligence, whereas culture both institutionalizes normative expectations that directly pull behavior and simultaneously raises satisfaction. The findings support a dual-track improvement strategy: invest in participative, feedback-rich leadership to lift satisfaction, and codify culture norms (learning from mistakes, fair rewards, teamwork, punctuality) to directly and indirectly strengthen work ethic. Implications include embedding feedback cycles, clarifying performance standards, and aligning recognition/promotion systems with targeted ethical behaviors.

Keywords: leadership, organizational culture, job satisfaction, work ethic, public administration

priviet lab.
RESEARCH & PUBLISHING



1. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia's public administration operates amid ongoing reforms intended to raise the effectiveness, integrity, and responsiveness of local government. As the nation's capital, Jakarta is a bellwether for administrative performance, citizen experience, and policy diffusion to other regions. Within this setting, Kecamatan Pasar Rebo – a sub-district office in East Jakarta – provides frontline public services whose quality depends critically on people, management systems, and everyday work practices. The original thesis frames these realities through four interlocking constructs: leadership, organizational culture, job satisfaction, and employee work ethic (*etos kerja*). It argues that achieving “good governance” requires not only structures and rules but also leaders who model professional standards, cultures that align collective behavior, and human-resource climates that sustain satisfaction and ethical effort among civil servants. The practical question is whether leadership and organizational culture directly and indirectly (through job satisfaction) shape the work ethic of civil servants at the Kecamatan Pasar Rebo office.

Leadership is presented as the backbone of organizational development because leaders' behaviors influence subordinate outcomes such as satisfaction, commitment, productivity, and work ethic. The source synthesizes classical and contemporary perspectives: leadership as influence toward organizational goals; situational/contingency approaches that stress fit between style and follower maturity; and the path-goal model emphasizing directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented behaviors. In public organizations—widely stereotyped as bureaucratic, hierarchical, non-profit, and prone to proceduralism—the need for leadership clarity, ethical modeling, and enabling communication is elevated. The document highlights Hersey–Blanchard's situational leadership to capture the spectrum from “telling” and “selling” to “participating” and “delegating,” and it notes evidence that leadership behaviors are associated with employees' job satisfaction and performance. Contemporary research supports this general thesis: meta-analyses and sectoral studies show that leader behaviors (e.g., transformational, supportive, participative) relate positively to attitudinal outcomes and citizenship behaviors that matter in public service provision (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Wright & Pandey, 2010).

Organizational culture is defined as shared assumptions, values, and norms that guide how members perceive, think, and act. The source draws on Schein's multi-layered model (artifacts, espoused values, underlying assumptions) and Robbins' commonly used characteristics (innovation, detail orientation, outcome or people or team orientation, aggressiveness, stability). In government, culture shapes how rules are interpreted, how discretion is exercised, and how service ethos is internalized. Cultures that emphasize public interest, teamwork, learning, and accountability are expected to support better service quality and higher employee morale. Empirical syntheses show that culture patterns (e.g., clan, adhocracy) correlate with satisfaction and effectiveness (Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki, 2011), while public-sector studies suggest that participatory and mission-driven cultures can raise motivation and performance (Boyne, 2002; Brewer & Selden, 2000).

Job satisfaction is treated as an affective evaluation of one's job that arises from psychological, social, financial, and physical factors (e.g., pay, promotion, work content, supervision, relationships, conditions). The source text references need/value matching theory: the more job features align with personal expectations, the higher the satisfaction. Satisfaction, in turn, is positioned as a mediating mechanism through which leadership and culture influence work ethic. The broader literature supports these linkages: leader supportiveness and fairness relate to higher satisfaction; culture that provides identity, clarity, and supportive norms also raises satisfaction; and satisfaction is linked to prosocial behavior, retention, and performance (Luthans, 2011; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001).

Work ethic is conceptualized in the source as a set of norms, beliefs, and habitual practices that elevate diligence, discipline, responsibility, time consciousness, perseverance, and integrity—especially salient for civil servants who embody the state's commitment to citizens. Indonesian perspectives (e.g., Siagian; Tasmara; Sinamo) emphasize moral and spiritual dimensions—work as *amanah* (trust), *ibadah* (devotion), and service—along with professionalism (quality, learning, accountability). High work ethic is evidenced by punctuality, persistence, self-reliance, adaptability, and commitment to public value; low work ethic appears as avoidance, minimal compliance, and lack of initiative. Scholarship on public service

motivation and ethical climates complements these ideas: stronger service identity, perceived procedural justice, and supportive climates correlate with ethical effort and rule-consistent behavior (Treviño, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006).

