Democratic, Authocratic, Bureaucratic and Charismatic Leadership Style: Which Influence School Teachers Performance in Education 4.0 Era?
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ABSTRACT
This study aims to analyze the influence of democratic, authocratic, bureaucratic and charismatic leadership styles on the performance of elementary school teachers. The method used in this research is quantitative method. Data collection was carried out by distributing an electronic questionnaire online to 252 elementary school teachers in Jakarta. The online electronic questionnaires were distributed using simple random sampling technique. The conclusion of this study is that democratic leadership style has a positive and significant effect on teachers performance, autocratic leadership style has a positive and significant effect on teachers performance, bureaucratic leadership style and charismatic leadership style has a positive and significant effect on teachers performance.

INTRODUCTION
In the era of the industrial revolution 4.0, the school leaders are a very important component to realize leadership in educational institutions. Educational institutions have a very important role in generating quality national education that is able to compete in this increasingly modern era. If an educational institution is advanced, education in Indonesia will also advance. In this case, it will never be separated from the role of a school leader. In the face of the Education 4.0 era, each one must upgrade its skills. The students that teachers are facing today are the thousand-year-old, no stranger to the digital world. Education at 4.0 is an incredibly hard challenge for teachers, teaching is this century's biggest challenge. In the next 30 years we will be facing severe difficulties if we do not improve how we train, teach and learn. Education and learning, filled with information contents that surpass the many currently applied attitudes and skills, would result in students who can not be competitive with machines. Competencies needed in the era of Education 4.0 are critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This competency is very important for students to have in 21st century learning. Teacher 4.0 must be able to make learning so that they can explore this competence from students, communication and collaborative skills. As a competency that is needed in the 21st century, this skill must be able to be constructed in learning, Information and communication technology-based learning models must be applied by teachers in order to construct communication and collaboration competencies, creative thinking and innovation skills. The industrial revolution 4.0 requires students to always think and act creatively and innovatively. This action needs to be done so that students are able to compete and create industry-based employment 4.0. This condition is necessary considering that there have been many victims of the 4.0 industrial revolution. For example, many professions are being replaced by robotic digital machines, information and communication technology literacy. The various leadership styles of school leaders have their respective advantages and disadvantages, but what must be considered is that the implementation of the leader's leadership style must be adjusted to the conditions that occur in educational institutions today. Each school leaders is expected to have an ideal leadership style according to the conditions and demands of the times. The problem is that not for all school leaders have the ability to be able to adapt to the demands of change, coupled with the lack of knowledge of school leaders regarding the transformation of school leaders leadership in the 21st century. Leadership in the industrial revolution era 4.0 is marked by technological developments in leadership in educational institutions. The results of observations made by researchers, it was found that the school leaders who did not have the ability to use technology in the interview with the speakers: The school leaders’ task of the school is to provide provisions for improving 21st century skills for teachers and students by having communication, creativity, collaboration, and critical problem-solving skills. In addition, students are expected to balance themselves from the negative impacts of the times by doing positive activities. Management sees education as a miniature of
society, therefore, to create a quality society it starts with educational institutions. According to the theory of the functional structure of society is a social system that is interrelated, there is a system of education, family, society which synergizes with each other to achieve balance and harmony. Based on previous research findings, the leadership strategy does not substantially affect teacher efficiency (David et al. 2017; Elyana et al. 2019; Khalifa Elgelal & Neramijati 2014; Makena 2017; Monoyasa et al. 2017; Putri & Soedarson 2017; Siswatiningsih et al. 2019). In comparison to some studies that suggest that the influence of leadership on teachers' success has a substantial impact (Ashari 2019; Fayzhall, Asbri, Purwanto, Goestyahjanti, etc., 2020; Jumiran et al. 2020; Maesaroh et al. 2020; Nugroho et al. 2020; Waruwa et al. 2020; Yanthy et al. 2020). Since the relationship between leadership still has a Study Lap. Consequently, this research gap encourages researchers to explore the relationship among the systems more thoroughly and widely. It aims to examine the impact on success of elementary school teacher in democratic, autocratic, bureaucratic and charismatic styles of leadership.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Leadership
Transforming leaders will transform their followers' senses, boost moral expectations, and inspire them to do their utmost to accomplish organisational objectives, not because they are compelled to do so, but because they are willing. There are three attributes of transformative leaders, according to (Bass & Avolio, 2000), namely that, first, they raise awareness about the importance of processes and efforts. Secondly, to allow supporters to give priority to Community interests rather than individual interests. Thirdly, the need for followers to move to a higher degree of self-esteem and upgrade, beyond material stuff. In other words. In other words.

