The Influence of Leadership, Professional Attitude, and Trust on the Performance of Navy Officers

Bambang Wiratama, Elisabeth Tanti Pudiastuti

Abstract. The performance of Navy personnel is urgently needed to drive the performance of the organization and in the context of increasing productivity and work ethics in the Navy's organization. At present, it is indicated that there has been a decline in performance among Navy personnel. As for several aspects that can affect the performance of Navy personnel, including the Leadership Style, Professional Attitude and Trust of subordinates. This study aims to significantly analyze how the interaction and influence between four variables consisting of: the direct influence of the Aspects of Leadership Style (X1) on the Performance of Navy Officers (Y), the direct influence of the Professional Attitude Aspect (X2) on the Performance of TNI AL Officers (Y), the direct influence of the Leadership Style Aspect (X3) on the Trust Aspect (X4), and the direct effect of the Attitude Attitude Aspect (X2) on the Trust Aspect (X3) and including analyzing how the relationship of indirect influence on these aspects. This study uses survey methods and hypothesis testing using the Correlation and Path Analysis Technique in the Constellation model between variables, to get a direct relationship between variables and by using the Sobel technique to determine the indirect relationship between variables. Furthermore, validation and reliability tests are also carried out to strengthen the research results. In the end the results showed that there was a strong direct relationship between the 4 aspects of the variable, with the correlation coefficient and path: (r1 = 0.409; r2 = 0.731), (r1 = 0.233; r2 = 0.591), (r3 = 0.288; r4 = 0.695), (r31 = 0.600; r31 = 0.704), (p 32 = 0.203; r32 = 0.512).
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I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of a rigid and hierarchical traditional military organization that was suitable in the era of World War II, in the 1980s, has been transformed into the concept of an organization without borders, which must be able to compete in areas that demand speed, innovation, flexibility, and integration. In addition to the challenges at the organizational level, the strategic environment facing military leaders also experienced changes at the individual level. The concept of the military as a special profession-oriented to institutional values such as duty, honor, and sacrifice, has slowly been transformed into a military concept as an occupation similar to other civil works that are oriented to occupational values such as salary, benefits, and satisfaction. work [7].

This change occurred due to a social shift from the industrial era in the 20th century called modern, to the 21st-century information era called post-modern, which also impacted the military environment. The most significant change in the concept of professionalism was triggered by the interpretation of job suitability (job-person fit), from being job-oriented, to being workers. This causes, the amount of responsibility due to increased duties and positions, no longer solely arises because of the position and organizational structure [9].

The main problem related to this is the problem of the performance of the Indonesian Navy's soldiers from the results of temporary observations that saw a decline, which is likely to have an impact on goal ignition. Facing the era of the Navy world-class, the expected performance is formed in every soldier especially Navy officers who include: (a) Liking the responsibility to solve problems. (b) Tend to set difficult targets and dare to take risks. (c) Has clear and realistic goals. (d) Have a comprehensive work plan. (e) Prioritize real feedback about the results of his achievements. (f) Happy with the task done and always want to complete it perfectly [20].

Discussing problems arising from suboptimal performance, researchers try to discuss and analyze some of the variables that are considered capable of influencing performance improvement, including:

a. Professional attitudes Variable, which is quite crucial and critical in soldier values about the military profession which is more associated with work values such as salary, benefits and job satisfaction. In this study, the profession as the military was examined based on the attitude of the profession which was thought to have an influence on the high and low performance [1].

b. Leadership Style Variable, this is related to the view that the Navy needs to formulate a doctrine of leadership that can maintain the soldier good values that have been the ideological strength and professional identity of the Indonesian Navy [3].

c. Trust Variable. The trust of individual members (officers) towards the leadership is a separate stimulus that comes from outside the self that can provide the driving force for achievement. Trust is defined as the willingness to be vulnerable to accepting authority or responsibility based on positive expectations of intentions and actions that are believed [5].

