Journal of Management Studies and Development
Vol. 4, No. 01, pp. XX-XX
journal.iistr.org/index.php/JMSD
DOI: 10.56741/jmsd.v4i01.771

The Impact of Discipline, Leadership Style, and Motivation on Productivity

A Case Study at at PT. Balagi, Indonesia

[1]Chrisilla Larasati Sutanto*, [1]Roland Y. H. Silitonga
Corresponding Author: *chrisillals@gmail.com
[1] Institut Teknologi Harapan Bangsa, Bandung, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received 3 December 2024
Revised 16 March 2025
Accepted 19 March 2025

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the impact of work discipline, leadership style, and motivation on employee productivity at PT. Balagi, a rattan company in Cirebon focused on exports. Work discipline reflects adherence to work rules, leadership style influences groups to achieve goals, and motivation acts as both internal and external drives to enhance performance. A quantitative approach is used in this research with a Likert-scale-based questionnaire instrument, converted into numerical data for statistical analysis. The results of multiple linear regression analysis show that discipline and motivation significantly affect productivity, while leadership style does not have a significant impact. Simultaneously, the three independent variables contribute 77.5% to employee productivity. This study provides recommendations for further development of research variables, exploration of more specific leadership dimensions, and the use of more complex analysis methods. Practically, it is recommended to improve work discipline and employee motivation through consistent policies, personal development training, and enhancing internal communication within the company.

Keywords
Leadership Style
Linear Regression
Motivation
Productivity
Work Discipline

This is an open-access article under the CC–BY-SA license.

Introduction

Indonesia, as a tropical country with rich forests, holds immense potential in the rattan industry. Rattan, known for its flexibility and aesthetic appeal, has long been a primary raw material for various handicrafts, furniture, and even building materials. However, Indonesia's rattan industry faces numerous challenges, including illegal logging, the lack of modern technology, and increasingly fierce global competition. To enhance the industry's competitiveness, efforts are needed to sustainably manage rattan resources, improve product quality, and develop innovative designs [1]. Rattan furniture remains a global trend in interior design.

The rattan industry plays a vital role in Indonesia’s economy, contributing significantly to foreign exchange earnings and providing employment for millions of people. Indonesia supplies 80% of the global rattan market. In 2022, the export value of Indonesian furniture products reached USD 2.5 billion [2]. This industry also creates job opportunities, particularly in rural areas, serving as a primary source of income for many families. However, despite its immense potential, Indonesia's rattan industry still faces challenges, one of which is low labor productivity in Cirebon. This issue is attributed to the region's lifestyle and work habits, which tend to be slower compared to other countries or even Jakarta.

Rattan manufacturers produce a wide range of products for export to countries worldwide. Cirebon has long been recognized as Indonesia's center for rattan craftsmanship. Its rich history in rattan processing has given rise to skilled artisans known for their expertise in creating high-quality rattan furniture. The unique designs, weaving techniques, and quality materials make Cirebon's rattan products highly sought after both domestically and internationally. The presence of rattan production hubs in Cirebon has significantly contributed to the regional economy and created employment opportunities for the local community [3].

PT. Balagi, located in Cirebon, is one of the leading companies in Indonesia's rattan industry, pioneering as a manufacturer and exporter of rattan products. Despite its prominent position, the company faces similar challenges. Although it employs a large number of skilled workers capable of producing various rattan products, their productivity needs improvement to meet corporate targets and advance the industry as a whole. This is particularly crucial given the slower pace of work among its labor force, which can be a hurdle in satisfying the demands of consumers from Europe, America, Asia, and Australia—regions known for their fast-paced working environments. Notably, 100% of PT. Balagi's customers are international.

Productivity is the key to success for any organization, including PT. Balagi. In today’s increasingly competitive globalized world, companies are under pressure to continuously improve efficiency and effectiveness in delivering products or services. However, enhancing

productivity is no simple task, as numerous factors can influence it, such as employee discipline, leadership style, and motivation.

PT. Balagi, as a manufacturing company in the rattan industry, holds significant potential for boosting productivity. Despite achieving notable successes, the company continues to face challenges in optimizing individual performance. Consequently, PT. Balagi must refine its systems to achieve maximum output, both in terms of quantity and quality. This study aims to identify the impact of employee discipline, leadership style, and motivation on productivity at PT. Balagi. The findings are expected to provide valuable insights for the company in formulating strategies to improve productivity.

