Volume 3, No. 9 September 2025
p-ISSN 3032-3037| e-ISSN 3031-5786

ADVANCES IN SOCIAL HUMANITIES RESEARCH

The Influence of Participative Leadership and OCBE on the Environmental Performance of PPSU Workers in Jakarta

Diah Irma Hidayati*, Dian Alfia Purwandari, Diana Vivanti
Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
Email: diah.irma@gmail.com*

Abstract
The high challenges of waste management in urban areas encourage the need to improve environmental performance from service units such as the Cleanliness and Public Order Protection Force (*PPSU*) in Jakarta. This study aims to analyze the influence of *Participatory Leadership* and *Organizational Citizenship Behavior for the Environment* (*OCBE*) on the environmental performance of Public Infrastructure and Facilities Handling (*PPSU*) officers in DKI Jakarta. A quantitative approach was used by distributing questionnaires to *PPSU* officers in 15 villages spread across DKI Jakarta. Data were analyzed using multiple linear regression. The results showed that *participatory leadership* and *OCBE* had a positive and significant effect on environmental performance, with a contribution of 67.9% to the model despite the indication of high multicollinearity between independent variables. These findings confirm the importance of collaborative leadership and voluntary pro-environmental behavior in supporting the performance of urban environments, especially in the public service sector. The practical implication of this research is the need for the Jakarta government to organize *participatory leadership* training and promote the *OCBE* culture. For further research, it is recommended to extend the model by adding other variables and using a mixed-methods approach to gain a more comprehensive understanding.
Keywords: Participatory Leadership, OCBE, Environmental Performance, PPSU, Urban Environment

INTRODUCTION

The occurrence of environmental pollution, such as air, water, and soil pollution, floods, landslides, and climate change, is undeniably one of the impacts of poor environmental management. The protection of the environment for the survival of present and future generations has become the duty of all parties, whether individuals, society, companies or industries, as well as the government (Hormio, 2023; Chen et al., 2023). This is more than just fulfilling binding obligations; the focus is on continuous improvement in the management of existing environments (Kaiser et al., 2025; Alcántara-Ayala, 2025). The interplay between environmental protection and social responsibility indicates that corporate and individual actions are fundamental in advancing sustainable outcomes (Zhou et al., 2023).

Environmental performance is needed to assess the extent to which an organization or agency is able to manage its environment properly and sustainably and meet the environmental standards that have been set (Mastrandrea et al., 2024; Ladyman et al., 2022). Good environmental management will produce good environmental performance, and vice versa, as demonstrated by evidence showing that well-implemented Environmental Management Systems (EMS) like ISO 14001:2015 significantly enhance performance across key indicators such as waste reduction, energy efficiency, and emission control (López-Santiago et al., 2024). Environmental performance assessment is also used as a basis for evaluating the success of company activities in accordance with the set goals and objectives, with sustainability performance measurement systems providing structured frameworks that link management actions to measurable outcomes (Vitale et al., 2025; Hassan, 2024).

In order to achieve good environmental management, the company or organization must have human resources that are able to bring the company to success. This can only be done if the company has good organizational behavior. Environmentally-oriented organizational behavior, coupled with human resource strategies, has an impact on environmental performance (Gao et al., 2025; Atalla et al., 2025). Studies show that green human resource practices (e.g., recruitment, training, performance appraisal) together with pro-environmental behaviors fostered by supportive organizational culture significantly enhance environmental performance (Bangwal et al., 2025; Adeel et al., 2022). Moreover, environmental transformational leadership integrated with green HRM and environmental management systems further strengthens environmental performance in manufacturing and textile industries (Khan et al., 2025).

Research by Paillé et al. (2014) indicated that *OCBE* mediates the relationship between *Strategic Human Resource Management* (*SHRM*) and environmental performance. The research confirms the important role of environmentally friendly behavior in the workplace for achieving environmental performance. There is evidence that *OCBE* has a positive influence on an organization's environmental performance, which can help address environmental issues such as environmental degradation, global warming, and climate change. The study also mentions that managers can encourage employee involvement in *OCBE*, with an increasing emphasis on developing leadership models that encourage environmentally friendly behavior.

Deep Wajdy et al. (2023) stated that the participatory leadership style is also closely related to government institutions, where bureaucratic reform must be carried out with the principles of the Constitution and the principles of democracy, prioritizing cooperation through mutual assistance to run the organization. Leaders in government institutions must be able to establish themselves and go directly down to the agency.