Starting from the complexity of the performance problems of the Navy officers, the researchers felt interested to examine more deeply in the study entitled “The influence of leadership style, professional attitude, and confidence in the performance of Navy officers”. Based on the background discussed, the problems in this study can be formulated as follows:

a. Does the leadership style have a direct positive effect on performance?
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II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

II.1. The Concept of Leadership Style

In an era full of competition as it is today, any type of organization is certainly required to stay afloat, and the influence of leadership is a distinguishing factor of the success of an organization. A leader must be able to give a good influence, especially can provide examples of behavior so that subordinate personnel wants to work together and work effectively and efficiently in achieving organizational goals. Definition of leadership style according to [6] Leadership Styles: Leadership is a social influence process in which the leader seeks the voluntary participation of subordinates to reach organizational goals. Leadership style is a way that leaders use to interact with their subordinates. Meanwhile, other opinions state that the leadership style is the pattern of behavior (words and actions) of a leader that is felt by others [8].

Leadership style is the behavior or method chosen and used by the leader in influencing the thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and behavior of the members of his subordinate organization [10]. The leadership style is as follows:

a. Authoritarian Leadership Style

This leadership style brings together several leadership behaviors or styles that are centered on the leader as the sole determinant, ruler, and controller of organizational members and their activities to achieve organizational goals.

b. Democratic Leadership Style

Leadership style puts people as the most important supporting factor in leadership that is based on and prioritizes orientation in relationships with members of the organization.

c. Free Leadership Style

This leadership style holds that members of the organization can be independent in making decisions or able to take care of themselves respectively, with little possible direction or guidance in realizing their respective basic tasks as part of the main tasks of the organization [11].

Related to the leadership style, it takes a leader who has a style that can align organizational goals with the development of civilization that can influence group members/organizations/ company employees to have high spirits in achieving organizational goals. This is in line with opinion [2] which says that: Today organizations need effective leaders who understand the complexities of the rapidly changing global environment. Different leadership styles may affect organizational effectiveness or performance. The success or failure of proper organizations, nations and other social units has been largely credited to the nature of their leadership style.

II.2. The Concept of Professional Attitude

The military profession can be called a profession with a class of public goods that is different from the profession of doctors and lawyers belonging to the profession of private goods [4]. The professional military is a picture of the military that has expertise specifications in the field of defense, has a social responsibility that is serving the country or in other words pays attention to national interests, and has a corporate character that gives birth to strong Esprit De Corps [12].

Understanding Attitude is an individual who can accept and consider all ideas that arise from anywhere. The personality arises because the individual has a lot of experience gained from his openness to new things that will affect individual creativity. Attitude is a way of placing or carrying oneself, or a way of feeling, a way of thinking, and behavior. Attitude is a complex mental state that involves beliefs and feelings, and disposition to act in a certain way. This opinion is reinforced that attitude is a mental and neural condition obtained from experience, which directs and dynamically influences individual responses to all objects and related situations. There are three components in attitude according to [22], namely:

a. Cognitive, consisting of all the cognitions that a person has regarding certain attitude objects, facts, knowledge, and beliefs about objects.

b. Affective, associated with emotions or feelings (positive, negative, like it or not), which accompanies an idea.

c. Behavior, related to the tendency or readiness for action. The attitude is formed through certain processes, through continuous social contact between individuals with other individuals around them.

Attitude Components according to [13], explains the three components of attitude that support each other. First, the component of cognition. Components of cognition include the receipt of information captured by the five senses, which are then processed and perceived, compared to data/information that has been owned, classified, then stored in memory and used in response to stimuli. Second, the affective component is related to the feelings or emotions of individuals in the form of happy or displeased toward the object of attitude. Third, the cognition component which refers to the tendency of an individual's actions or responses to attitude objects that originate from the past. The intended response can be in the form of observable actions and can be in the form of intentions or intentions to carry out certain actions in connection with the object of attitude.

As for the definition of Profession, according to [15], Profession is a position or job that demands expertise from its members, that is, a profession cannot be done by just anyone. People who run a profession must have special expertise and have the ability to obtain from special education for the profession. The profession has several characteristics, as follows: (a) Performance standards; (b) Special educational institutions to produce professional actors with responsible academic quality standards; (c) Professional organization; (d) Professional ethics and codes of ethics; (e) Reward system; (f) Recognition from the community [18].
A profession is a job that is prepared through a process of education and training. The higher the level of education that must be fulfilled, the higher the degree of the profession it carries. High or low professionalism is highly dependent on the expertise and education level. Professional attitude influences performance. This condition is also supported by [16] which states that: From some of the concepts above, the attitude of the profession can be synthesized as a way of placing or carrying oneself to a job, which is measured using cognitive indicators of the Navy's military profession, affective of the Navy's military profession, and conative profession the Indonesian Navy.