This research is motivated by intriguing findings from interviews with PT. Balagi's production managers. The interviews revealed fundamental issues impacting the company's productivity. Many employees perceive their supervisors as overly lenient and permissive, leading to unproductive behaviors such as procrastination, negligence in maintaining work quality, and a general relaxation in performance. This leniency often gives employees the impression that mistakes or shortcomings will not result in serious consequences, and some even take this as an opportunity to act irresponsibly. Although intended to create a harmonious work environment, this permissive leadership style can be counterproductive, resulting in decreased motivation and performance among employees. This situation has significantly affected the company's production quality and quantity, ultimately hindering the achievement of its targets and objectives. This supports Fiedler's [4] theory that effective leadership styles are situational. A democratic leadership style, for instance, may not always positively impact productivity and can be as ineffective as other approaches in certain contexts.

Discipline, as a cornerstone of productivity and organizational success, is an indispensable aspect of modern workplaces. According to Bugdol [5], discipline serves as a driving force for employees. In the context of a manufacturing company like PT. Balagi, discipline not only refers to adherence to established rules and procedures but also reflects individual commitment to shared goals. High levels of discipline positively influence product quality, production efficiency, and customer satisfaction. However, in practice, discipline-related challenges often arise. Factors such as individual differences, leadership styles, organizational culture, and workplace dynamics can all affect employee discipline. Moreover, rapid changes in the business world, including technological advancements and global competition, further test employees' adherence to existing rules and procedures. Therefore, understanding the factors influencing discipline and developing effective strategies to enhance it are crucial for the sustainability and success of PT. Balagi.

Leadership style has been a topic of interest among academics and practitioners for decades. It refers to the behavioral patterns exhibited by leaders in influencing and directing their team members. Various theories have sought to explain how different leadership styles affect organizational performance, employee satisfaction, and turnover rates. For example, Bass [6] distinguishes between transactional and transformational leadership, with the latter being considered more effective in inspiring and motivating followers. Yukl [7] provides a comprehensive overview of various leadership styles, including participative, task-oriented, and relationship-oriented leadership. Empirical studies suggest that no single leadership style is universally effective. Fiedler's contingency theory [4] emphasizes the importance of aligning leadership style with situational needs. In modern organizations, the demand for flexibility, innovation, and adaptability to rapid changes has increased, requiring leaders to adopt a range of leadership styles as needed. Goleman [8] highlights the importance of emotional intelligence in leadership. Leaders with high emotional intelligence tend to be more effective in building strong relationships with their teams and fostering a positive work environment.

Motivation is a key factor driving individuals to act and achieve their goals. In organizational settings, employee motivation plays a critical role in improving productivity, performance, and job satisfaction. Over the past few decades, research on motivation has evolved significantly, introducing various theories and models to explain this complex phenomenon. In recent years, studies on motivation have increasingly focused on contextual factors, such as job design, organizational culture, and leadership. Deci and Ryan's [9] self-determination theory (SDT) highlight the importance of fulfilling basic psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—in motivating individuals. Research also indicates that intrinsic motivation, which comes from within the individual, has a more enduring impact than extrinsic motivation, such as financial rewards. Amabile & Kramer [10] emphasize the significance of the experience of progress in boosting employee motivation and creativity. Other studies suggest that providing constructive feedback and opportunities for self-development can enhance employee motivation. Additionally, the concept of employee well-being has gained traction, with research showing that employees who feel a sense of well-being tend to exhibit higher levels of motivation.

The relationship between discipline, leadership style, and work motivation forms a complex, interdependent system. Transformational leadership, for instance, not only provides clear direction and objectives but also inspires employees to achieve higher performance. When employees feel inspired and have a clear sense of purpose, they are more likely to be disciplined in performing their tasks. Conversely, high levels of discipline create a conducive environment for participative leadership styles, where employees feel valued and involved in decision-making. Intrinsic motivation, such as a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction from

a job well done, reinforces the effectiveness of transformational leadership styles and enhances work discipline. Together, these variables interact and contribute to overall performance improvement.

