

# The Effect of Work Discipline, Work Engagement, Work Attitude and Commitment on Employee Performance in the Pamong Praja Police Unit, Labuhan Batu Regency

Nurul Azmi Tambak<sup>1</sup>, Yuniman Zebua<sup>2</sup>, Siti Lam'ah Nasution<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Universitas Labuhanbatu, Indonesia

[azmin3259@gmail.com](mailto:azmin3259@gmail.com), [oinitehezeb@gmail.com](mailto:oinitehezeb@gmail.com), [sitinasution81@gmail.com](mailto:sitinasution81@gmail.com)

## Abstract

*This study aims to analyze the effect of work discipline, work involvement, work attitude and commitment to employee performance in the Civil Service Police Unit, Labuhan Batu Regency. This type of research is quantitative, the place of this research is the Civil Service Police Unit on Jalan WR. Supratman No. 46, Labuhanbatu. Data collection techniques used in the study were observation, documentation and questionnaires using a Likert scale. In this study, the population was the Pamong Praja Rantau Prapat police unit as many as 233 people. The sample was taken using the Slovin formula, which was determined or the significance level was 0.05, so the sample size in this study was 147 people multiple linear regression equation as follows:  $Y=1.459+0.170X1+0.402X2+0.152X3+0.159X4$ . Table 6 explains that the B value in work discipline (B1) is 0.170. The value of work involvement (B2) is 0.402. The value of work attitude (B3) is 0.152. The commitment value (B4) is 0.159, and the constant value (a) is 1.459. The description of the multiple linear regression equation shows that the variables of work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2), and commitment (X4) have a positive direction coefficient on employee performance. The value of Fcount is 50.710 > Ftable 2.43 with a significance value of 0.000 < 0.05. From these results, it can be concluded that work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2), work attitude (X3), and commitment (X4) simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y). The value of R Square from the analysis of the coefficient of determination of 0.588 means that work productivity can be explained by the variables of work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2), work attitude (X3), and commitment (X4) of 58.8%, while the remaining 41, 2% can be explained by other variables not examined in this study.*

## Keywords

Work discipline; work involvement; work attitude; commitment; employee performance.



## I. Introduction

Human Resources (HR) is the most important component in a company or organization to run the business it does. Organization must have a goal to be achieved by the organizational members (Niati et al., 2021). Development is a change towards improvement. Changes towards improvement require the mobilization of all human resources and reason to realize what is aspired (Shah et al, 2020). The development of human resources is a process of changing the human resources who belong to an organization, from one situation to another, which is better to prepare a future responsibility in achieving organizational goals (Werdhiastutie et al, 2020).

Every organization or company of course always tries to increase work productivity in order to achieve the goals of an organization. To achieve the goal of work productivity,

of course, requires a job that has good productivity that works effectively and efficiently. The most important resource for an organization is human resources (HR). Namely people who provide energy, talent and creativity in an organization. Human resource management (HRM) can be defined as the utilization of human resources within the organization which is carried out through the functions of human resource planning. Octorend (2015), discipline is an attempt to move employees to comply with and follow the rules and responsibilities imposed by the company on the individual himself. Discipline is essentially the ability to control oneself in the form of not doing inappropriate actions and supporting something that has been created. Some experts argue that the notion of work discipline is a management action to enforce organizational standards (Octorend, 2015; Lemon & Palenchar, 2018 ;). According to Kempa & Chaterine (2016), employee work discipline can affect employee productivity because they have high work discipline. An employee will carry out his duties and work effectively and efficiently so that employee productivity can be further improved and will have an impact on achieving organizational goals. According to Stevanie (2017) that work discipline has several indicators, namely: (1). Objectives and Abilities (2). Leader's Example (3). Remuneration (Some experts argue that the notion of work discipline is a management action to enforce organizational standards (Octorend, 2015; Lemon & Palenchar, 2018 ;). According to Kempa & Chaterine (2016), employee work discipline can affect employee productivity because they have high work discipline. An employee will carry out his duties and work effectively and efficiently so that employee productivity can be further improved and will have an impact on achieving organizational goals. Organization must have a goal to be achieved by the organizational members (Niati et al., 2021). The success of leadership is partly determined by the ability of leaders to develop their organizational culture. (Arif, 2019).