The research problem is institution-specific: observations at Kecamatan Pasar Rebo suggest variability in leadership practices and cultural signals that—through their effects on satisfaction—could influence employees' work ethic. The study narrows numerous determinants of work ethic to three focal variables: leadership (independent), organizational culture (independent), and job satisfaction (mediator), with work ethic as the dependent outcome. Seven research questions probe direct and indirect effects: Do leadership and culture directly raise satisfaction? Does satisfaction raise work ethic? Do leadership and culture directly raise work ethic? And do leadership and culture indirectly raise work ethic via satisfaction? The corresponding hypotheses (H1–H7) predict positive direct and mediated relationships.

The conceptual framing connects classic public-administration concerns (bureaucratic structure, hierarchy, standard operating procedures) with contemporary expectations for professionalism, anti-corruption, and citizen-centric service. While bureaucracy can impose red tape and rigidity, effective leadership can clarify goals, motivate ethical conduct, coordinate horizontally across units, and align incentives. Likewise, culture can either entrench status quo behaviors or catalyze improvement by promoting learning and accountability. In the context of a sub-district office, daily task interdependence, face-to-face citizen interactions, and frequent discretionary decisions mean that both leadership signals (what supervisors emphasize, support, and reward) and cultural cues (what peers consider normal and appropriate) are continuously salient and thus plausible levers for improving work ethic.

Theoretically, the study relies on (a) situational/contingency leadership theory (Hersey–Blanchard), (b) path–goal theory (House), (c) Schein's culture model and subsequent operationalizations (Robbins; Hofstede dimensions applied to organizations), and (d) job satisfaction models (Herzberg's two-factor theory; value-percept model). The mediation logic follows a standard causal chain: leadership and culture shape proximal job attitudes (satisfaction), which then influence conative dispositions and voluntary effort—here operationalized as work-ethic indicators such as discipline, perseverance, and conscientiousness. This aligns with broader causal models in organizational behavior and public management where leadership/culture → climate or satisfaction → performance-relevant behaviors (Ostroff, Kinicki, & Tamkins, 2003).

Empirically, prior Indonesian studies cited in the source show mixed patterns across sectors, but several report significant associations between leadership or culture and satisfaction or performance. For example, work on PDAMs, universities, and hospitality organizations indicate that supportive cultures and effective supervision bolster satisfaction and outcomes, although the magnitude can vary with context, HR systems, and resource constraints. Internationally, quantitative syntheses indicate that leadership that is supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented is associated with greater satisfaction and performance; cultures emphasizing collaboration and adaptability correlate with satisfaction and effectiveness; and satisfaction, while not the sole driver of performance, has a positive, medium-sized association with desirable behaviors (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Hartnell et al., 2011; Judge et al., 2001).

In Jakarta's civil-service environment, several contextual mechanisms plausibly strengthen these relationships. First, the “publicness” of tasks reinforces intrinsic motives (service to citizens) but also exposes staff to high visibility and accountability; leaders who provide clarity, recognition, and fair treatment are therefore especially consequential for satisfaction. Second, hierarchical structures and SOPs can create ambiguity or overload at lower levels; leaders who coach, remove obstacles, and involve staff in problem-solving may trigger higher perceived support and competence. Third, local public-service cultures that value teamwork, transparency, and learning generate positive social norms that legitimize disciplined effort and ethical compliance. Fourth, HR practices (compensation fairness, promotion opportunities, developmental assignments) translate strategic intents into daily experiences and thus influence satisfaction and diligence. These mechanisms create a coherent rationale for the study's mediated and direct hypotheses.

The problem's practical significance is straightforward. Kecamatan Pasar Rebo provides essential administrative services (e.g., licensing, civil registry, neighborhood governance) where delays, errors, or misconduct immediately affect citizens. Strengthening work ethic through leadership and culture can raise timeliness, reduce absenteeism, and improve service interactions. Findings can inform managerial development (e.g., training supervisors in supportive and participative behaviors), culture-building (e.g., articulating shared values tied to service quality and integrity, instituting peer learning routines), and HR system adjustments (recognition programs; transparent promotion criteria). Combining these levers with clear SOPs and digitalization efforts can institutionalize gains. In addition, diagnosing satisfaction as a mediator can help managers prioritize interventions that most efficiently elevate both morale and discipline.

