

# The Influence of Leadership and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at PT. Visionet Data Internasional Tangerang City

**Suwanto**

Faculty of Economics, Universitas Pamulang, Indonesia

Management Science, Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Indonesia

[dosen01813@unpam.ac.id](mailto:dosen01813@unpam.ac.id)

## Abstract

*This study aims to determine the effect of leadership and work discipline on employee performance at PT. Tangerang City International Data Visionet. This research method is descriptive quantitative with a population of 80 employees and drawn as a saturated sample. The analytical method used in this research includes instrument data test, classical assumption test, linear regression test, correlation coefficient along with determination and hypothesis testing. Based on the results of the study that leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance, it is proven by a simple linear regression test  $Y = 20.701 + 0.396 X_1$ , with a hypothesis test  $t$  arithmetic  $> t$  table ( $3,818 > 1,664$ ) strengthened by a sig value  $< 0.05$  then  $H_1$  is accepted. The work discipline variable has a positive and significant effect on employee performance with a simple linear regression test  $Y = 11,222 + 0.660 X_2$ , with a hypothesis test  $t$  arithmetic  $> t$  table ( $8,464 > 1.664$ ) strengthened by sig value  $< 0.05$  then  $H_2$  is accepted. Leadership and Work Discipline simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance as evidenced by multiple linear regression  $Y = 2.461 + 0.117 X_1 + 0.826 X_2$ , the correlation coefficient  $r$  is 0.692 which indicates a strong level of relationship. The value of the coefficient of determination  $R^2$  of 0.489 indicates that the influence of leadership and work discipline on employee performance is 48.9%. The results of the third hypothesis test are obtained by the calculated  $F$  value  $> F$  table, namely ( $36.833 > 3.12$ ) then  $H_3$  is accepted.*

## Keywords

leadership; work discipline;  
employee performance



## I. Introduction

The era of globalization has brought many changes and progress, this can be felt in various sectors of life (economic, social, business, political, legal, and educational). The progress of this century is not only seen significantly in the technology and information sector, but changes are also evident in the industrial or service sectors. Therefore, in order to face the challenges of globalization, it is necessary to develop quality Human Resources (HR), HR who are ready to compete with character (morals).

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).

Human Resources (HR) is the main factor in an organization or company. In achieving its goals, an organization requires human resources as system managers. In order for this system to work, of course, its management must pay attention to important aspects such as leadership, work motivation, work discipline, work environment and other aspects. This will make human resource management one of the important indicators of achieving organizational goals as a whole effective and efficient.

Leaders must be able to determine policies that are in line with company goals. This policy is implemented through the benefits of the company's resources, both marketing, production, financial and human resources.

An effective organization must be able to find, utilize, and develop people to achieve the aspired goals. Human resource management as the utilization of human resources to achieve organizational goals.

One of the factors that affect employee performance is leadership. Leadership can be defined as the process of influencing and directing employees in doing the work that has been assigned to them. In addition, there are problems with the work discipline of employees.

The problem with work discipline is that there are still many employees who arrive late when the briefing will start, while the problem with performance is the decline in employee performance due to the lack of firm leadership. Robbins and Judge (2015: 410) state that "leadership is the ability to influence a group towards the achievement of a vision or set of goals". In the development of employee performance, the element of leadership is considered very influential.

Work discipline affects employee performance. Work discipline is compliance with the rules or orders set by the organization. According to Hasibuan (2017: 193) states that "work discipline is the awareness and willingness of a person to obey all applicable social rules and norms and do all their duties well, not under coercion".

The success achieved by the company can be influenced by work discipline. The company's goals will be impossible to achieve without the discipline of all employees and leaders in the company. Based on the observations studied, there is instability in the level of punctual attendance of employees at PT. Tangerang City International Data Visionet. During briefings, lunch breaks, the employees also procrastinate beyond the existing schedule. This makes the quality of employee work still not up to the company's expectations.

