The Differences in Work Discipline between Permanent Employees and Contract Employees (Outsourcing) Based on Rewards, Punishment, and Leadership Style in Service and Manufacturing Companies in Tangerang Regency, Banten – Indonesia

Arsadi

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi PPI, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to determine the differences in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on rewards, punishment and leadership style in service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten-Indonesia. Data in this study are quantitative data. Samples were taken randomly using a questionnaire as an instrument. In this study, the researcher used a non-probability sampling technique. The researcher also involved 100 permanent employees and 100 contract employees as research sample to make sure that a balanced comparison could be made. Data analysis technique used included reliability and validity testing as a test instrument, classical assumption test, and ANOVA which was used as a hypothesis testing tool. The results of this study include: 1) there is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on reward, 2) there is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on punishment, and 3) there is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on leadership style.

Keywords: *Work Discipline; Punishment; Leadership Style; Rewards*

Introduction

Every company has an expectation that their employees perform well and are productive so that they can become company assets (Abdullah, 2014). Besides, every employee also certainly has a desire to make a positive contribution to his company so that his status becomes clear, one of which is the change in position from a contract employee to a permanent employee (Mallu, 2015).

Contract employees tend to compete to become permanent employees. The question that then arises is whether they still have a good behavior if they have become permanent employees. For this reason, the researcher intended to compare their behavior with work discipline as dependent variable and reward, punishment and leadership style in service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten-Indonesia as independent variables.

Employees are basically all residents who enter the working age range (aged 15 to 64 years), or the total number of residents in a country producing goods and services if there is a demand for the power they produce, and if they want to be involved/participate in the activity (Subri, 2003). According to Hasibuan (2016), employee is any person who provides services (in the form of thoughts or energy) and receives remuneration or compensation, the amount of which has been determined in advance.

Work discipline is the expectation of every company to its employees which has become a very basic obligation. However, basic things are often ignored and underestimated by employees. In fact, Hasibuan (2016) claimed that discipline is the most important operational function of human resource management since the better the discipline of employees, the higher work performance they can achieve. Many companies are very sincere and happy to give rewards to every employee who has met the disciplinary criteria in accordance with the prescribed procedures and regulations. This is in line with the opinion expressed by Arikunto (2012) that a reward is something given to someone because he/she has got the desired achievement.

On the other hand, different from reward, punishment is usually avoided by the company and becomes an action that the department tends to dislike. However, in order to comply with the applicable rules and regulations that have been determined by the company and have been mutually agreed upon as well as to provide a deterrent effect for the employees concerned, the company needs to do it. In this case, Febrianti (2014) strongly advocated that punishment is an act that is consciously and deliberately inflicted on someone, in which he/she has a weakness in terms of physical or spiritual aspects so that we are responsible for guiding and protecting him/her.

Furthermore, leadership style has a very dominant role in creating work discipline of employee. Each leadership style has its own strengths and weaknesses. Leadership style is how a leader performs his leadership function and how he is seen by his subordinates or those who may be observing from outside (Trang, 2013). Tampi (2014) believed that leadership style is actually various patterns of behavior favored by leaders in the process of directing and influencing employees. Therefore, it plays a very important role in determining work discipline of employees.

Literature Review

Work Discipline

Hasibuan (2016) claimed that work discipline is a person's awareness and willingness to comply with all company regulations and prevailing social norms. Moreover, Rivai & Bacthiar (2013) stated: "Work discipline is a tool used by managers to communicate with employees so that they are willing to change behavior. It is also an effort to increase awareness and willingness to comply with all company regulations." According to Sutrisno et al., (2016), here are things affecting work discipline of employees:

1. Amount of compensation. The amount of compensation can affect work discipline. Employees tend to obey all applicable regulations if they feel that they are guaranteed remuneration that is worth the hard work that has been done for the company.
2. Existence of exemplary leaders in the company. Exemplary leaders are very important since in a company environment, all employees always pay attention to how the leader can enforce his own discipline and control himself in terms of words, actions, and attitudes that can be detrimental to the established discipline rules.
3. Existence of definite rules that can be used as guidelines. Discipline cannot be implemented in a company if there are no definite written rules that can be used as a common guideline.
4. Leadership courage in taking action. If there is an employee who violates discipline, courageous leader is needed to take action in accordance with the violation made.