Material and Methods

The questionnaire data will be analyzed using an inferential quantitative approach, employing multiple linear regression. The data analysis in this study will use multiple linear regression to test the simultaneous effect of several independent variables, namely Discipline (X1), Leadership (X2), and Motivation (X3), on the dependent variable, which is Productivity (Y). The multiple linear regression model is chosen because it allows for identifying the relative contribution of each independent variable to changes in the dependent variable.

Results

A. Validity Test

Based on the theoretical study of Discipline, 13 statements were formulated as questionnaire items, which were distributed to 96 respondents for their responses. After checking the returned questionnaires and calculating by correlating the score of each statement item with the total score, the results can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Table of Results of Validity Test

X1		X2		X3		Y	
Item	r-value	Item	r-value	Item	r-value	Item	r-value
X1.1	0.779	X2.1	0.552	X3.1	0.849	Y.1	0.561
X1.2	0.783	X2.2	0.756	X3.2	0.832	Y.2	0.823
X1.3	0.783	X2.3	0.722	X3.3	0.781	Y.3	0.714
X1.4	0.714	X2.4	0.764	X3.4	0.677	Y.4	0.675
X1.5	0.798	X2.5	0.709	X3.5	0.580	Y.5	0.761
X1.6	0.681	X2.6	0.768	X3.6	0.715	Y.6	0.728
X1.7	0.655	X2.7	0.642	X3.7	0.762	Y.7	0.756
X1.8	0.701	X2.8	0.698	X3.8	0.692	Y.8	0.711
X1.9	0.686	X2.9	0.586				
X1.10	0.775	X2.10	0.625				
X1.11	0.665	X2.11	0.609				
X1.12	0.715	X2.12	0.711				
X1.13	0.721	X2.13	0.780				
		X2.14	0.753				
		X2.15	0.740				
		X2.16	0.639				
		X2.17	0.502				
		X2.18	0.631				
		X2.19	0.703				
		X2.20	0.761				

Based on Table 1, all questionnaires were deemed valid as their calculated r-values exceeded the critical r-value of 0.300. The Discipline questionnaire, comprising 13 statements, the Leadership Style questionnaire with 20 statements, the Motivation questionnaire containing 8 statements, and the Productivity questionnaire, also with 8 statements, all met this validity criterion.

B. Reliability Test

According to Sugiyono [11], reliability testing refers to how consistent the measurement results are when the same object is measured repeatedly. This reliability test was conducted on 96 respondents, using the questions that were deemed valid in the validity test, and the reliability will be determined based on these responses.

Table 2. Reliability Test

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
Diclipine (X1)	0.925
Leadership Style (X2)	0.940
Motivation (X3)	0.881
Productivity (Y)	0.904

Based on the reliability test results above, the reliability coefficient value for the research instrument is greater than 0.600, which means that all research variables are considered reliable and meet the required criteria [12]. Since both the validity and reliability tests indicate that all variables are valid and reliable, it means that the instruments (questionnaires) used are valid and reliable.

C. Classic Assumption Test

1. Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity refers to the phenomenon where there is a linear or definite relationship between independent variables (explanatory variables) in a regression model. One of the signs of multicollinearity in the model occurs when the R^2 value from the regression results is very high. Yet, most independent variables do not show a significant relationship with the dependent variable. According to Ghozali [13], multicollinearity is related to "micro numerosity," or small sample size. Detection of multicollinearity can also be done using the correlation matrix of the independent variables [14]. A correlation coefficient value greater than 0.8 indicates serious multicollinearity.

Table 3 shows the correlation coefficients between Discipline (X1), Leadership Style (X2), and Motivation (X3) are all below 0.8.

Table 3. Multicollinearity Test

		Discipline	Leadership	Motivation
Discipline	Pearson Correlation	1	.713**	.757**
	(Sig. 2-tailed)		<.001	<.001
	N	96	96	96
Leadership	Pearson Correlation	.713**	1	.691**
	(Sig. 2-tailed)	<.001		<.001
	N	96	96	96
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.757**	.691**	1
	(Sig. 2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	
	N	96	96	96

Correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

This indicates that there is no multicollinearity among the independent variables. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity issue in the regression equation

2. Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test aims to detect whether there is unequal variance of residuals between different observations. According to Ghozali [13], a good regression model is one where heteroscedasticity does not occur. There are various methods for detecting the presence of heteroscedasticity, one of which is the Glejser test. According to Gujarati in Ghozali [13], the Glejser analysis regresses the absolute value of residuals against the independent variables. If the significance probability is above the 5% confidence level, it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity in the regression model.