Teacher Performance
The assessment of success is based on several criteria: consistency, quantity, timeliness, productivity and interpersonal interaction (Bernardin & Russel, 1993). While this is the case (Mathis & Jackson, 2002), there are many elements to teachers' success, including: quantity, consistency, precision, engagement, co-operation and loyalties. Robbins (2006) notes that there are six metrics of employee success, namely. The quality of work is assessed by employers 'perceived work quality and the perfection of work on employees' skills and abilities. Quantity is the sum generated in terms of the number of units, the number of completed operation cycles. Timeliness: the activity level at the beginning of the given period, seen from the point where the outcomes are co-ordinated, and time allowed for other acts is maximised. According to Swanson and Holton (20014), 'Individual performance of the employee is seen in terms of whether the task and the goals of an employee are compatible with the institution's mission, whether employees face job challenges and achieve results, whether employees are mental, physical, emotional and motivated, competent and experienced. Performance can be measured by (1) work quantity, (2) quality of work, (3) cooperation, (4) knowledge of work, (5) work independence, (6) attendance and timeliness, (7) knowledge of policies and objectives, organization, (8) healthy initiatives and ideas, (9) supervisory skills and techniques (Schuler and Dowling, in Keban, 2004: 195). To measure performance individually, McKenna and Beech (1995) have several indicators, indicators of performance that are often used to assess individual employee performance according to McKenna and Beech are Knowledge, abilities and skills at work/competence, work attitudes, expressed as enthusiasm, commitment and motivation. Interaction, for example communication skills and the ability to relate to other people in a team.

Democratic Leadership Style and performance
According to Clark R (2009) democratic leadership style involves subordinates in the decision-making process. Mullins (2005) consulting democratic leadership style with subordinates and evaluating their opinions and suggestions before making decisions. Lewis (1939) democratic leadership style Acting to reward input and commitment through participation, listening to bad news and good news. According to Anderson (1991) democratic leadership style Share decision making with other members. Datt (2014) democratically delegates authority to others to encourage decision making. Mullins (2007) democratic leadership style Group members have greater rights in decision making, policy making, systems and implementation procedures.

Hypothesis 1 (H1) Democratic leadership style have positive effect on Teachers performance

Autocratic Leadership Style and performance
Leader escape accountability, pay no attention to followers' needs, provide no input and delay in decision-making as reported by Bass & Riggio (2006). The autocratic leadership style of Swarp (2013) is the most potent force and leading policymaker. DurBrin (2006) notes that monitoring and exercising power with little trust in supporters. Joost & Fourie (2009) Due to this mindset, system supporters dislike their leader and mistrust them. Hypothesis 2 (H2) of autocratic leadership style on performance

Bureaucratic Leadership Style and performance
Michael (2012) notes that bureaucratic management is typically dedicated to a style of bureaucratic leadership, according to Sheaffer (2005), follow procedures which are useful for organisations with regular work by workers. Michael (2010) motivates and establishes bureaucratic leadership, adopting problem-solving processes and citizens who are neglected by bureaucratic leaders. Bass (2008) states that the Leader's conduct is characterised by bureaucratic leadership style Hypothesis 3 (H3) Bureaucratic leadership have positive effect on Teachers performance