The phenomenon that exists in the Civil Service Police Unit of Labuhan Batu Regency is that there are still employees who arrive late at predetermined working hours, there are still employees who are absent during work days, leaders and employees still have good relations, so there has not been a creation. good work involvement, there are still frequent miscommunications between employees with one another, there are still employees who do not want to cooperate between other employees, and also the low work commitment of employees at the Civil Service Police Unit of Labuhan Batu Regency so that this - it reduces employee productivity.

Job involvement is an idea that must be understood between leaders and employees as an internal state and can also lead to the process of job recovery, psychological release, and so on (Karanika-Murray et al., 2015). Work engagement is defined as an emotional state characterized by passion, dedication, and absorption (Admasachew & Dawson, 2011; de Beer, 2014). Moreover, work engagement is a servant leader ensuring a fair and equal distribution of work based on individual abilities (Chen and Peng, 2019; Huertas-Valdivia et al., 2019). Job involvement is a leader who serves, provides development training and shares decision-making responsibilities to employees. They also build relationships and respect others, stay true to the principles (Sipe and Frick, 2015 ;). According to Kanungo (1982) in Latifah (2018), the indicators of work involvement are: (1). actively participate in work, (2). Prioritizing Work, (3). Work is important for self-esteem, (4). Loyalty to work, (5). Strive to achieve organizational goals, (6) maintain good relations with colleagues within the company and outside the company.

Work attitude is also a reflection of a person's belief in the work he does, Gomendio (2017). According to Pitriyanti & Halim (2020) that work attitude employee have indicators that must be met by employee include: (1). Working Conditions (2). Supervisory Supervision (3). Cooperation from Colleagues (4). For Forward (5). Security (6). Work

Facilities. Work commitment is translated as the moral responsibility of an employee to his company, so that in every company activity, they work responsibly, work hard, totally and thoroughly, and dare to take risks (Al-Sada, et al., 2017). Commitment in a general sense is an agreement. So, when an employee has become part of a company, then he should keep the agreed contract, for example carrying out obligations in accordance with the attached provisions (Lambert, et al., 2020). The indicators of commitment according to (Gopinath, 2020) are (1). Commitment to the company (2). Commitment to work (3). Commitment to leadership (4). Commitment to the work team (5) Commitment to discipline (6). Commitment to yourself.

The opinion of Colquitt and J. Wesson (2013:38-42) that employee performance is a number of behaviors and contributions of organizational members to the achievement of organizational goals. According to Shields quoted by Bose, (2018: 72), employee performance is defined as the ability of an employee to carry out his duties and responsibilities. Employee performance is also associated with results, achievements, and collective efforts and behaviors that are relevant to organizational goals that are controlled by employees. Employee performance is reflected in the work shown by employees. Ivancevich and Matteson (2012: 170) suggest that performance is the result of performance in carrying out a job. The essence of performance management is the actual measurement of individual or group performance.

## II. Research Method

This type of research is quantitative, the place of this research is the Labuhan Batu Civil Service Police Unit on Jalan WR. Supratman No. 46, Labuhanbatu. Data collection techniques used in the study were observation, documentation and questionnaires using a Likert scale. In this study, the population was the Pamong Praja Rantau Prapat police unit as many as 233 people. In this study, samples were taken using the Slovin formula, which was determined or the significance level was 0.05, so the sample size in this study was 147 people. The analytical method used in this research is multiple linear regression.