Table 4. Heteroscedasticity Test

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	
1				
(Constant)	2.665E-15	1.900	—	.000
Discipline	.000	.068	.000	.000
Leadership	.000	.069	.000	.000
Motivation	.000	.136	.000	.000

Dependent Variable: Standardized Residual

Based on the results of the heteroscedasticity test in Table 4, the Sig. values for the unstandardized residuals of the Discipline variable are 1.000; for the Leadership Style variable, it is 1.000; and for the Motivation variable, it is 1.000. From these results, it can be concluded that the regression model does not experience heteroscedasticity. This is

because the values of each variable are not significant, or the Sig. values are greater than 0.05.

3. Normality Test

The normality test is performed to determine whether the data follows a normal distribution. To assess normality, the data is compared with data that is normally distributed, having the same mean and standard deviation. The normality test is conducted using the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, with calculations assisted by SPSS 27.0 for Windows. If the significance level is ≥ 0.05, the data is considered normally distributed [14].

Table 5. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

	Discipline	Leadership	Motivation	Productivity	Unstandardized Residual
N	96	96	96	96	96
Normal Parameters					
Mean	40.0521	65.9688	24.7396	32.0729	0.0000000
Std. Deviation	10.78827	15.18895	6.84758	8.79024	4.04254043
Most Extreme Differences					
Absolute	.059	.080	.079	.074	.050
Positive	.059	.080	.077	.073	.043
Negative	-.043	-.073	-.079	-.074	-.050
Test Statistic	.059	.080	.079	.074	.050
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.200[d]	.200[d]	.200[d]	.200[d]	.200[d]
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)					
Sig.	.549	.138	.166	.200	.811
99% Confidence Interval					
Lower Bound	.536	.129	.137	.197	.801
Upper Bound	.561	.146	.155	.218	.821

Based on the normality test results presented in Table 5, the model shows multivariate normality, as the Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) values obtained are greater than the significance level set (0.05) for all variables. Therefore, it can be concluded that the data to be processed has a normal distribution.

D. Multiple Linear Regression Test Results

Table 6 presents the coefficients from a multiple regression analysis examining the influence of Discipline, Leadership Style, and Motivation on Productivity. Discipline has a positive and significant effect on productivity (B = 0.299, p < 0.001). The standardized coefficient (Beta = 0.368) indicates that discipline has a strong influence on productivity. Leadership Style does not have a significant effect on productivity (B = 0.016, p = 0.905). The very low Beta value (0.006) suggests that leadership style has minimal impact. Motivation has the strongest positive influence on productivity (B = 0.729, p < 0.001), with the highest standardized coefficient (Beta = 0.568), indicating that motivation is the most influential

predictor. The constant term (1.078) is not statistically significant (p = 0.893), meaning it does not contribute meaningfully to the model.

Table 6. Linear Regression

B	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	
1				
(Constant)	1.078	8.026	—	.134
Discipline	.299	.062	.368	4.854
Leadership Style	.016	.137	.006	.120
Motivation	.729	.098	.568	7.458

Dependent Variable: Productivity

Motivation and discipline significantly impact productivity, with motivation being the strongest predictor. However, leadership style does not significantly affect productivity in this model. Based on the values in Table 6, the regression equation is as follows:

$$Y = 1.078 + 0.299(X1) + 0.016(X2) + 0.729(X3) + e \quad \text{.....(1)}$$

Where:
Y : Productivity
X1 : Discipline
X2 : Leadership Style
X3 : Motivation

From the equation, the constant of 1.078 indicates that if all independent variables are held constant, productivity will be 1.078. The notion of a decrease of 0.035 units appears to be a misunderstanding, as the constant represents the baseline value when all independent variables are zero. The regression coefficient for Discipline (X1) is 0.299, implying that for every one-unit increase in Discipline, productivity will increase by 0.299 units, while a one-unit decrease in Discipline will reduce productivity by the same amount. Similarly, the regression coefficient for Leadership Style (X2) is 0.016, meaning that a one-unit increase in Leadership Style will raise productivity by 0.016 units, whereas a one-unit decrease will lower it by the same value. Lastly, the regression coefficient for Motivation (X3) is 0.729, indicating that a one-unit increase in Motivation will enhance productivity by 0.729 units, while a one-unit decrease will lead to a corresponding reduction in productivity.