5. Existence of leader supervision. Supervision is needed in every activity carried out by the company to direct employees so that they can work appropriately and in accordance with predetermined rules.
6. Caring leader towards employees. Employees are human beings who have different characters from one another.

Mangkunegara (2016) stated that there are 3 forms of work discipline including:

1. Preventive discipline
It is an effort to direct employees to follow and comply with the work guidelines and rules that have been regulated by the company.
2. Corrective discipline
It is an effort to direct employees in a regulation and direct them to comply with the regulations in accordance with the guidelines that apply to the company.
3. Progressive discipline
It is an activity that provides harsher punishment for repeated offenses.

Sutrisno et al., (2016) added:

1. Obey the working time regulation. It can be seen from the hours to come to work, time to go home, and rest hours according to the applicable rules in the company.
2. Comply with company regulations. It concerns basic rules about how to dress and behave at work.
3. Obey the rules of behavior at work. It is shown by ways of doing jobs in accordance with the position, duties and responsibilities as well as how to build relationship with other work units.
4. Comply with other regulations in the company. It concerns the rules regarding behavior that can and should not be done by employees in the company.

Reward

According to Tangkuman et al., reward in a business sector is defined as "an effort to foster a feeling of being accepted (recognized) in the work environment, which is related to aspects of compensation and relationship between workers".4 This definition is based on the purpose of rewarding. Reward means any form of remuneration or compensation to employees for their employment. It can be in the form of direct cash payments (wages, salaries, incentives, bonuses), in the form of indirect payments (insurance, holidays at company expense), or in the form of non-monetary rewards (flexible working hours, prestigious offices, more challenging work) (Dessler, 2005).

Omtinah (2013) affirmed that reward is a remuneration given by a company to its employees which can be valued in money and has a tendency to be given regularly.

Table 1. Dimensions and Indicators of Reward according to Byars & Rue (2010)

Intrinsic	Extrinsic
Achievement	Formal recognition
Feeling of accomplishment	Fringe Benefits
Informal recognition	Incentive payments
Job Satisfaction	Work environment
Personal Growth	Promotion
Status	Social relationship

Punishment

Ngalim (2007) declared that "punishment is a hardship given or inflicted on purpose by someone (parents, teachers, etc.) after an offense, crime, or mistake". According to Febrianti (2014), it is an act of displeasure by a person with a higher position for offense and crime, which is intended to correct a child's mistakes and not to hold a grudge. Sadulloh (2010) added that punishment is an act given because a child makes a mistake and violates the applicable rules so that he/she does not repeat the mistake. It is given as a training for children to become a moral person".

Dimensions and Indicators of Punishment

Punishment generally can be divided into two types (Ngalim, 2007):

1. Preventive Punishment. This is done to prevent the occurrence of a violation, meaning that it is done before the violation is committed. Thus, preventive punishment is a punishment that 'prevents' prevent things that can hinder or disrupt the smooth running of the work process.

2. Repressive Punishment. It is done because of the violations and sins committed. Thus, it is given after a violation or mistake occurs. Repressive punishment is given when an action is considered contrary to the rules.

Leadership Style

Leadership style is a method owned by a leader who shows an attitude with certain characteristics to influence employees in achieving organizational goals (Mulyadi, 2015:150). Leadership style is a set of characteristics used by leaders to influence employees so that organizational goals are achieved. In other words, it is a pattern of behavior and strategies applied by a leader (Zainal et al., 2017:42). It is basically a particular way of a leader being able to influence his/her followers so that they voluntarily want to carry out various joint actions ordered without feeling pressured in order to achieve organizational goals (Busro, 2018:226).

According to (Busro, 2018:251), leadership style has the following dimensions and indicators:

1. Initiative structure consists of several indicators including compiling work division, work relationship, and goals.

2. Consideration consists of several indicators: trust, idea taking, level of concern/care.

Research Methods

Qualitative Data Collection Techniques

In *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (the official dictionary of the Indonesian language), data collection is the process, method, act of collecting, or compiling data.

Sugiyono (2012:7) affirmed that quantitative method is referred to as traditional method since it has been used for a long time so that it has become a method for research. This method is called a positivistic method because it is based on the philosophy of positivism. It is also a scientific method considering that it has met scientific principles such as concrete/empirical, objective, measurable, rational, and systematic. Some experts called this method as discovery since it can help the process of discovering

and developing new science and technology. It is called a quantitative method because research data are in the form of numbers and the analysis uses statistics.