## **II. Research Method**

This research was conducted at PT. Visionet Data Internasional which is located at Boulevard Gajah Mada No. 2120 Lippo Cyber Park, Lippo Village Tangerang 15811 Banten Indonesia and this research was conducted from June to December 2021. The population in this study were all employees at PT. Visionet Data Internasional Tangerang City which opened 80 employees. The population sample used as the object of research, namely 80 employees PT. Visionet Data Internasional Kota Tangerang

### III. Results and Discussion

The purpose of this study is to analyze financial ratios in determining company value in banking companies listed on the IDX in 2015-2019. The use of this research analysis is multiple regression, with the elaboration of the research results, namely:

#### 3.1 Validity Test

**Table 1.** Leadership Variable Validity Test (X1)

| Indicator | R Value | R table | Decission |
|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|
| X1.1      | 0.625   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X1.2      | 0.605   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X1.3      | 0.688   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X1.4      | 0.706   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X1.5      | 0.706   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X1.6      | 0.808   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X1.7      | 0.775   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X1.8      | 0.46    | 0.22    | Valid     |

**Table 2.** Work Discipline Variable Validity Test (X2)

| Indicator | R Value | R table | Decission |
|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Y.1       | 0.682   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| Y.2       | 0.797   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| Y.3       | 0.695   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| Y.4       | 0.801   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| Y.5       | 0.789   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| Y.6       | 0.797   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| Y.7       | 0.726   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| Y.8       | 0.75    | 0.22    | Valid     |

**Table 3.** Employee Performance Variable Validity Test (Y)

| Indicator | R Value | R table | Decission |
|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|
| X2.1      | 0.648   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X2.2      | 0.621   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X2.3      | 0.815   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X2.4      | 0.783   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X2.5      | 0.779   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X2.6      | 0.808   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X2.7      | 0.803   | 0.22    | Valid     |
| X2.8      | 0.805   | 0.22    | Valid     |

### 3.2 Classic Assumption Test

#### a. Data Normality Test



#### b. Normality Test

**Table 4.** Normality Test

|                                  |                | Unstandardized Residual |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| N                                |                | 80                      |
| Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup> | Mean           | 0                       |
|                                  | Std. Deviation | 3.05130487              |
|                                  | Absolute       | 0.118                   |
| Most Extreme Differences         | Positive       | 0.118                   |
|                                  | Negative       | -0.1                    |
| Test Statistic                   |                | 0.118                   |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)           |                | .008 <sup>c</sup>       |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

#### c. Multicollinearity Test

**Table 5.** Multicollinearity Test

| Model      | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |       | T     | Sig.  | Collinearity Statistics |       |
|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------------|-------|
|            | B                           | Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients | Beta  |       |       | Tolerance               | VIF   |
|            |                             |            |                           |       |       |       |                         |       |
| (Constant) | 9.177                       | 3.129      |                           |       | 2.933 | 0.004 |                         |       |
| 1 X1       | 0.112                       | 0.091      | 0.112                     | 0.112 | 1.237 | 0.22  | 0.804                   | 1.244 |
| X2         | 0.613                       | 0.087      | 0.642                     | 0.642 | 7.067 | 0     | 0.804                   | 1.244 |

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

**d. Heteroscedasticity Test**

**Table 6. Heteroscedasticity Test**

| <b>Model Summary<sup>b</sup></b> |                   |          |                   |                            |               |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Model                            | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
| 1                                | .699 <sup>a</sup> | 0.489    | 0.476             | 3.091                      | 2.229         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), WORK DISCIPLINE, LEADERSHIP

b. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

**e. Heteroscedasticity Test**

**Table 7. Heteroscedasticity Test**

| <b>Coefficients<sup>a</sup></b> |                |                             |            |                           |        |       |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|-------|
| Model                           |                | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig.  |
|                                 |                | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |       |
| 1                               | (Constant)     | 3.401                       | 2.216      |                           | 1.535  | 0.129 |
|                                 | Leadership     | -0.018                      | 0.064      | -0.036                    | -0.287 | 0.775 |
|                                 | Work Dicipline | -0.02                       | 0.061      | -0.041                    | -0.32  | 0.75  |

a. Dependent Variable: Abs\_RES

1. Hypothesis Test

t-Test

**Table 8. Leadership (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)**

| <b>Coefficients<sup>a</sup></b> |            |                             |            |                           |       |      |
|---------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| Model                           |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T     | Sig. |
|                                 |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      |
| 1                               | (Constant) | 20.701                      | 3.407      |                           | 6.077 | 0    |
|                                 | LEADERSHIP | 0.396                       | 0.104      | 0.397                     | 3.818 | 0    |