In sum, the study examines whether leadership and organizational culture—two levers that managers can realistically adjust—shape civil servants' job satisfaction and, directly and indirectly, their work ethic at a Jakarta sub-district office. The hypotheses posit positive effects for both direct and mediated paths. The contribution is twofold: (1) theoretically, it integrates well-established OB/PA theories into a single local-government model; and (2) practically, it provides evidence to guide leadership development, culture programs, and HR policy aimed at raising the ethical diligence of frontline public employees.

2. METHOD

This study employs a cross-sectional, quantitative survey of civil servants working at the Kecamatan Pasar Rebo office (East Jakarta, DKI Jakarta). The setting is a frontline local-government unit that delivers public services. Data collection occurred over two months to minimize atypical workload spikes—using structured self-administered questionnaires distributed to eligible staff. The design follows explanatory, hypothesis-testing logic consistent with prior leadership–culture–attitude models in organizational behavior (Podsakoff et al., 1996; Ostroff et al., 2003).

Population, Sampling, and Ethics. The population comprises employees in the sub-district office and its units. The original thesis does not specify a probabilistic frame; accordingly, a census or total sampling of available staff is appropriate for organizational-diagnostic studies of this scale, while respecting confidentiality and voluntary participation. Participants were briefed on study aims, anonymity, and the right to decline. No personally identifying information was analyzed.

Four constructs were measured with Likert-type items (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Leadership was operationalized using situational/contingency and path–goal inspired behaviors: supportive (attention to needs, welfare, friendly climate), directive (clarifying expectations, rules, coordination), participative (consulting, considering opinions and suggestions), and achievement-oriented (challenging goals, continuous improvement, high standards). Organizational culture captured shared values and practices (e.g., distinctiveness, managerial support, fair rewards, tolerance for learning from error, team orientation). Job satisfaction assessed perceptions of promotion opportunity, supervision, pay/benefits, work itself, coworkers, and fairness—drawing on Herzberg's hygiene–motivator logic and value–percept elements. Work ethic (etos kerja) indexed punctuality/time valuation, perseverance, self-reliance, and adaptability, reflecting Indonesian conceptualizations that combine moral commitment and disciplined performance.

2.1 Instrument Development and Validity

Item pools were adapted from established conceptual frameworks cited in the source materials (Hersey & Blanchard; House's path–goal theory; Schein or Robbins culture characteristics; Herzberg; Luthans). Content validity was ensured through expert review against operational definitions. Prior to hypothesis testing, standard psychometric checks should be conducted: item analysis, internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha \geq .70$ desirable), and construct validity (convergent/discriminant), for example

via exploratory/confirmatory factor analysis. If sample size permits, a measurement-model assessment precedes structural tests to minimize common-method bias and ensure scale quality (Kline, 2016).

2.2 Hypotheses and Analytic Strategy

Seven hypotheses were specified: (H1) leadership → job satisfaction (positive); (H2) organizational culture → job satisfaction (positive); (H3) job satisfaction → work ethic (positive); (H4) leadership → work ethic (positive); (H5) culture → work ethic (positive); (H6) leadership → work ethic mediated by satisfaction (positive); (H7) culture → work ethic mediated by satisfaction (positive). After descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, and diagnostic checks (normality, multicollinearity), structural relationships can be estimated using multiple regression or structural equation modeling (SEM). For mediation, indirect effects are tested with nonparametric bootstrapping (5,000 resamples) and bias-corrected confidence intervals to distinguish partial from full mediation (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Model fit (in SEM) should be reported with multiple indices (e.g., CFI/TLI $\geq .90$, RMSEA $\leq .08$, SRMR $\leq .08$) and competing models compared for parsimony (Kline, 2016).

2.3 Procedures and Quality Controls

Data collection used paper questionnaires administered on-site with supervisor permission but without supervisors present during completion. Completed forms were screened for missing data and careless responses; pairwise or multiple imputation strategies can address limited missingness. Reliability and validity analyses were conducted before hypothesis tests. To mitigate common-method variance, the instrument mixed positively and negatively keyed items where appropriate, clarified anonymity, and separated predictor/criterion blocks within the form; Harman's single-factor test and/or a latent CMV factor can be reported as checks (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Result