## III. Results and Discussion

### 3.1. Result

The validity test of the research variables has significant criteria  $> 0.5$ . The validity test in this study was carried out on 30 samples carried out at the Serdang Bedagai Civil Service Police Unit, North Sumatra Province. Ghazali (2018) states that the validity test is used as a measure of whether a questionnaire is valid or not. Valid data is data that does not differ between data reported by researchers and data that actually occurs in the object of research. The results of the validity of this study can be contained in Table 1:

**Table 1.** Validity Test Results

Variable Indicator Items	Total Correlation	Sig Criteria	Description
X1.1	,580	0.5	Valid
X1.2	,877	0.5	Valid
X1.3	,617	0.5	Valid
X1.4	,867	0.5	Valid
X1.5	,781	0.5	Valid
X1.6	,846	0.5	Valid

X1.7	,867	0.5	Valid
X1.8	,842	0.5	Valid
X2.1	,888	0.5	Valid
X2.2	,858	0.5	Valid
X2.3	,875	0.5	Valid
X2.4	,858	0.5	Valid
X2.5	,704	0.5	Valid
X2.6	,665	0.5	Valid
X3.1	,566	0.5	Valid
X3.2	,883	0.5	Valid
X3.3	,888	0.5	Valid
X3.4	,883	0.5	Valid
X3.5	,773	0.5	Valid
X3.6	,811	0.5	Valid
X4.1	,664	0.5	Valid
X4.2	,617	0.5	Valid
X4.3	,851	0.5	Valid
X4.4	,830	0.5	Valid
X4.5	,852	0.5	Valid
X4.6	,669	0.5	Valid
Y.1	,875	0.5	Valid
Y.2	,810	0.5	Valid
Y.3	,623	0.5	Valid
Y.4	,749	0.5	Valid
Y.5	,793	0.5	Valid
Y.6	,632	0.5	Valid

*Description: \*Sig Criteria < 0.5*

*Source: Research Results, 2021.*

Sugiyono (2017) suggests that the reliability test is carried out to find out the results of the measurement are consistent if the same measuring instrument is measured, an indicator in the questionnaire can be accepted if the alpha coefficient has a value  $> 0.6$ . The results of the reliability test in this study can be contained in Table 2:

**Table 2.** Reliability Test Results

Variable	Croanbach Alpha (CA)	Description
Work Discipline	,787	Reliable
Work Engagement	,800	Reliable
Work attitude	,799	Reliable
Commitment	,788	Reliable
Employee Performance	,788	Reliable

*Description: \*Criteria CA > 0.6.*

*Source: Research Results, 2021*

Table 1 and Table 2 show that all statement items are valid and reliable. The next test uses the classical assumption test with normality. The normality test of this study is contained in Table 3 One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test:

**Table 3.** One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		147
Normal Parameters, b	mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	1.18321939
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.057
	Positive	.050
	negative	-.057
Test Statistics		.057
asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200c,d

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Description: \* $p > 0.05$ .

Source: Research Results, 2021.

The normality test above uses the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method with a significance value of 0.200 where the result is greater than the 0.05 significance level. So it can be concluded that the normality test in this study is normally distributed. The following is a normality test using a p-plot graph. The results of the multicollinearity test in the study are listed in Table 4:

**Table 4.** Test results Multicollinearity

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1,459	1,670			
	Work Discipline	.170	.061	.214	.502	1991
	Work Engagement	.402	.066	.418	.610	1,641
	Work attitude	.152	.065	.153	.681	1.469
	Commitment	.159	.070	.168	.535	1.869

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Description: \* $p < 0.05$ .

Source: Research Results, 2021.

Table 4 shows that the three independent variables have a VIF value  $< 10$  and a value of *tolerance*  $> 0.1$  which means the data in this study does not experience multicollinearity. Classical assumption testing with heteroscedasticity test using the glesjer method in this study can be contained in Table 5:

**Table 5.** Test results Heteroscedasticity of the Glesjer. Method

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.297	1.026		4.187	.000
	Work Discipline	-.020	.037	-.059	-.525	.600
	Work Engagement	-.076	.041	-.190	-1.857	.065

Work attitude	-.089	.040	-.217	-2.239	.027
Commitment	.056	.043	.142	1.297	.197

a. Dependent Variable: Abs\_res

Source: Research Results, 2021.