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

**Table 9. Work Discipline (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)**

| <b>Coefficients<sup>a</sup></b> |                |                             |            |                           |       |      |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| Model                           |                | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T     | Sig. |
|                                 |                | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      |
| 1                               | (Constant)     | 11.222                      | 2.666      |                           | 4.208 | 0    |
|                                 | WORK DICIPLINE | 0.66                        | 0.078      | 0.692                     | 8.464 | 0    |

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

2. Simultaneous Hypothesis Test (F-Test)

**Table 10.** Leadership (X1) and Work Discipline (X2) on Employee Performance (Y)

| ANOVA <sup>a</sup> |                |    |             |        |                   |
|--------------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model              | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
| Regression         | 703.674        | 2  | 351.837     | 36.833 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
| 1 Residual         | 735.526        | 77 | 9.552       |        |                   |
| Total              | 1439.2         | 79 |             |        |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE (X1)

b. Predictors: (Constant), WORK DICIPLINE (X2), LEADERSHIP (Y)

**Table 11.** Multiple Linear Regression

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |                             |            |                           |       |       |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|
| Model                     | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T     | Sig.  |
|                           | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |       |
| (Constant)                | 9.177                       | 3.129      |                           | 2.933 | 0.004 |
| 1 LEADERSHIP (X1)         | 0.112                       | 0.091      | 0.112                     | 1.237 | 0.22  |
| WORK DICIPLINE (X2)       | 0.613                       | 0.087      | 0.642                     | 7.067 | 0     |

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

From the table above, the multiple linear regression equation model can be obtained as follows:

$$Y = 9,177 + 0.112 X_1 + 0.613 X_2.$$

Detail:

Y : Employee performance

X<sub>1</sub>: Leade Work Discipline rship

X<sub>2</sub>: Work Dicipline

The results of the multiple linear regression equation can be seen that the regression coefficient obtained by the Leadership and Work Discipline variable has a positive influence on Employee Performance, meaning that every increase in the Leadership and Work Discipline variable will also increase Employee Performance.

The equation can be explained as follows:

- The value of the constant = 9.177 states that if the value of the leadership variable (X<sub>1</sub>) and work discipline (X<sub>2</sub>) does not exist or = 0, then the value of the employee performance variable is 9.177.
- The leadership value (X<sub>1</sub>) is 0.112, meaning that if the constant is fixed and there is no change in the Work Discipline variable (X<sub>2</sub>), then every 1 unit change in the Leadership variable (X<sub>1</sub>) will result in a change in Employee Performance (Y) of 0.112 points.
- Work discipline (X<sub>2</sub>) 0.613, meaning that if the constant is fixed and there is no change in the Leadership variable (X<sub>1</sub>), then every 1 unit change in the Work Discipline variable (X<sub>2</sub>) will result in an increase in Employee Performance (Y) of 0.613 points

### 3. Coefficient of Determination (R Square)

**Table 12.** Leadership Determination Test Results (X1)

| Model Summary |                   |          |                   |                            |                 | Change Statistics |     |     |               |
|---------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model         | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change          | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1             | .699 <sup>a</sup> | 0,489    | 0,476             | 309,068                    | 0,489           | 36,833            | 2   | 77  | 0,000         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), WORK DICIPLINE (X2), LEADERSHIP (Y)

Based on the table, the value of the coefficient of determination is 0.489, it can be concluded that the variables of Leadership and Work Discipline have an effect on Employee Performance of 48.9% while the remaining (100%-48.9%) = 51.1% is influenced by other factors that are not research done.