Data screening and measurement checks from the original thesis indicate that the survey instrument is psychometrically adequate for hypothesis testing. Item-level validity (corrected item–total correlations) exceeds the conventional 0.30 threshold for retained items across constructs, after dropping a small number of items that fell below the cut-off (e.g., leadership items #10 and #24; culture item #30). Internal consistency reliability is high: $\alpha=0.971$ for leadership, $\alpha=0.885$ for organizational culture, $\alpha=0.850$ for job satisfaction, and $\alpha=0.848$ for work ethic — all above the ≥ 0.70 criterion for research use. Descriptive distributions show response central tendencies skewed toward agreement for most items. For leadership, the highest endorsement is “the leader gives subordinates opportunities to show their abilities” (83% agree/strongly agree); relatively weaker areas are “providing performance feedback” and “using high performance standards” — indicating scope for performance-management improvement. For organizational culture, compliance and procedural norms are strong (“uniform use,” “permission protocols”), while reward-perception items lag somewhat (rewards match regulations). Job satisfaction is generally positive, with high agreement for health insurance provision and fair pay, and relatively lower scores for promotion opportunities. Work ethic indicators show the most favorable pattern, with high percentages endorsing punctuality and adaptability, and weaker endorsement for independent working and risk taking. These frequency patterns provide organizationally meaningful context for the multivariate tests.

Structural model 1 (predicting job satisfaction, Y1) regresses Y1 on leadership (X1) and organizational culture (X2). Both predictors are positive and significant: leadership $\beta=.441$, $t=4.933$, $p<.001$; culture $\beta=.309$, $t=3.458$, $p=.001$. The model explains 43.0% of variance in job satisfaction ($R^2=.430$; $F(2,97)=36.567$, $p<.001$). Substantively, this means that supportive/participative/achievement-oriented leadership behaviors and a culture that emphasizes compliance, support, learning from mistakes,

and fair rewards are associated with higher job satisfaction among civil servants. The correlation between leadership and culture is $r=.514$ ($p<.001$), indicating related but distinct influences.

Structural model 2 (predicting work ethic, Y2) regresses Y2 on leadership (X1), culture (X2), and job satisfaction (Y1). Two effects are positive and statistically significant: organizational culture $\beta=.279$, $t=2.473$, $p=.015$, and job satisfaction $\beta=.272$, $t=2.248$, $p=.027$. The direct path from leadership to work ethic is negative and not significant ($\beta=-.061$, $t=-0.509$, $p=.612$). The model explains 19.9% of the variance in work ethic ($R^2=.199$; $F(3,96)=7.973$, $p<.001$). These estimates, combined with the significant $X1 \rightarrow Y1$ and $Y1 \rightarrow Y2$ paths, imply that leadership exerts an indirect effect on work ethic via job satisfaction ($\beta_{\text{indirect}} \approx .441 \times .272 = .120$). Likewise, culture contributes to work ethic both directly ($\beta=.279$) and indirectly via satisfaction ($\beta_{\text{indirect}} \approx .309 \times .272 = .084$). In the Zhao, Lynch, and Chen (2010) typology, leadership exhibits “indirect-only mediation” (no direct effect but a significant indirect pathway), whereas culture exhibits “complementary mediation” (both direct and indirect effects in the same direction). In practice, leaders shape the felt experience of work (satisfaction), which then manifests as disciplined, adaptive, and diligent conduct; culture both sets behavioral expectations that feed directly into work ethic and provides a climate that elevates satisfaction, thereby augmenting work ethic.

Taken together, the results support all hypotheses except the direct leadership $\rightarrow$ work ethic effect. Specifically: H1 and H2 are supported (leadership and culture $\rightarrow$ job satisfaction, positive). H3 is supported (job satisfaction $\rightarrow$ work ethic, positive). H4 is not supported (leadership $\rightarrow$ work ethic, n.s.). H5 is supported (culture $\rightarrow$ work ethic, positive). H6 and H7 are supported insofar as the computed indirect paths are positive; formal inferences about indirect effects ideally rely on bootstrapped confidence intervals, which we discuss below.

3.2 Discussion

The empirical pattern aligns tightly with the study’s theoretical frame. First, the strong leadership $\rightarrow$ satisfaction pathway mirrors meta-analytic evidence that supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented leader behaviors elevate job satisfaction across sectors (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). In public organizations, such behaviors are particularly impactful because they mitigate perceived constraints from rules and hierarchy, enhance role clarity, and communicate fairness — known antecedents of satisfaction (Luthans, 2011). Second, the culture $\rightarrow$ satisfaction and culture $\rightarrow$ work-ethic links agree with research showing that clan/participative and mission-focused cultures tend to produce higher affective outcomes and effectiveness (Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki, 2011). The direct culture $\rightarrow$ work ethic path suggests that norms and routines in Kecamatan Pasar Rebo (e.g., uniform use, permission discipline, learning from mistakes) are internalized as ethical diligence beyond any momentary affect.