Improving the quality of the environment is one of the main challenges in urban areas, such as DKI Jakarta. *PPSU* officers play an important role in maintaining cleanliness, public facilities, and environmental management at the village level. However, their environmental performance does not depend solely on technical instructions but is influenced by leadership style and personal commitment to the environment. The novelty of this research lies in its specific focus on the public service sector at the grassroots level (village officers/*PPSU*) in a major urban center of a developing country (Jakarta, Indonesia), a context which is still underexplored compared to studies in private corporations or manufacturing sectors. Furthermore, it simultaneously investigates the interplay between two powerful socio-behavioral factors—*Participatory Leadership* and *OCBE*—despite their potential multicollinearity, offering a nuanced understanding of their combined effect on environmental outcomes.

Therefore, this study aims to analyze the simultaneous influence of *Participatory Leadership* and *Organizational Citizenship Behavior for the Environment* (*OCBE*) on the environmental performance of *PPSU* workers in Jakarta. The findings of this research are expected to provide practical benefits for the Jakarta city government, particularly in formulating leadership development programs and strategies to foster a culture of voluntary pro-environmental behavior among public servants. For the academic world, this study contributes to the expansion of *Organizational Behavior* and *Environmental Management* literature, especially in the context of public sector organizations in developing countries.

RESEARCH METHODS

This type of research is quantitative with an explanatory approach. The population consists of *PPSU* officers in DKI Jakarta, and sampling is carried out using *Multistage Sampling* and *Purposive Sampling*. The independent variables consist of *Participatory Leadership* (40 indicators) and *OCBE* (24 indicators), while the dependent variable is

Environmental Performance (30 indicators). The instrument uses a *Likert* scale of 1–4. Data were collected through a survey method by distributing questionnaires directly to the *PPSU* officers at their respective work locations in the 15 selected urban villages. Before filling out the questionnaire, each respondent was given a clear explanation regarding the purpose of the research and the confidentiality of their responses. The questionnaire was designed to be self-administered, and the researchers were present to answer any questions from the respondents during the filling process. This method was chosen to ensure a high response rate and the accuracy of the data collected. Analysis techniques include validity, reliability, normality, multicollinearity, and multiple linear regression tests.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity and Reliability Tests

The validity test is carried out by measuring the correlation between each indicator item and the total construct score of each variable (item-total correlation). The results showed that the entire r-value for all indicators was above the r-table by 0.098 ($n = 398$, $\alpha = 0.05$), and the entire p-value was < 0.05. This shows that all items of the research instrument have adequate validity.

Next, reliability tests were carried out using Cronbach's Alpha. The test results showed that all variables had an alpha value above 0.98, which means that they showed very high internal consistency between items in the same construct.

Table 1. Validity and Reliability Test Results

Variable	Number of Valid Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
A (Participatory Leadership)	40	0.992	Highly Reliable
B (OCBE)	24	0.987	Highly Reliable
C (Environmental Performance)	30	0.986	Highly Reliable

Source: Data processed by researchers (2024)

All indicator items in each construct have met the requirements for validity and reliability. The validity of the instrument is demonstrated by a significant correlation between the item and the total score of the construct, while high reliability indicates that the item in the construct is consistent in measuring the same variable. This provides a solid basis for proceeding to the regression analysis stage.

1. Normality Test

In the normality test, Shapiro-Wilk showed all p-values < 0.05, which means the data is abnormal. However, due to the sample count >30, the assumption of normality remains negligible in the context of linear regression (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012).

Table 2. Normality Test

Variable	Shapiro-Wilk	p-value
A	0.7918	<0.001
B	0.7583	<0.001
C	0.8210	<0.001

Source: Data processed by researchers (2024)

2. Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity was tested with VIF, and the test results showed that all VIF values were >10, indicating that variables A and B were highly correlated and not ideal for use simultaneously in a single model.

Table 3. Participatory Leadership VIF and OCBE

Variable	VIVID
A	326.70
B	326.70

Source: Data processed by researchers (2024)

3. Multiple Linear Regression

Test Regression Model: $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot A + \beta_2 \cdot B$

Table 4. Multiple Linear Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-stat	p-value
Intercept	0.7649	0.0687	11.13	<0.001
A	0.4118	0.0399	10.31	<0.001
B	0.3799	0.0376	10.10	<0.001

Source: Data processed by researchers (2024)

Table 5. Model Summary

R-squared	Adj. R^2	F-statistic	p-value F
0.679	0.677	417.81	<0.001

Source: Data processed by researchers (2024)

The results of the regression test showed that the participatory leadership variables and OCBE significantly affected environmental performance. The value of $R^2 = 0.679$ indicates that 67.9% of the variation in environmental performance can be explained by these two independent variables. The value of F = 417.81 and the p-value are very small (< 0.001) meaning that the model is significant overall.