II.3. The Concept of Trust

Trust is a positive expectation that another will not allow words, actions, or decisions-act opportunistically [17]. Trust is a positive hope that others will not be opportunistic either through words, actions or decisions. The term opportunistic refers to risks and innate vulnerabilities in trust-based relationships. Trust is vulnerable at times, for example, opening personal information or sticking to someone else's promises. This means that if the trust fades, it will have a serious impact on team performance. Vice versa if fellow employees trust each other then they will be willing to bear the impact of the actions taken together. This is in accordance [14] which states: there is a great need for trust. Trust is important in all spheres of social life. Trust has emerged as a central construct in a wide range of organizational studies including those focusing on performance.

By opinion [23] which states that Trust has become a major element of socially responsible and ethical business enterprises. Furthermore, [21] states that Trust is the capacity to depend on each other's words and actions. Trust is the capacity to depend on each other's words and actions. Meanwhile, [19] also argues about trust as an expectation that occurs in two directions: Trust refers to positive expectation one person has toward another person in situations involving risk. A high level of trust occurs when others affect you in situations where you are at risk but you believe they will not harm you. Trust includes both your beliefs and conscious feeling about the relationship with other members.

A belief gives a positive hope for someone towards others in a risky situation. A high level of trust occurs when other people influence you in a risky situation but you believe that they will not harm you. Trust includes beliefs and conscious feelings about relationships with other members. [21] argues that “Trust is an essential element in effective leader-follower relationships because it inspires collaboration and commitment to common goals”. Trust is an important element in the effectiveness of leaders' relationships with subordinates because it inspires collaboration and commitment to common goals. The indicators of trust are:

a. The honesty of the seller in the transaction.
b. The seller's responsibility to the buyer.
c. Trust that the company has a good reputation.

II.4. The Concept of Personnel Performance

The poor performance of organizational members will certainly be a bad influence on the course of the organization's wheels as a whole not only affect the achievement of the vision and mission of the organization but will also affect morale and performance of all parts of the organization. Likewise with the Navy organization, allowing members or personnel to perform poorly or not optimally and then mutating them to be out of formation might be an easy solution to do because they are considered not to contribute optimally to the organization, but in fact, this is a transfer of the problem to new problems.

Discussing the performance, there are several definitions expressed by the experts as [24] states Performance or performance is the result of work produced by employees or actual behavior that is displayed following its role in the organization. Furthermore [25] defines performance and work performance, performance is the result of work in quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out their duties by the responsibilities given to him. [26] also states that performance is the work that can be achieved by one or a group of people in an organization, following the responsibilities and authority of each to achieve organizational goals.

Individual performance and organization performance have a very close relationship. The achievement of organizational goals cannot be separated from the resources owned by organizations that are driven or run by a group of people who play an active role as actors in efforts to achieve organizational goals. Performance includes several aspects [19] namely:

- a. From Quality of Work
- b. Promptness
- c. Capability
- d. Communication

According to [8], Performance indicators are criteria used to assess the success of achieving organizational goals that are realized in certain measures. Performance indicators can also be defined as certain values or characteristics that are used to measure the output or outcome of an activity. Whereas [12] states that in accordance with the notion of performance that is what is done or not done by an employee in carrying out his main tasks, the performance indicators in carrying out work in an organization or company environment includes five elements, namely: (a) Quantity of results work achieved, (b) The quality of the work achieved, (c) The time period for achieving the performance, (d) Attendance and activities while present at work, and (e) Ability to work together.

II.5. The Research Methods

This research uses a quantitative approach through survey methods. As the unit of analysis is Navy personnel with the rank of Colonel. According to [22], Survey design means the procedure is used to select units from the population for inclusion in the sample. Designing a survey is the most important stage of a survey since design deficiencies cannot always be compensated for when editing and analyzing the data. Furthermore according to [16], Descriptive survey research, the approaches share the following common characteristics: (a) Identify a Research Topic; (b) Conduct a Review of the Literature; (c) Develop Research Questions; (d) Develop the Survey.