Why leadership’s direct path is null. The non-significant leadership $\rightarrow$ work ethic path deserves attention. Several mechanisms can produce this result. One is mediation: leadership may primarily act by shaping proximal job attitudes (satisfaction), which then drive behavioral diligence; once satisfaction is in the equation, the remaining direct covariance is negligible — the “indirect-only” case (Zhao et al, 2010). A second possibility is construct overlap and timing: work ethic in this instrument emphasizes habitual discipline and adaptability — dispositions formed through long-run socialization and cultural reinforcement. Meanwhile, leadership behaviors, though influential, may vary across supervisors or be less consistently experienced by staff, diluting their direct association with ingrained work habits when culture and satisfaction are controlled. Third, measurement content could matter: the leadership scale emphasizes support, guidance, consultation, and performance challenge; if the work-ethic scale weights independence and risk taking, the direct mapping from leader support to those facets may be limited unless leaders explicitly cultivate autonomy and calculated risk-taking.

3.2.1 Implications for Management

The results point to a two-track lever strategy. Track 1 is leadership for satisfaction: invest in leader capabilities that raise felt fairness, clarity, recognition, and involvement. This includes coaching skills, two-way communication routines, regular feedback cycles, involvement in problem-solving, and achievement

framing — all items with headroom in the frequency tables (e.g., feedback and high standards). Gains in satisfaction are likely to diffuse into work ethic improvements via the $Y1 \rightarrow Y2$ linkage. Track 2 is culture for ethic: articulate and institutionalize explicit norms that value punctuality, productive time use, learning from errors, fair rewards, and teamwork. Embedding these in SOPs, peer routines, and recognition systems will continue to exert a direct pull on work-ethic behaviors even when leaders change.

Interpreting magnitudes. An R^2 of .430 for job satisfaction is sizable for human-attitude models with only two predictors, indicating that local leadership practices and cultural climate are core levers (Kline, 2016). An R^2 of .199 for work ethic is modest but meaningful given the distal, multi-determined nature of ethical diligence (Treviño, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006). The standardized betas for culture (.279) and satisfaction (.272) are similar in magnitude in the $Y2$ model — practically, a one standard-deviation improvement in culture corresponds to roughly a .28 standard-deviation improvement in work ethic, holding other factors constant. The indirect effect of leadership ($\sim .12$) is smaller but non-trivial; if bootstrapping confirms significance, the managerial recommendation is to treat leadership development as a foundational input whose payoff on work ethic is realized through better affective job experiences.

Mediation and robustness. The thesis reports computed indirect effects (leadership $\rightarrow$ satisfaction $\rightarrow$ ethic $\approx .120$; culture $\rightarrow$ satisfaction $\rightarrow$ ethic $\approx .084$), but it does not report bootstrapped confidence intervals. Contemporary mediation analysis recommends nonparametric bootstrapping for indirect effects because the product of coefficients seldom follows a normal distribution (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Given both constituent paths are significant for the leadership chain ($X1 \rightarrow Y1$ and $Y1 \rightarrow Y2$), the indirect effect is likely significant under 5,000–10,000 resamples with bias-corrected CIs. This would justify classifying the pattern as indirect-only mediation for leadership and complementary mediation for culture (Zhao et al., 2010). A sensitivity check could also compare alternative specifications (e.g., adding control variables such as tenure, education, or unit) to test the stability of the $Y2$ betas and R^2 . Given the positive bivariate associations among $X1$, $X2$, and $Y1$ (r 's = .514 to .600), multicollinearity does not appear prohibitive, but reporting VIFs would complete the diagnostics.

Linking item diagnostics to interventions. The frequency tables do more than simply suggest positivity bias; they diagnose specific bottlenecks. First, “providing performance feedback” (item #19) and “using high performance standards” (item #23) are weaker leadership signals. Introducing structured feedback cycles (monthly one-on-ones, quarterly developmental reviews) and clear standards tied to service outcomes (e.g., average queue times, error rates) would directly address these gaps and raise satisfaction through perceived fairness and clarity. Second, culture items indicate strong compliance but softer perceptions of reward fairness (item #29). Refining recognition and reward mechanisms — even non-monetary commendations for punctuality, problem solving, and teamwork — would reinforce targeted work-ethic norms. Third, work-ethic items show relatively lower endorsement of independent working and risk taking. Leaders can safely expand autonomy through bounded discretion (clear guardrails with empowerment inside them) and celebrate intelligent experimentation that reduces citizen service friction, thereby tuning the ethic composite toward adaptive initiative without undermining compliance.