Research Instruments

According to Arikunto (2012), data collection instruments are tools selected and used by researchers in collecting data so that the collection process becomes systematic and simplified. Sugiyono (2014) added that instrument is a measuring tool used to obtain quantitative information about variations in the characteristics of variables objectively. He believed that based on data collection techniques, quantitative research can be carried out, one of which is by distributing questionnaires. The questionnaire is a data collection technique done by giving a set of questions or written statements to the respondent to be answered. It is an efficient data collection technique if the researcher understands exactly what variables to measure and what is expected from the respondent. Questionnaire is also suitable if the number of respondents is large enough and spread over a large area. Thus, data collection in this study was carried out using a questionnaire.

Population

Sugiyono (2014) strongly advocated that population is a generalization area consisting of: objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics determined by the researcher for study, and then the researcher draws a conclusion. The population in this study were contract employees and permanent employees who worked in service companies such as colleges, universities, insurance, finance, and banks. In addition, the population in manufacturing companies included employees who worked in food and beverage companies, packaging companies, ceramic companies, and household appliance and electronics companies.

Sample

According to Sujarweni (2015), sample is a number of characteristics possessed by the population used for research. If the population is large, researchers may not involve all populations for research due to limited funds, energy, and time. For this reason, researchers can use samples drawn from that population. In this study, sampling was conducted using non probability sampling technique. (Sugiyono, 2019) stated that one of the techniques in non-probability sampling is incidental sampling technique; a sampling technique based on chance. It means that anyone who accidentally or incidentally meets the researcher can be used as a sample as long as they fit the predefined criteria.

More importantly, according to Nazir (2011), sample size is basically determined on personal consideration as long as it is sufficiently representative of the population considering time and cost. Since the exact number of permanent and contract employees in Tangerang was not known, the researcher involved 100 permanent employees and 100 contract employees as research samples to make sure that a balanced comparison could be made.

Likert scale was used in the questionnaire. Sugiyono (2014) mentioned that Likert scale assists researchers to describe variables to be measured into variable indicators as a starting point for arranging instrument items that can be in the form of statements.

Limitation

This study was limited to employees who received the regional minimum wage or employees who received overtime pay. In addition, the researcher did not specify the timing of the study due to COVID-19 pandemic.

Data Analysis Technique

Validity and Reliability Test

Validity test in this study was used to measure whether a questionnaire was valid. Validity shows the accuracy and exactness of a measuring instrument in performing its measuring function. According to Sugiyono (2014), validity test is the degree of accuracy between the data that occurs on the object of research and the data that can be reported by the researcher. Calculation of validity test utilized computer assistance, that was the SPSS (Statistical Package for Service Solution) version 23 program for windows. Sugiyono (2014) affirmed that a reliable instrument is an instrument that will produce the same data even though it is used several times to measure the same object. Widodo (2017) added that questionnaire is considered reliable if Cronbach's alpha value, tested together on all statements, shows an alpha value > 0.60. The reliability test in this study used SPSS version 23 for windows.

Assumption Test

Assumption test used in this research was normality test and homogeneity test. It refers to Muhammad (2009) in which the assumption test used depends on the statistical test tool used. Normality test is always needed as an assumption or condition for any parametric test. Normality test is done to find out whether the distribution of the data obtained follows or approaches the standard normal distribution law of Gauss. if depicted on a polygon graph, the normal distribution of the data will resemble the shape of a bell or a chime (Muhammad, 2009).

Ghozali (2013) stated that normality test aims to test whether confounding or residual variables have a normal distribution in the regression model. The t test and F test assume that the residual value follows a normal distribution. If this is violated, the statistical test becomes invalid for a small sample size. Normality test in this study used a residual value. Homogeneity tests are only required for parametric tests that assess differences in two or more groups.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

ANOVA is a comparative test used to test the difference in the mean (average) of data for more than two groups. The principle of the ANOVA test is to analyze the variability of data into two sources of variation, namely variations within groups and between groups. spss.html#Pengertian_Uji_ANOVA

Reliability and Validity Test of Research Instrument

Table 2. Reliability Statistics

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Reward	.852	9
Punishment	.786	9
Leadership Style	.900	9
Work Discipline	.879	9

Table 2 shows the results of the reliability test, in which all instrument variables are declared reliable because the Cronbach's Alpha value is above 0.6. Moreover, table 2 also shows that each variable has the same number of instruments; nine statements for each variable.

Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1

H0: There is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on rewards in service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten - Indonesia.
H1: There are differences in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on rewards in service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten - Indonesia.

Hypothesis 2
H0: There is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on punishment in service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten - Indonesia.
H1: There are differences in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on punishment in service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten - Indonesia.

Hypothesis 3
H0: There is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on leadership style in service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten - Indonesia.
H1: There are differences in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on leadership style in service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten - Indonesia.

Results and Discussion

Validity Test

Table 3. Item-Total Statistics

	Reward Correct Item-Total Correlation	Punishment Correct Item-Total Correlation	Leadership Style Correct Item-Total Correlation	Work Discipline Correct Item-Total Correlation
Item_1	.775	.603	.573	.747
Item_2	.789	.461	.601	.745
Item_3	.493	.482	.783	.673
Item_4	.380	.217	.732	.468
Item_5	.568	.504	.665	.558
Item_6	.354	.483	.823	.749
Item_7	.857	.501	.686	.637
Item_8	.634	.655	.699	.611
Item_9	.539	.409	.665	.490

The results of the validity test above show that all items from all variables are valid. This is indicated by using a standard > 0.2 and being compared with the numbers in the Correct Item-Total Correlation column (Nisfiannoor 2009:240)

The Differences in Work Discipline between Permanent Employees and Contract Employees (Outsourcing) Based on Rewards, Punishment, and Leadership Style in Service and Manufacturing Companies in Tangerang Regency, Banten – Indonesia

114

Assumption Test

Normality Test of Permanent Employees Data

Table 4. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		100
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	3.76914976
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.065
	Positive	.038
	Negative	-.065
Test Statistic		.065
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200[c,d]

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

The table above shows a significance value of $0.2 > 0.05$ which proves that the data is normal (Nisfiannoor 2009:129).

Normality Test of Contract Employees Data

Table 5. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		100
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	3.95428027
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.069
	Positive	.065
	Negative	-.069
Test Statistic		.069
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200[c,d]

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

The table above shows a significance value of $0.2 > 0.05$ which proves that the data is normal (Nisfiannoor 2009:129).

Homogeneity Test
Homogeneity of Permanent Employees Variable

Table 6. Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Reward_Permanent	1.456	13	82	.152
Punishment_Permanent	1.204	13	82	.292
Leadership_Style_Permanent	.888	13	82	.569

Significance of each independent variable in the table of permanent employees is in a position greater than 0.05 (all sig> 0.05), which means that the data on the independent variable of permanent employees are homogeneous.

Homogeneity of Permanent Employees Variable

Table 7. Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Work_Discipline_Permanent

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.361	13	83	.196

Significance of dependent variable on permanent employees is in a position greater than 0.05 (0.196> 0.05), which means that the data on the dependent variable of permanent employees are homogeneous.

Homogeneity of Contract Employees Variable

Table 8. Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Reward_Contract	.741	13	85	.718
Punishment_Contract	1.256	13	85	.256
Leadership_Style_Contract	.777	13	85	.682

Significance of each independent variable in the table of contract employees is in a position greater than 0.05 (all sig> 0.05), which means that the data on independent variable of contract employee are homogeneous.

Homogeneity of Contract Employees Variable

Table 9. Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Work_Discipline_Contract

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.907	14	82	.555

Significance of the dependent variable on permanent employees is in a position greater than 0.05 (0.555 > 0.05), which means that the data on the dependent variable of permanent employees is homogeneous.

Hypothesis Testing
Hypothesis 1

Table 10. Descriptive

Reward

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Permanent	100	76.2700	5.14017	.51402	75.2501	77.2899	65.00	87.00
Contract	100	77.0400	5.27031	.52703	75.9943	78.0857	60.00	90.00
Total	200	76.6550	5.20687	.36818	75.9290	77.3810	60.00	90.00

The most important thing in the descriptive table is to see the number of samples of each employee, either permanent or contract employees; and each category shows 100 employees. Thus, it is known that the total sample is 200 employees. Additionally, the mean of instruments for permanent employees and contract employees referring to the reward and work discipline variables is 76.6550.