Based on the results of the coefficient of determination test, the R-Square value is 0.775, indicating that the explanatory variables account for 77.5% of the variation in the response variable, while the remaining 22.5% is influenced by other factors outside the regression model. The F-statistic test is used to assess the combined effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable, following the rule that Ho is accepted if F-calculated < F-table. In

this study, the regression model analyzing the influence of Discipline, Leadership Style, and Motivation on Productivity yielded an F-calculated value of 105.642. This result is statistically significant at a 5% confidence level, as it exceeds the F-table value of 3.0954. Therefore, Discipline, Leadership Style, and Motivation collectively have a significant impact on Productivity at $\alpha = 0.05$.

E. T-Test

The partial significance test is used to examine the effect of each independent variable individually on the dependent variable. The statistical test used is the t-test. The decision criteria are as follows:

- if the t-calculated value is less than the t-table value, then the independent variable does not have a significant effect on the dependent variable;
- if the t-calculated value is greater than the t-table value, then the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable.

Alternatively, this can be determined by looking at the p-value:

- if the Sig. value is greater than 0.05, the hypothesis is not supported;
- if the Sig. value is less than 0.05, the hypothesis is supported.

Table 7. T-test Results

Variable	Coefficient Regression	t-counted	t-table	Summary
Discipline	0.299	4.854	1.9861	H0 is rejected. this conclusion means that the variable of Discipline has a statistically significant influence on Productivity. as the test statistic (t-value) for Discipline exceeds the critical value. leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis (H0).
Leadership Style	0.016	0.1200	1.9861	H_0 is accepted. there is no significant effect of Leadership Style on Productivity
Motivation	0.729	7.458	1.9861	H_0 is rejected. there is a significant influence of Motivation on Productivity

Discussion

The regression coefficient for Discipline is 0.299, with a p-value of less than 0.001, indicating a statistically significant relationship with Productivity. The standardized coefficient (Beta = 0.368) suggests that Discipline has a strong influence on productivity levels. According to Judge et al. [15], discipline in the workplace fosters efficiency and minimizes disruptions, which in turn enhances productivity. Similarly, studies by Sari & Nugroho (2021) found that a structured work environment with clear rules and expectations significantly improves employee performance.

The coefficient for Leadership Style is 0.016, with a p-value of 0.905. This high p-value indicates that Leadership Style does not significantly influence Productivity. The standardized coefficient (Beta = 0.006) is also extremely low, reinforcing the minimal impact of Leadership Style in this model. This contradicts previous findings by Bass & Avolio [16], who suggested that transformational leadership plays a crucial role in boosting employee performance. However, research by Yukl [7] supports our findings, indicating that leadership style alone may not directly impact productivity unless coupled with other factors such as motivation and job satisfaction.

Motivation has the strongest effect on Productivity, with a regression coefficient of 0.729 and a p-value of less than 0.001. The standardized coefficient (Beta = 0.568) further confirms its dominant role in influencing productivity. According to Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, motivation plays a crucial role in workplace performance, as it directly affects job satisfaction and employee engagement [17]. Empirical evidence by Deci & Ryan [18] also suggests that intrinsic motivation significantly enhances work efficiency and output.

The R-Square value is 0.775, indicating that the explanatory variables (Discipline, Leadership Style, and Motivation) account for 77.5% of the variation in Productivity. The remaining 22.5% is influenced by other factors outside the regression model. This high R-squared value suggests that the model provides a strong explanation of productivity variations based on the independent variables. This is consistent with previous research by Judge et al. [15], which found that motivation and discipline explain a large proportion of performance variance in organizations.

The F-test evaluates the combined effect of all independent variables on the dependent variable. The calculated F-value is 105.642, which exceeds the F-table value of 3.0954 at a 5% significance level. This result confirms that the model is statistically significant overall, meaning that Discipline, Leadership Style, and Motivation collectively have a meaningful impact on Productivity. Studies by Podsakoff et al. [19] also support the finding that discipline and motivation jointly contribute to enhanced employee performance.