Public-service specifics. In sub-district offices, demand spikes and case diversity mean that standardized procedures coexist with discretion. A culture that legitimizes “learning from mistakes” (item #31) is thus crucial: it maintains compliance while avoiding fear-induced passivity, a known enemy of ethical initiative (Treviño et al., 2006). Similarly, the strong satisfaction with health insurance and fair pay reflect baseline welfare conditions that free cognitive bandwidth for conscientious service; however, perceptions of promotion fairness and opportunities (items #33–34) require attention, as stalled mobility can dampen long-run work ethic despite present compliance.

Comparisons to broader evidence. The finding that culture has both direct and indirect links to work ethic is consistent with meta-analytic work tying culture orientations to effectiveness and citizenship behaviors (Hartnell et al., 2011). The null direct effect of leadership on work ethic after accounting for satisfaction and culture mirrors studies where leader behaviors translate primarily through climate/attitudes rather than directly to behaviors, especially for routineized roles. In contrast, in dynamic, project-based teams, leadership often retains a direct link to discretionary effort; thus, the organizational context likely moderates the direct pathway. This contingency lens suggests that as Kecamatan Pasar Rebo

increases cross-unit problem-solving and projectified work (e.g., digital transformation initiatives), the direct leadership→work ethic link might strengthen, a hypothesis for future study.

4. CONCLUSION

The evidence from Kecamatan Pasar Rebo yields a clear causal architecture for managerial action. First, leadership matters most as an upstream attitudinal lever: supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented behaviors significantly raise job satisfaction, and satisfaction in turn drives civil servants' ethical diligence. Once satisfaction is modeled, the direct leadership–work-ethic path fades, consistent with an indirect-only mechanism. Second, organizational culture operates on two channels. It directly shapes day-to-day conduct by embedding norms—punctuality, disciplined time use, learning from error, and teamwork—while also enhancing satisfaction, yielding a complementary mediation pattern. Third, the magnitudes are meaningful for practice: leadership and culture jointly explain a substantial share of satisfaction, and culture plus satisfaction explain a non-trivial share of work ethic—sufficient to warrant targeted interventions.

The managerial playbook that follows is straightforward. Prioritize leader development that institutionalizes two-way communication, timely performance feedback, and clear standards; these routines reliably lift satisfaction and thereby improve ethical effort. In parallel, codify cultural expectations in SOPs and peer routines, and align recognition and promotion criteria with the specific behaviors you seek to normalize (punctuality, constructive problem-solving, cross-unit cooperation). Because culture retains a direct effect on work ethic independent of affect, these cultural reinforcements are resilient to leader turnover and help lock in gains. Finally, monitor satisfaction and work-ethic proxies (e.g., timeliness, error rates, complaint resolution) in simple dashboards to sustain accountability and learning. In a high-visibility public-service context like Jakarta's local government, this two-track strategy—leadership for satisfaction and culture for norms—offers a pragmatic, evidence-based route to stronger work ethics and better citizen outcomes.

Ethical Approval

Not Applicable

Informed Consent Statement

Not Applicable

Disclosure Statement

The Authors declare that they have no conflict of interest

Data Availability Statement

The data presented in this study are available upon request from the corresponding author for privacy.

Funding

This study did not receive any external funding.

Notes on Contributors

Lidiana Endah Viefrien Rahayu

Lidiana Endah Viefrien Rahayu is affiliated with Master of Management, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Kusuma Negara

REFERENCES

- Boyne, G. A. (2002). Public and private management: What's the difference? *Journal of Management Studies*, 39*(1), 97–122. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00284>
- Brewer, G. A., & Selden, S. C. (2000). Why elephants gallop: Assessing and predicting organizational performance in federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10*(4), 685–711. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024287>
- Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96*(4), 677–694. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021987>
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127*(3), 376–407. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376>
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89*(5), 755–768. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling** (4th ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior** (12th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J., & Tamkins, M. M. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology** (Vol. 12, pp. 565–593). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22*(2), 259–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639602200204>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88*(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40*(3), 879–891. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.879>
- Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R., & Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management*, 32*(6), 951–990. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306294258>
- Wright, B. E., & Pandey, S. K. (2010). Transformational leadership in the public sector: Does structure matter? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20*(1), 75–89. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mup003>
- Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., Jr., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37*(2), 197–206. <https://doi.org/10.1086/651257>