Charismatic Leadership Style and Performance
According to Bell (2013) charismatic leadership styles inspire others and encourage them to become Weber (1947) not from formal authority but from followers' perceptions of leaders who are endowed with extraordinary qualities. According to Snow et al., (1986) charismatic leadership styles motivate followers to embrace social change. Bass (1985) charismatic leadership styles are more likely to be in a culture of charismatic leadership styles and they change, not just nurture. They revived failed companies, developed new products and revolutionized processes (Bass, 1981). They can put forward a good vision for the future in the best interest of their organization (Dubrin and Banglish, 2003).

Hypothesis 4 (H4) Charismatic leadership have positive effect on Teachers performance
Based on the study of existing theories and previous research, the following hypotheses were made:

Hypothesis 1 (H1) Democratic leadership style have positive effect on Teachers performance

Hypothesis 2 (H2) Autocratic leadership style have positive effect on Teachers performance

Hypothesis 3 (H3) Bureaucratic leadership have positive effect on Teachers performance

Hypothesis 4 (H4) Charismatic leadership style have positive effect on Teachers performance

METHODS

The approach used in this analysis is quantitative. Data collection was achieved via the electronic questionnaires distributed in Jakarta to all primary school teachers online. Five answer choices were given for every item in the question / t argument, namely: strong agreement (SS) on score 5, agreement (S) on score 4, neutral (N) score 3, discrepancy (TS) score 2, score 1 (STS) on score 1. Data processing software is PLS, using software for SmartPLS 3.0. Teachers from five primary schools in Jakarta, with 252 respondents, were respondents to this survey.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The convergent validity test step is performed by searching for each indicator ’s charge factor against the house. In order to understand latent structures, a factor value of 0.5 or more is deemed to have adequate validation (Chin, 1998; Ghozali, 2014; Hair et al., 2010). For the analysis, the minimum limit is 0.5 if the AVE of each building is > 0.5 (Ghozali, 2014). The loading factor is 0.5.

Table 1. Respondent Profil Descriptive Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 Years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 40 Years</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 40 Years</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masa kerja sebagai guru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5 Years</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Years</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 Years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Master’s degree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 1. Research Model
Following the estimation by SmartPLS 3.0 of the questionnaire data there are some indicators or elements that must be omitted from the model; consequently, all indicators have a load factor value above 0.5 or if the value of AVE is above 0.5. This study model has reached the convergent validity value. For all complete buildings the importance of loads, cronbach alpha, composite reliability and AVE can be seen in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Loadings, Cronbach’s Alpha, Composite Reliability, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) Testing Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structural reliability and the composite reliability of each building could be measured from the Cronbach alpha value. The composite reliability and alpha value of cronbach recommended is more than 0.7. The results of the durability tests show that all buildings have composite reliability and the alpha value of Cronbach is greater than 0.7 (> 0.7). To conclude, all buildings have achieved the durability required.

Discriminatory validity is implemented to ensure that each latent variable definition varies from the other latent variables. The model is validly discriminatory because each exogenous construct’s square AVE value (the diagonal value) goes beyond the connexion between that and other constructs (values below the diagonal) (Ghozali, 2014). The results of discriminating validity tests use the AVE square value, in other words the Fornell-Larcker value, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Discriminant Validity Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The test results in Table 3 above show that all leadership systems have a quadrant root AVE value that exceeds the correlation value with other latent constructions (through the Fornell-Larcker criteria). The cross-charging value of all the indicator management components is also higher than the other indicator components as set out in Table 4, and it can be assumed that the model has fulfilled the discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Hypothesis Testing
The PLS hypothesis test is often referred to as the internal leadership test model. This evaluation involves an evaluation of the importance of the direct and indirect effects and a review of the exogenous variables’ influence on endogenous variables. The impact test was conducted with the t-statistical test using the SmartPLS 3.0 programme on the partially less squared (PLS) analysis model. The R square value and the sense test value, as shown in Table 4 and Table 5 below, are achieved with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P-Values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>D -&gt; TP</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>2.123</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>A -&gt; TP</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>2.981</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>B -&gt; TP</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>3.876</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>C -&gt; TP</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>2.876</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION
Relationship Democratic Leadership and Teachers Performance
On the basis of the results of the statistical calculations used in Table 5 above, it is concluded that the impact on the teaching performance of democratic leadership is positive and important. The value of t-statistics is 2.123, greater than 1.96 and the p-value is less than 0.05. It supports the hypothesis (H1). These findings are consistent with and consistent with the results of previous studies (Firdaus, 2019; Wijayanti, etc., 2013; Basuki et al., 2020) that democratic leadership has a positive and important impact on the performance of teachers, if the style of democratic leadership is effective, the teacher performance increases and democratic leadership is not implementable.