The partial significance test (t-test) examines the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable. For the Discipline**,** the t-value is 4.854, which is greater than 1.9861, and the p-value is less than 0.001. Thus, the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected, indicating a significant effect of Discipline on Productivity. This aligns with findings from Goleman [8], who highlighted the role of self-discipline in professional success. For Leadership Style, the t-value is 0.1200, which is less than 1.9861, and the p-value is 0.905. Therefore, H0 is accepted, meaning Leadership Style does not significantly affect Productivity. This is consistent with

findings from Hofmann [20], who suggested that leadership effectiveness varies based on context. For Motivation, the t-value is 7.458, which exceeds 1.9861, and the p-value is less than 0.001. Hence, H0 is rejected, confirming a significant effect of Motivation on Productivity. Research by Ryan & Deci [9] further supports this, indicating that highly motivated employees exhibit increased productivity.

Conclusion

The findings of this study highlight that Motivation and Discipline are critical factors in enhancing Productivity, with Motivation playing the most substantial role. Leadership Style, however, does not exhibit a significant impact. Organizations seeking to improve employee performance should focus on strategies that enhance motivation and establish disciplined work environments. Future research could explore additional factors influencing Productivity, such as job satisfaction, organizational culture, and technological advancements, to develop a more comprehensive understanding of productivity determinants.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Ministry of Trade of the Republic of Indonesia. (2017, August). Lampu kuning industri rotan Indonesia [Yellow light for Indonesia's rattan industry]. https://bkperdag.kemendag.go.id/media_content/2017/08/Lampu_Kuning_Industri_Rotan_Indonesia.pdf.

[2] Audit Board of the Republic of Indonesia. (n.d.). *Permendag No. 89M-Dagper 10/2015 tentang ketentuan impor rotan* [Regulation of the Minister of Trade No. 89M-Dagper 10/2015 concerning the provisions for rattan imports]. [Website] https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/129004/permendag-no-89m-dagper102015-tahun-2015

[3] Institut Teknologi Bandung. (n.d.). *Dedikasi ITB untuk rotan Cirebon* [ITB's dedication to Cirebon rattan]. https://pengabdian.lppm.itb.ac.id/information/dedikasi_itb_untuk_rotan_cirebon

[4] Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill.

[5] Bugdol, M. (2018). A different approach to work discipline. *Human Resource Management. Palgrave Macmillan: Springer International Publishing*, *12*.

[6] Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. Free Press.

[7] Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations*. Pearson.

[8] Goleman, D. (1998). *Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam Books.

[9] Deci, E. L.., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). *Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness*. Guilford Publications.

[10] Amabile, T. M., & Kramer, S. J. (2011). *The Progress Principle: Using Small Wins to Ignite Joy, Effort, and Ultimate Success*. Harvard Business Review Press.

[11] Sugiyono (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alphabet.

[12] Sujarweni, V. W. (2019). *Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis & Ekonomi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Baru Press.

[13] Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro: Semarang.

[14] Gujarati, D. (2003). *Ekonometri Dasar*. Terjemahan: Sumarno Zain, Jakarta: Erlangga.

[15] Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel psychology*, *52*(3), 621-652.

[16] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Manual*. Redwood City, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
[17] Ibrahim, I. W., Ghazali, I. M., Syed, S. A., Abdullah, N. H. R., Hamid, M. H. A., & Aisyah, S. H. (2023). Exploring motivation for learning using Hertzberg's two factor theory. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *13*(3), 1065-1083.
[18] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "What" and "Why" of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268.
[19] Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology*, *94*(1), 122-141.
[20] Hofmann, D. C. (2023). Charismatic leadership. In *Encyclopedia of Business and Professional Ethics* (pp. 326-329). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Authors



Chrisilla L. Sutanto holds a bachelor's degree in Electrical Engineering and, after earning a master's degree in Management at Institut Teknologi Harapan Bangsa, Jalan Dipati Ukur No.80, Bandung, Indonesia, is currently attending Korean and Chinese language school. She presently works at two companies in Indonesia, one as an auditor and the other as an accountant. (email: chrisillals@gmail.com).



Dr. Roland Y. H. Silitonga is a lecturer at Institut Teknologi Harapan Bangsa, Indonesia, He holds his undergraduate degree in Mechanical Engineering; his master's degree and doctorate are in Industrial Engineering and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia. His researches are on Inventory Systems, Innovation Management, and Industrial Value Chain Analysis. He is a lecturer at the Industrial Engineering Department, Institut Teknologi Harapan Bangsa, Indonesia. (email: roland@ithb.ac.id).