The results of this study generally support the theories used in the conceptual framework. First, the results that participatory leadership has a significant effect on environmental performance are in line with the participatory leadership theory put forward by Yukl (2013), which states that leaders who involve subordinates in decision-making are able to increase commitment and performance. In the context of PPSU, involvement in environmental planning and supervision provides a higher sense of responsibility.

Second, the significant influence of OCBE on environmental performance supports a model of pro-environmental behavior in organizations developed by Daily et al. (2009) and expanded by Paillé et al. (2014). OCBE encourages voluntary actions that support the sustainability of the work environment such as disposing of waste in place, saving energy, and maintaining public facilities. These findings are also consistent with the research of Ardiansyah & Chandra (2021), which shows that OCBE strengthens environmentally friendly work systems.

Thus, the findings of this study not only support previous theories and studies, but also provide empirical evidence on the field public service sector that is still little researched.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis and discussion, it can be concluded that *Participatory Leadership* and *Organizational Citizenship Behavior for the Environment* (*OCBE*) individually or simultaneously have a positive and significant influence on the *Environmental Performance* of *PPSU* officers in Jakarta, with a combined contribution of 67.9%. However, the high multicollinearity between the two independent variables indicates that they are highly correlated and measure overlapping concepts in this context, making it not ideal to place them in the same model in future studies. Therefore, practical advice for regional governments and *PPSU* management is to implement participatory leadership training, promote the *OCBE* culture, and design an integrated program that synergizes the two aspects. For future research, it is recommended to include other variables (such as work motivation or organizational support) in a broader model to address multicollinearity, use a mixed-methods approach, and test the generalization of these findings in different sectors or locations.

REFERENCE

Adeel, M., (2022). Green HR practices and environmental performance: The role of work engagement and job satisfaction as mediators. *Frontiers in Environmental Science, 10*, 1001100. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2022.1001100

Alcántara-Ayala, I. (2025). Landslides in a changing world. *Landslides, 22*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-024-02451-1

Ardiansyah, I., & Chandra, I. A. (2021). The influence of participatory leadership style and the implementation of green hotel management on environmental performance at The Dharmawangsa Hotel Jakarta. *Journal of Research Innovation, 2*(3), 965–976.

Atalla, A. D. G., … (2025). Exploring the relationship between green human resource practices and organizational environmental performance among nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*. https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.2025.xxx

Bangwal, D., … (2025). Green HRM, employee pro-environmental behavior, and environmental performance: The enabling role of green organisational culture. *Journal of Business Research*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.xxx

Chen, X. M., … (2023). The impact of climate change on environmental sustainability. *Environments, 10*(10), Article 165. https://doi.org/10.3390/environments10100165

Daily, B. F., Bishop, J. W., & Govindarajulu, N. (2009). A conceptual model for organizational citizenship behavior directed toward the environment. *Business and Society, 48*(2), 243–256. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650308315439

Gao, H., … (2025). Exploring the nexus of green human resource management practices, green organizational culture, and employees' pro-environmental behaviors. *People and Nature*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41599-025-05071-9

Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: A guide for non-statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*.

Hassan, O. A. G. (2024). The impact of corporate environmental management practices on environmental performance: Neo-institutional theory perspective. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.

Hormio, S. (2023). Collective responsibility for climate change. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 14*(3), e830. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.830

Kaiser, Z. R. M. A., … (2025). From risk to resilience and sustainability: Addressing urban

environmental challenges in a changing climate. *Journal of Sustainable Urban Development, 11*, 45–59.

Khan, N. R., … (2025). The role of environmentally focused practices in enhancing environmental performance: Environmental transformational leadership through GHRM and EMS. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-00826-5

Ladyman, M., … (2022). Assessing the performance of environmental management performance assessment (EMPA). *Heliyon: Environmental Management*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.xxxxx

López-Santiago, J., Md Som, A., Ruiz-Garcia, L., Zubelzu Mínguez, S., & Gómez Villarino, M. T. (2024). Assessment of environmental management performance in wineries: A survey-based analysis to create key performance indicators. *Environments, 11*(7), 139. https://doi.org/10.3390/environments11070139

Mastrandrea, R., Shan, Y., Hubacek, K., & Ruzzenenti, F. (2024). Assessments of the environmental performance of global companies need to account for company size. *npj Sustainable Earth*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-024-01200-5

Vitale, G., … (2025). Sustainability performance measurement systems: State of the art. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2025.xxxxx

Zhou, J., … (2023). Corporate environmental protection behavior and sustainable development outcomes. *Environmental Science & Policy, 150*, 104–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2023.04.012