Relationship Autocratic Leadership and Teachers Performance
Based on the statistics used in table 5 above, the autocratic leadership has a positive and substantial influence on teachers’ success. The results of the statistical calculation are shown. The t-statistic value of 2.981 is shown to be greater than 1.96 and the p-value of 0.001 is less than 0.05. The second hypothesis (H2) is also accepted. These findings represent that autocratic leadership has a positive effect and major impact on teaching performance, and if the self-leadership style is well performed it will promote a higher teacher performance and that it will be consistent with previous results (Mirayani, 2020; Goestjahantji, et al, 2020; Budi Santoso, et al, 2020; Prameswari et al, 2020).

Relationship Bureaucratic Leadership and Teachers Performance
Based on the statistical estimates in Table 5 above using SEMPLS, the inference is that the impact on teacher’s success is positive and significant. The p-statistic value of t is 3.876 and the p-value is less than 0.05. The statistics are 3 876. In other words, the third hypothesis is agreed (H3). These findings are consistent with and consistent with the results from previous studies (Purwanto, 2020; Wijayanti, et al, 2019; Prameswari et al, 2020). This is that bureaucratic leadership is positively and significantly affected in the teacher’s teaching performance, which will lead to an improvement in teacher performance and the bureaucratic leadership will be successfully implemented.

Relationship Charismatic Leadership and Teachers Performance
Based on the results of statistical calculations using SEMPLS in Table 5 above, it is concluded that charismatic leadership has a positive and significant effect on teacher performance. It is evident from the t-statistics value of 2.876 which is greater than 1.96 and the p-value of 0.001 is smaller than 0.05. That is, the fourth hypothesis (H4) is accepted. These findings are in line with and in accordance with the results of previous studies (Wijayanti, 2020; Prameswari, et al, 2020) that charismatic leadership has a positive and significant effect on teacher performance, meaning that if the charismatic leadership style is properly executed it will encourage an increase in teacher performance and if the charismatic leadership style is not implemented properly it will encourage a decrease in hospital performance.

Leadership in education is very important because the leadership of the leaders has a significant influence on the quality of education. Several recent studies have shown that there is a significant relationship between the leadership abilities of leaders and school effectiveness. In fact, with adequate abilities and appropriate leadership strategies, school leaders are sure to be able to create effective schools. However, due to constraints in understanding and implementing educational leadership strategies in schools, schools are not very successful as educational platforms. Thus, there must be an appropriate leadership strategy that can be implemented by the leaders when managing schools so that they are effective and achieve educational goals. Becoming a schoolleader must go through various stages of selection, from administrative selection, academic selection, to having to pass training and training for
prospective school leaders. Leaders of the School of Social Sciences Scientific Journal, In the current era of the industrial revolution 4.0, a strategic problem that has received a lot of attention is the importance of improving the quality of graduates to be able to compete in the world of work. Although at first glance this is identical to the school level, but in policy terms, the implementation of the 2013 curriculum which replaces the 2006 curriculum aims to improve the quality of education as well as the competitiveness of graduates at each level. The era of the industrial revolution 4.0 is an era where a lot of work has been done digitally. Important abilities that the leaders must have are managerial skills, while these abilities include: the leaders is able to lead the school; compile school program and various school policies; managing teachers, staff, students, and all school members; maintain good relationships with guardians, school committees, and the community; managing facilities and infrastructure in schools; manage finances in an honest, transparent and reliable manner; and can take advantage of technological advances in schools. In the era of the industrial revolution 4.0, school leaders are expected to innovate and have bright ideas to be able to understand the opportunities that occur in the industrial revolution so that they can come up with the right solutions for school leaders in facing the industrial revolution era. It is also hoped that the school leaders will lead to the right solution for school leaders in carrying out their duties and functions in the era of industrial revolution 4.0 and 21st century learning.