## IV. Conclusion

The results of hypothesis testing have proven that there is an influence between the Leadership variable and Employee Performance. Tests prove that leadership has a positive influence on employee performance. Judging from the calculations that have been carried out, the coefficient value is 0.697 and the value of  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  ( $3.818 > 1.664$ ) with a significance value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ , thus  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_o$  is rejected. The results of hypothesis testing have proven that there is an influence between Work Discipline variables and employee performance. Tests prove that work discipline has a positive effect on employee performance. Judging from the calculations that have been carried out, the coefficient value is 0.692 and the value of  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  ( $8,464 > 1,664$ ) with a significance value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ , thus  $H_a$  is accepted,  $H_o$  is rejected. The results of hypothesis testing have proven that there is an influence between the variables of Leadership and Work Discipline on Employee Performance.

Examiners prove that leadership and work discipline have a significant effect on employee performance. Judging from the calculations that have been made, the R Square value is 0.489 and the value  $F_{(count)} > F_{table}$  ( $36.833 > 3.12$ ) with a significance level of  $0.000 < 0.05$ , which means that the hypothesis in this study  $H_o$  is rejected,  $H_a$  is accepted..

According to research on the variable Leadership ( $X_1$ ) PT. Visionet Data Internasional Tangerang City, received a response from employees who "Strongly Disagree" on the statement "Your leader is willing to listen to opinions or suggestions from subordinates" (3.89%). This shows that the leader must be willing to listen to the opinions and suggestions of subordinates to increase employee motivation and work optimally. According to research on the work discipline variable ( $X_2$ ) PT. Visionet Data Internaional Tangerang City, received a response from employees who "Strongly Disagree" on the statement "I use the work uniform that has been determined" (4.06%). This shows that there are employees who do not use the work uniforms that have been determined by the company. Therefore, employees must obey the rules that have been set in the company.

According to research on Employee Performance variable (Y) PT. Visionet Data Internasional Tangerang City, received a response from employees who "Strongly Disagree" to the statement "I always tidy up work equipment after use" (4.10%). This



shows that employees do not tidy up work equipment after use. Therefore, employees must tidy up work equipment after use to keep the equipment from being lost.

## References

- A.A. Anwar Prabu Mangkunegara. 2016. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia
- A.A. Anwar Prabu Mangkunegara. 2017. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan, Bandung : Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Andi Supangat. 2013. Statistika dalam Kajian Deskriptif, Inferensi, dan Nonparametik, Bandung : Kencana penada media group.
- Ghozali, Imam. 2011. Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program SPSS. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Ghozali, Imam. 2016. Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program IBM SPSS 23 (Edisi 8). Cetakan ke VIII. Semarang : Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hasibuan, Malayu. 2016. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara
- Irham Fahmi. 2017. Analisis Laporan Keuangan, Alfabeta. Bandung.
- Malayu SP. Hasibuan. 2015. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Edisi Revisi. : Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- Mudrajad Kuncoro. 2013. Metode Riset untuk Bisnis dan Ekonomi Edisi 4. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- 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>
- 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.
- Sugiyono. 2014. Metode Penelitian Bisnis. Edisi Kesembilan. Bandung : CV Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. 2015. Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mix Methods). Bandung : Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. 2016. Metode Penelitian Bisnis. Bandung. Penerbit : Alfabeta
- Sugiyono. 2017. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung : Alfabeta, CV.
- Sunarsi, D. (2018). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Motivasi Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pendidik Yayasan Marvin. *Inovasi*, 5(1), 1-18.
- Suwanto, S., Sunarsi, D., Erlangga, H., Nurjaya, N., & Haryadi, R. N. (2022). Pengaruh Pemberian Reward dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Prestasi Kerja yang Berdampak pada Kinerja Karyawan pada PT Surya Pratama Gemilang di Bekasi. *JENIUS (Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia)*, 5(2), 471-484.
- 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.