The significant value with the Glejser method is known that the variable Work Discipline (X1) of 0.600, Work Involvement (X2) is 0.065, Work Attitude (X3) is 0.027, and Commitment (X4) is 0.197. This explains that there is no heteroscedasticity due to the significance value of the variable work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2) and commitment (X4) because it is greater than 0.05. While the work attitude variable (X3) explains that heteroscedasticity occurs because  $0.027 < 0.05$ . The results of the research analysis by testing multiple linear analysis can be contained in Table 6:

**Table 6.** Results Multiple Linear Analysis

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1,459	1,670			
	Work Discipline	.170	.061	.214	.502	1.991
	Work Engagement	.402	.066	.418	.610	1,641
	Work attitude	.152	.065	.153	.681	1.469
	Commitment	.159	.070	.168	.535	1.869

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Description: \* $p < 0.05$

Source: Research Results, 2021.

Based on this value, the following multiple linear regression equation was obtained:  $Y = 1.459 + 0.170X_1 + 0.402X_2 + 0.152X_3 + 0.159X_4$ . Table 6 explains that the B value in work discipline (B1) is 0.170. The value of work involvement (B2) is 0.402. The value of work attitude (B3) is 0.152. The commitment value (B4) is 0.159, and the constant value (a) is 1.459. The description of the multiple linear regression equation shows that the variables of work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2), and commitment (X4) have a positive direction coefficient on employee performance.

To test the research hypothesis can be used t test. This test was conducted to analyze the effect of the independent variables, namely work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2), work attitude (X3), and commitment (X4) partially on the dependent variable, namely employee performance (Y). The equation for determining the t table value can be used as follows:  $df = nk - 1 = 147 - 4 - 1 = 142$ . After calculating using this equation, the t table value is 1.6554. The results of the t test can be loaded in Table 7:

**Table 7.** Result t test (Partial)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,459	1,670		.874	.384
	Work Discipline	.170	.061	.214	2.813	.006
	Work Engagement	.402	.066	.418	6.053	.000
	Work attitude	.152	.065	.153	2,344	.020

Commitment	.159	.070	.168	2.282	.024
------------	------	------	------	-------	------

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Description: \* $p < 0.05$

Source: Research Results, 2021

Based on Table 7, it can be seen from the results of the regression analysis that the t value of 2.813 > t table 1.6554 means that the work discipline variable (X1) has a positive effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Then the significant value is 0.006 < 0.05, which means that the work discipline variable (X1) has a significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Based on the results of the regression analysis, the t-count value of 6.053 > t-table 1.6554 means that the work involvement variable (X2) has a positive effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Then the significant value is 0.000 < 0.05, which means that the work involvement variable (X2) has a significant effect on the work productivity variable (Y). Furthermore, the results of the regression analysis obtained the value of t count of 2,344 > t table 1, 6554 this means that the work attitude variable (X3) has a positive effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Then the significant value is 0.020 < 0.05, which means that the work attitude variable (X3) has a significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y). The results of the regression analysis obtained that the t value was 2.282 > t table 1.6554. This means that the commitment variable (X4) has a positive effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Then the significant value is 0.024 < 0.05, which means the commitment variable (X4) has a significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y). 6554 This means that the commitment variable (X4) has a positive effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Then the significant value is 0.024 < 0.05, which means the commitment variable (X4) has a significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y). 6554 This means that the commitment variable (X4) has a positive effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Then the significant value is 0.024 < 0.05, which means the commitment variable (X4) has a significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y).

The F test was conducted to test the independent variables, namely work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2), work attitude (X3), and commitment (X4) simultaneously having a significant relationship or not to the dependent variable, namely employee performance (Y). As for determining the value of Ftable, the following equation can be used:  $df = k; n - k = 4; 147 - 4 = 3; 143$ . After calculating using this equation,  $F_{table} = (3; 143 - 3)$ , the value of Ftable is 2.43. The results of the F test in this study can be contained in Table 8:

**Table 8.F . Test Results ANOVAa**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	342,662	4	85.666	50.710	.000b
	Residual	239,882	142	1,689		
	Total	582,544	146			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Commitment, Job Involvement, Work Attitude, Work Discipline

Description: \* $p < 0.05$

Source: Research Results, 2021.

Table 8 shows the Fcount value of  $50.710 > F_{table} 2.43$  with a significance value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ . From these results, it can be concluded that work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2), work attitude (X3), and commitment (X4) simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y).