In this study, hypothesis testing uses path analysis techniques with a constellation model between variables, consisting of 4 variables namely; variable X, called the independent variable (exogenous), namely Leadership Style (X1),
Professional Attitude (X2), Trust (X3) and Y variable, called the dependent variable (endogenous), namely the Performance of Navy Officers. The constellation of research problem models that show the model of the relationship between exogenous variables (X) and endogenous variables (Y) is described as follows:
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Y: Performance of Navy Officers
X1: Leadership Style
X2: Professional Attitude
X3: Trust

Based on theoretical studies and frameworks, the hypotheses in this study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Leadership style has a direct positive effect on performance
Hypothesis 2: Professional attitude has a direct positive effect on performance
Hypothesis 3 Trust has a direct positive effect on performance.
Hypothesis 4: Leadership style has a direct positive effect on trust
Hypothesis 5: Professional attitude has a direct positive effect on trust
Hypothesis 6 Leadership style has a positive indirect effect on performance through trust
Hypothesis 7: The attitude of the profession has a positive indirect effect on performance through trust

In this study, the population that was the object was the Navy Officer with the rank of Colonel. Primary data were obtained directly from respondents in the form of their responses to research instrument items. Sampling for this study with the Stratified Random Sampling method [26]. To determine how many samples were taken, the Slovin formula with an error rate of 5% is used as follows:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N \cdot (e)^2} \]

n: Sample size taken
N: Total population
e: Margin of error (0.01 - 0.5)

Data collection in this study was carried out through questionnaires designed in models such as the Linkert scale. In this scale, the statements submitted are supplemented by five alternative answers and their weights for each alternative [27]. For the Linkert scale the details are: Always = 5, Often = 4, Sometimes = 3, Rarely = 2, and Never = 1.

The questionnaire as a research instrument is based on a theoretical framework that is confirmed in the form of conceptual definitions and operational definitions which are then presented in the form of a research instrument grid. The grid is then spelled out in statement items and then tested to expert respondents using validity and reliability testing before being used for research.

II.6. Validity Test

The validity of the instrument is the appropriateness of the measuring instrument used to measure the consistency of Navy Supply Service personnel measurement results. The questionnaire was arranged based on indicators on each variable and functioned as an instrument grid. Calculate the correlation coefficient between the test result scores to be tested for validity with the standardized test results owned by the same person by using the formula of product-moment correlation using rough numbers (Pearson product correlation), namely:

\[ r_{xy} = \frac{n \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i y_i - \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \right)}{\sqrt{\left( n \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 - \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \right)^2 \right) \left( n \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i^2 - \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \right)^2 \right)}} \]

Note:
- \( r_{xy} \): correlation coefficient between X and Y
- \( x_i \): i-th data values for group X
- \( y_i \): i-th data values for group Y
- n: data
The instrument is valid if \( r_{arithmetic} \geq r_{table} \)
The instrument is invalid if \( r_{count} < r_{table} \)

II.5. Reliability Test

Instrument reliability is the level of reliability of the measuring instrument used to measure the consistency of Navy Supply Service personnel measurement results. If the reliability coefficient of the instrument is high, then describing the measuring instrument is reliable and reliable so that it can be used in research. To calculate the reliability of the instrument the reliability testing is done by analyzing the consistency of the items that existed by testing the instrument to the test respondents [28]. This reliability analysis was carried out using the Alpha Reliability Coefficient (Alpha Cronbach) technique.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
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III.1. Analysis of Research Results