The school leaders have an important role in making various efforts to improve the quality of education by monitoring and evaluating programs that are oriented towards the school's vision and mission. The last competency that the leaders must have is social competence which can be seen from the collaboration between the leaders and the community, schools are required to be able to participate in social activities and have social sensitivity in the surrounding environment. That is necessary to have the professionalism of the leaders, the readiness of the leaders to face challenges, as well as the readiness to provide solutions to the challenges of leaders leadership in the era of the industrial revolution 4.0. Ideal leadership is leadership that follows the demands of the 4.0 industrial revolution, a leader who follows technological developments to be able to influence, encourage, guide, direct and mobilize others to carry out and develop education and teaching in the era of industrial revolution 4.0. school leaders who are authoritarian do not provide space for teachers, school staff, and all school members to express opinions so that they are not included in making decisions. In the end, it can add to problems in schools such as inappropriate school policies because they are not discussed, there are parties who are disadvantaged or discriminated against, because the power of the school leaders is very high, there is a risk of corruption of school funds. Charismatic leadership style is characterized by the personality of a special leader who has authority and attractiveness so that it is obeyed by his subordinates, a leader who has strong power and is trusted by his subordinates, a charismatic leader has the ability to influence his subordinates with his leadership style. Based on research, charismatic leadership styles are rarely found because these features cannot be owned by just anyone. The democratic school leaders always embrace and protect his subordinates without differentiating one from another. Democratic school leaders can solve various problems that occur in schools wisely and be decided together. These various leadership must be adapted to the current conditions of society’s demands. Ideal leadership is born from the competence of the leaders in leading his school. The leaders personality competencies that the researcher found include the following: the leaders has noble morals; mandate in carrying out tasks; discipline, high integrity; open to updates to receive criticism and suggestions; a strong desire for self-development; have interests and talents as a leader. The leaders are a role model for teachers, students, and all school members so that this personality competence is very important for the leaders to have. Documentation of the leaders' personality that can make the school atmosphere better.

CONCLUSION
The conclusion of this study is that democratic leadership style has a positive and significant effect on teacher’s performance, autocratic leadership style has a positive and significant effect on teacher’s performance, bureaucratic leadership style. It has a positive and significant effect on teacher’s performance, charismatic leadership style has a positive and significant effect on teacher’s performance. The leadership style of school leaders has undergone transformation following changes, the leadership style of school leaders is more suitable today, namely democratic leadership that can embrace teachers, students, school committees, guardians of students, and the community. In the study of the sociology of education, schools must carry out their functions properly so that the leadership of the leaders can be the progress of the led educational institution. Becoming a professional school leader is required to have personality, managerial, entrepreneurial, supervisory and social competences. Skills in facing the era of the industrial revolution 4.0 can be seen from the ability of the leaders in the use of technology and entrepreneurial skills. Efforts made by the leaders to improve abilities are by continuing education, participating in various trainings, seminars, workshops, and various supporting activities. There needs to be collaboration from various parties, especially policy makers so that school leaders can become professional and quality leaders.
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