The coefficient of determination was carried out to analyze the contribution of the influence of the independent variables, namely work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2), work attitude (X3), and commitment (X4) to the dependent variable, namely employee performance (Y). The results of the coefficient of determination test can be contained in Table 9:

**Table 9.** Coefficient of Determination Test Results

<b>Model Summary<sup>b</sup></b>				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.767 <sup>a</sup>	.588	.577	1,300

a. Predictors: (Constant), Commitment, Job Involvement, Work Attitude, Work Discipline

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity

*Description: \* $p < 0.05$*

*Source :Research Results, 2021.*

The value of R Square from the analysis of the coefficient of determination of 0.588 means that work productivity can be explained by the variables of work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2), work attitude (X3), and commitment (X4) of 58.8%, while the remaining 41, 2% can be explained by other variables not examined in this study.

### 3.2. Discussion

The results of the regression analysis obtained the t arithmetic value of  $2.813 > t_{table} 1.6554$ . This means that the work discipline variable (X1) has a positive effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Then the significant value is  $0.006 < 0.05$ , which means that the work discipline variable (X1) has a significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y). The results of this study are in accordance with the results of previous studies conducted by Nurjaya Nurjaya, Denok Sunarsi, Aidil Amin Effendy, Arga Teriyan, Gunartin Gunartin (2021) which stated that work discipline partially had a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Based on the results of the regression analysis, the t-count value of  $6.053 > t_{table} 1.6554$  means that the work involvement variable (X2) has a positive effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Then the significant value is  $0.000 < 0.05$ , which means that the work involvement variable (X2) has a significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y). This research has previously been carried out by Khairul Amar, Meutia Meutia, Diswandi Diswandi (2021), which describes that work involvement partially has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Furthermore, the results of the regression analysis obtained the t arithmetic value of  $2.344 > t_{table} 1.6554$ . This means that the work attitude variable (X3) has a positive effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Then the significant value is  $0.020 < 0.05$ , which means that the work attitude variable (X3) has a significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y). The results of previous research conducted by Jasmin, Wasillah (2021) explained that work attitudes had a positive and significant effect on employee performance.



The results of the regression analysis obtained that the t value was  $2.282 > t$  table 1.6554. This means that the commitment variable (X4) has a positive effect on the employee performance variable (Y). Then the significant value is  $0.024 < 0.05$ , which means the commitment variable (X4) has a significant effect on the employee performance variable (Y). The results of previous research conducted by Meutia Meutia, Diswandi Diswandi (2021), which explains that commitment partially has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The value of Fcount is  $50.710 > F$ table 2.43 with a significance value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ . From these results, it can be concluded that work discipline (X1), work involvement (X2), work attitude (X3), and commitment (X4) simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance (Y).

#### IV. Conclusion

1. Work Discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Labuhan Batu District Civil Service Police Unit
2. Work Involvement has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Labuhan Batu District Civil Service Police Unit
3. Work Attitude has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Labuhan Batu District Civil Service Police Unit
4. Commitment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in the Labuhan Batu District Civil Service Police Unit
5. Work Discipline, Work Involvement, Work Attitude and Commitment simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance in Labuhan Batu District Civil Service Police Unit

#### References

- Admasachew, L., & Dawson, J. (2011). The association between presenteeism and engagement in National Health Service staff. *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, 16(1), 29e33. <https://doi.org/10.1258/jhsrp.2010.010085>
- Al-Sada, M., Al-Esmael, B., & Faisal, M. N. (2017). Influence of organizational culture and leadership style on employee satisfaction, commitment and motivation in the educational sector in Qatar. *EuroMed Journal of Business*.
- Arif, S. (2019). Influence of Leadership, Organizational Culture, Work Motivation, and Job Satisfaction of Performance Principles of Senior High School in Medan City. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. P. 239-254
- Bose Indranil. (2018). Employee Empowerment and Employee Performance: An Empirical Study on Selected Banks in UAE. *Journal of Applied Management and Investment* 7(2)
- Chai, M. Tyng, Hafeez U. Amin, Mohamad N. M. Saad, and Aamir S. Malik (2017). The Influences of Emotion on Learning and Memory. *Front Psychol.* 2017; 8: 1454
- Chen, S., Peng, J., (2019). Determinants of frontline employee engagement and their influence on service performance. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* 1–24
- Colquitt, Jason A., Jeffery A. Lepine, and Michael J. Wesson. (2013). *Organizational Behavior: Improving Performance and Commitment in The Workplace*. Third Edition. McGraw-Hill International Edition.
- Ghazali Imam. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program IBM SPSS25*. STIE Indonesia.