Data collected in this study are data from four variables, including Performance (Y) as Endogenous, Leadership Style (X1), Professional Attitudes (X2) and Trust (X3) as Exogenous variables. The data obtained from research on each variable has a theoretical score and an empirical score. Theoretical scores are obtained by calculating the minimum and maximum scores of the instrument before the instrument is used research. While the empirical score is obtained by calculating the minimum and maximum scores obtained from an instrument after the research is used. Theoretical scores and empirical scores are then compared so that it can be seen how far the difference between the two is in Table 1, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument of Variable</th>
<th>Number of Statement Items</th>
<th>Theoretical score</th>
<th>Empirical score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Lowest</td>
<td>The Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Attitude</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data analysis of the above research results, each of the highest average values per item and the lowest average value per item in the indicators contained from leadership style variables (X1), professional attitude variables (X2), trust variables (X3) and the Performance variable (Y) can be seen in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Highest indicator</th>
<th>Lowest indicator</th>
<th>Average Value per Item</th>
<th>Average Value per Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Performance (Y)</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Work quality</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Leadership style (X1)</td>
<td>Satisfying</td>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Professional Attitude (X2)</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>4.493</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Trust (X3)</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2, it is known that the results of the average value per indicator item of each variable continued to calculate the data obtained from the results of the study tabulated to describe the distribution of data or data through central tendency values and graphs. Central tendency values include the mean, standard error of mean, median, mode (highest frequency score), standard deviation, variance, skewness, standard error of skewness, kurtosis, standard error of cursor, Range, minimum (lowest value), maximum (highest value) and Sum (total number), as well as frequency distribution and histogram. Based on the results of data processing, Table 3 Correlation between Main Variables is made, to find out the correlation coefficient is significant or not, see Table 3 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>x1</th>
<th>x2</th>
<th>x3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.732*</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.695*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>x1</th>
<th>x2</th>
<th>x3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.732*</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.695*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>x1</th>
<th>x2</th>
<th>x3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.591*</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.704*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>x1</th>
<th>x2</th>
<th>x3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.695*</td>
<td>.704*</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

** Table 4. Data Processing Results to Determine the Correlation between Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.732**</td>
<td>0.591**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.732**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.515**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.591**</td>
<td>0.515**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.695**</td>
<td>0.704**</td>
<td>0.512**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 and Table 3 above show the correlation between:

a. Performance with leadership style is 0.732 with a significance level of 0.000, then 0.000 <0.05, so the data is valid.

b. Performance with a professional attitude of 0.591 with a significance level of 0.000, then 0.000 <0.05, so the data is valid.

c. Performance with the confidence of 0.695 with a significance level of 0.000, then 0.000 <0.05, so the data is valid.

d. Trust with a leadership style of 0.704 with a significance level of 0.000, then 0.000 <0.05, so the data is valid.

5. Confidence with a professional attitude of 0.512 with a significance level of 0.000, then 0.000 <0.05, so the data is valid.

The next step is to calculate the path coefficient. Based on the calculation of the path coefficient with the SPSS Statistics Version 23 program, the following results are obtained: The calculation results for the first structure obtained the following results.

Table 5. Results of calculations using SPSS statistical programs for X1, X2, and X3 Exogenous, and Endogenous Y.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,051</td>
<td>5,584</td>
<td>4,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>3,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>2,613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Performance
The table above, to calculate the Regression equation $Y ^\text{ predicted} = 23.051 + 0.341X1 + 0.198X2 + 0.197X3$

For $\rho_{y1} = 0.409$ $\rho_{y2} = 0.233$ $\rho_{y3} = 0.288$

For the $YX1$ equation, $t$ arithmetic = 3.698 > $t$ table 2.390 at $\alpha = 0.01$ and $t$ table = 2,000 at $\alpha = 0.05$, then it is significant.

For the $YX2$ equation, $t$ arithmetic = 2.547 > $t$ table 2,000 at $\alpha = 0.05$, then it is significant.

For the $YX3$ equation, $t$ count = 2.613 > $t$ table 2.390 at $\alpha = 0.01$ and $t$ table = 2,000 at $\alpha = 0.05$, then it is significant.

Thus overall the path diagram in this study can be presented in Figure 2. as follows:

Figure 2. Relationship Diagram of Leadership Style, Professional Attitude, Trust and Performance
Based on the calculation above, it turns out that the value of t count that has a path coefficient is greater than the value of t table \( \alpha = 0.05 \) is \( \rho y1, \rho y2, \rho y3, \rho p31, \) and \( \rho p32. \) So it can be stated that \( \rho y1, \rho y2, \rho y3, \rho p31, \) and \( \rho p32. \) Significant path coefficient. Equation diagram for sub-structure paths 1 and 2, see Table 7.

### Table 7. Equation of Path Structure diagram

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sub Structure</th>
<th>Regression Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>( Y^\approx = 23,051 + 0.341 X1 + 0.198 X2 + 0.197 X3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>( X3^\approx = 0.882 + 0.731 X1 + 0.253 X2 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III.2. Hypothesis test.