- Gomendio, M. (2017), Empowering and Enabling Teachers to Improve Equity and Outcomes for All, International Summit on the Teaching Profession, OECD Publishing, Paris
- Gopinath, R. (2020). Impact of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment among the Academic Leaders of Tamil Nadu Universities. *GEDRAG & Organisatie Review*, 33(2), 2337-2349.
- Griffin, Jill. (2015). *Customer Loyalty, Menumbuhkan dan Mempertahankan Kesetiaan Pelanggan*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Ivancevich, J.M., dan Matteson, M...T (2012). *Organizational Behaviour and Management*. Singapore: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.
- Jasmin, Wasillah, (2021), Effect of Work Attitude Competency And Work Stress On Employee Performance Of Pt Putera Raja Sejahtera Palembang
- Karanika-Murray, M., Pontes, H. M., Griffiths, M. D., & Biron, C. (2015). Sickness presenteeism determines job satisfaction via affective-motivational states. *Social Science & Medicine*, 139, 100e106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.06.035>
- Kempa, C., & Chaterine, P. (2016). The effect of compensation and work discipline on employee performance CV. Citra Surya Indoprima. *Journal Agora*, 4(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.33370/jmk.v15i2>
- Khairul, A, Meutia, Diswandi, (2021) The Effect Of Organizational Commitment And Work Engagement On Employee Performance With Motivation As Intervening Variable (Study at Rasanae Barat District Office, Bima City)
- Lambert, E. G., Keena, L. D., Leone, M., May, D., & Haynes, S. H. (2020). The effects of distributive and procedural justice on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of correctional staff. *The Social Science Journal*, 57(4), 405-416.
- Latifah & Efendy. (2018). Pengaruh Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Keterlibatan kerja Dan Gaya Kepemimpinan Transformasional Terhadap kinerja karyawan Sinokor Merchant Marine Co., Ltd. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Vol.14, No.1*.
- Lemon, L. L., & Palenchar, M. J. (2018). Public relations and zones of engagement: Employees' lived experiences and the fundamental nature of employee engagement. *Public Relations Review*, 44(1), 142-155. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2018.01.002>
- Luthans, Fred. 2016. *Perilaku Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Andi
- Niati, D. R., Siregar, Z. M. E., & Prayoga, Y. (2021). The Effect of Training on Work Performance and Career Development: The Role of Motivation as Intervening Variable. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 2385-2393. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i2.1940>
- Nurjaya, Denok, S, Aidil, A, E, Arga, T, Gunartin, (2021) the Effect of Work Ethic and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at the Bogor City Forestry and Plantation Service.
- Octorend, T. R. (2015). Effect of Work Discipline, Work Motivation, and Job Satisfaction on Employee Organizational Commitment in the Company (Case Study in PT. Dada Indonesia). 3(8), 318-328. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujm.2015.030803>
- Shah, M. M., et al. (2020). The Development Impact of PT. Medco E & P Malaka on Economic Aspects in East Aceh Regency. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Volume 3, No 1, Page: 276-286*.
- Sipe, J.W., Frick, D.M., 2015. *Seven Pillars of Servant Leadership: Practicing the Wisdom of Leading by Serving*. Paulist Press.
- Stevanie, D. (2017). *Upaya Meningkatkan Kedisiplinan Kerja Karyawan Pada Hotel*

- Merpati Pontianak. *Bisnis Manajemen*, 1(9), 1863–1872.
- Sugiyono. 2017. *Metode Penelitian dan Pengembangan: Research and Development*, Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Werdhiastutie, A. et al. (2020). Achievement Motivation as Antecedents of Quality Improvement of Organizational Human Resources. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)* Volume 3, No 2, Page: 747-752.