#### III.2.1. Direct Hypothesis Testing.

After analyzing the path structure model, the path coefficient results are used to test the research hypothesis. The criteria used in hypothesis testing is if the path coefficient obtained is less than \( \alpha = 0.05 \), then it can be considered path coefficient is meaningless.

a. The Effect of leadership style on performance.

The first hypothesis states that the leadership style directly influences performance.

Statistical Hypothesis: Ho: \( \beta y1 \leq 0 \)  
\( H1: \beta y1 > 0 \)

Based on the calculation results show that leadership style has a positive effect on performance, this can be seen from the path coefficient \( \rho y1 = 0.409 \) to find out whether leadership style has a direct effect on performance, then the significance test with t-test was performed. The path coefficient is significant if the value of t \( > t \) table. T-test results obtained t-count = 8.652 while t table = 2.390 at \( \alpha = 0.01 \) for \( dk = 65 \) so that \( t \) count \( > t \) table or 8.652 > 2.390, then reject H0 or accept H1, the path coefficient \( \rho y1 \) is significant. Thus the leadership style (X1) has a positive effect on performance (Y).

b. The Effect of Professional Attitudes on Performance.

The first hypothesis states that professional attitude directly influences performance.

Statistical Hypothesis: Ho: \( \beta y2 \leq 0 \)  
\( H1: \beta y2 > 0 \)

Based on the calculation results show that the attitude of the profession has a positive effect on performance, this can be seen from the path coefficient \( \rho y2 = 0.233 \) to find out whether Empowerment has a direct effect on performance, then the significance test with t-test was performed. The path coefficient is significant if the value of t \( > t \) table. T-test results obtained t-count = 5.903 while t table = 2.390 at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) for \( dk = 65 \) so that \( t \) count \( > t \) table or 5.903 > 2.390, then reject H0 or accept H1, the path coefficient \( \rho y2 \) is significant. Thus the leadership style (X1) has a positive effect on performance (Y).

c. The Effect of trust on Performance.

The first hypothesis states that trust directly influences performance.

Statistical Hypothesis: Ho: \( \beta y3 \leq 0 \)  
\( H1: \beta y3 > 0 \)

Based on the calculation results show that trust has a positive effect on performance, this can be seen from the path coefficient \( \rho y3 = 0.288 \) to find out whether or not trust significantly has a direct effect on performance, then a significance test with the t-test is performed. The path coefficient is significant if the value of t \( > t \) table. T-test results obtained t-count = 7.800 while t table = 2.390 at \( \alpha = 0.01 \) for \( dk = 65 \), so that \( t \) count \( > t \) table or 7.800 > 2.390, then reject H0 or accept H1, the path coefficient \( \rho y3 \) is significant. Thus trust (X3) has a positive effect on Performance (Y).

d. Effect of leadership style on Trust.

The first hypothesis states that leadership style directly influences trust.

Statistical Hypothesis: Ho: \( \beta 31 \leq 0 \)  
\( H1: \beta 31 > 0 \)

Based on the calculation results show that leadership style has a positive effect on trust, it can be seen from the path coefficient \( \rho 31 = 0.600 \) to determine whether leadership style has a direct effect on trust, so the significance test with t-test was carried out. The path coefficient is significant if the value of t \( > t \) table. The results of the t-test are obtained t-count = 8.000, while t-table = 2.390 at \( \alpha = 0.01 \) for \( dk = 65 \), so that t \( > t \) table or 8.000 > 2.390, then reject H0 or accept H1, the path coefficient \( \rho 31 \) is significant. Thus the leadership style (X1) has a positive effect on Confidence (X3).

e. The Influence of professional attitude on Trust.

The first hypothesis states that professional attitudes directly influence Trust.

Statistical Hypothesis: Ho: \( \beta 32 \leq 0 \)  
\( H1: \beta 32 > 0 \)

Based on the calculation results show that the attitude of the profession has a positive effect on Trust, this can be seen from the path coefficient \( \rho 32 = 0.203 \) to find out whether the attitude of the profession has a significant direct effect on Trust, then the significance test is performed with the t-test. The path coefficient is significant if the value of t \( > t \) table. T-test results obtained t-count = 4.806, while t table = 2.000 at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) for \( dk = 65 \), so that \( t \) table or 4.806 > 2.000 then reject H0 or accept H1, the path coefficient \( \rho 32 \) is significant. Thus the attitude of the profession (X2) has a positive effect on Confidence (X3).

### Table 8. Hypothesis Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Statistic Test</th>
<th>Path coefficient</th>
<th>T Count dk =65</th>
<th>T Table</th>
<th>Ho Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Leadership style has a positive effect on performance | \( Ho: \beta y1 \leq 0 \)  
\( H1: \beta y1 > 0 \) | \( \rho y1 =0,409 \)  
\( 8,652** \) | 2.390 | Ho Rejected |
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III.2.2. The indirect effect hypothesis. (using Sobel Test).

a. The indirect influence of leadership style on performance through trust. The hypothesis states that the leadership style has an indirect effect on performance through trust.

Statistic Hypothesis: Ho: βy31 ≤ 0
H1: βy31 > 0

Based on the calculation results show that leadership style influences trust, at α = 0.05, this is count = 0.002, Z count = 2.5727, with Z critical value limit = ±1.96, where = 2.5727 > 1.96, thus stated a significant effect. (using Sobel Test).

b. The indirect influence of professional attitudes on performance through trust. The hypothesis states that the attitude of the profession has an indirect effect on performance through trust.

Statistic Hypothesis: Ho: βy32 ≤ 0
H1: βy32 > 0

Based on the calculation results show that the attitude of the profession influences trust, at α = 0.05, this is count = 0.000, and count = 0.000, Z arithmetic = 2.8337, with Z critical value limit = ±1.96, where = 2.8337 > 1.96, thus stated a significant effect. (Using Sobel Test).

c. Trust has a direct positive effect on performance. The implication to improve performance can be done by adjusting the leadership style with the existing work situation, a leader in the military environment must understand that the leadership style in the military environment is authoritarian democratic so that a leader must know when and under conditions how to apply the leadership style between authoritarian styles in a democratic style. Applying the right leadership style will be able to create a good performance. So that the real implication can be said that performance can be improved if there is an adjustment to the leadership style.

IV. CONCLUSION

This research is intended to look for factors that can affect the performance of the Navy Colonel. In its implementation using quantitative methods that are processed based on the path analysis method. Based on the results of the statistical hypothesis test and discussion, the study produced the following conclusions:

a. Leadership style has a direct positive effect on performance.

b. The attitude of the profession has a direct positive effect on performance.

c. Trust has a direct positive effect on performance.

d. Leadership style has a direct positive effect on trust.

e. The attitude of the profession has a direct positive effect on Belief.

f. Leadership style has an indirect positive effect on performance through trust.

g. The attitude of the indirectly positive effect on performance through trust

The implications of the results of the study with the title of how the influence of leadership style, attitude, and confidence in performance, can be explained as follows:

| 2 | The attitude of the profession has a positive effect on performance | Ho : βy2 ≤ 0 | H1 : βy2 > 0 | Py2 =0,233 | 5,903* | 2,000 | Ho Rejected |
| 3 | Trust has a positive effect on performance | Ho : βy3 ≤ 0 | H1 : βy3 > 0 | Py3 =0,288 | 7,800** | 2,390 | Ho Rejected |
| 4 | Leadership style has a positive effect on trust | Ho : β31 ≤ 0 | H1 : β31 > 0 | P31 =0,600 | 8,000* | 2,000 | Ho Rejected |
| 5 | Leadership style has a positive effect on performance | Ho : β32 ≤ 0 | H1 : β32 > 0 | P32 =0,203 | 4,806** | 2,390 | Ho Rejected |

* Significant at α = 0.05 (table = 2.000)
** Very significant at α = 0.01 (table = 2.390)
effect on performance through trust. The implication to improve performance can be done by increasing the professional attitude properly and correctly according to the proportion by increasing the trust used as mediation first before increasing performance. That professional attitudes by maximizing/increasing indicators of contributing are very large, including indicators of cognitive, affective and conative attitudes, to be able to contribute near-ideal/perfect, as well as stimulating/increasing indicators of large contributions, including honesty, responsibility, and confidence.
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