Table 11. ANOVA

Reward

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	29.645	1	29.645	1.094	.297
Within Groups	5365.550	198	27.099		
Total	5395.195	199			

F value is 1.094 and sig = 0.297 > 0.05, meaning that H0 is accepted

Based on the results of the table, it can be interpreted that there is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on rewards at service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten - Indonesia. Work discipline of employees can also be known through the number of sick permits, late attendance, leaving before work hours end, and attendance list (Akbar & Slamet, 2017).

Hypothesis 2

Table 12. Descriptive

Punishment

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1.00	100	75.8900	5.92699	.59270	74.7140	77.0660	60.00	89.00
2.00	100	75.1200	5.64842	.56484	73.9992	76.2408	63.00	85.00
Total	200	75.5050	5.78770	.40925	74.6980	76.3120	60.00	89.00

The total sample is 200 employees. The mean of instruments for permanent employees and contract employees referring to punishment and work discipline variables is 75.5050.

Table 13. ANOVA

Punishment

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	29.645	1	29.645	.884	.348
Within Groups	6636.350	198	33.517		
Total	6665.995	199			

F value is 0.884 and sig = 0.348 > 0.05, meaning that H0 is accepted

Therefore: There is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on punishment in service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten - Indonesia.

Hypothesis 3

Table 14. Descriptive

Leadership_Style

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1.00	100	75.8900	5.92699	.59270	74.7140	77.0660	60.00	89.00
2.00	100	76.6600	5.67329	.56733	75.5343	77.7857	63.00	89.00
Total	200	76.2750	5.79979	.41011	75.4663	77.0837	60.00	89.00

The total sample is 200 employees. The mean of instruments for permanent employees and contract employees referring to reward and work discipline variables is 76.2750.

Table 15. ANOVA

Leadership_Style

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	29.645	1	29.645	.881	.349
Within Groups	6664.230	198	33.658		
Total	6693.875	199			

F value is 0.881 and sig = 0.349 > 0.05, meaning that H0 is accepted
Therefore, there is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on leadership style in service and manufacturing companies in Tangerang, Banten - Indonesia.

Conclusion

There is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on rewards. It can be seen in table 10 which shows the calculation result of F value = 1.094 and sig = 0.297 > 0.05. Moreover, there is no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on punishment. It can be seen in table 12 which shows the results of calculation of F value = 0.884 and sig = 0.348 > 0.05. Last but not least, there is also no difference in work discipline between permanent employees and contract employees based on leadership style. It can be seen in table 12 which shows the results of the calculation of F value = 0.881 and sig = 0.349 > 0.05.

References

Abdullah, M. (2014). *Manajemen dan evaluasi kinerja karyawan*. Aswaja Pressindo.

Akbar, T., & Slamet, S. (2017). Analisis Disiplin Kerja Karyawan Kontrak pada PT at Indonesia di Karawang. *Jurnal Lentera Bisnis*, *6*(1), 113–130.

Arikunto, S. (2012). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Rineka Cipta.

Byars, L. L., & Rue, L. W. (2010). *Human Resource Management, tenth*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin, Boston, MA, USA.

Dessler, G. (2005). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Alih bahasa: Eli Tanya). *Penyunting Bahasa: Budi Supriyanto). Indeks: Jakarta*.

Febrianti, S. (2014). Pengaruh Reward dan Punishment Terhadap Motivasi Kerja Serta Dampaknya Terhadap Kinerja (studi pada karyawan PT. Panin Bank Tbk. Area Mikro Jombang). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, *12*(1).

Ghozali, I. (2013). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program IBM dan SPSS. In aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program ibm spss 19 (p. 113)*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Hasibuan, M. S. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Bumi Aksara.

Mallu, S. (2015). Sistem pendukung keputusan penentuan karyawan kontrak menjadi karyawan tetap menggunakan metode topsis. *Jurnal Ilmiah Teknologi Infomasi Terapan*, *1*(2).

Mangkunegara, A. A. P. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Muhammad, N. (2009). Pendekatan Statistika Modern Untuk Ilmu Sosial. *Jakarta: Salembe Humanika*.

Nazir, M. (2011). *Metode Penelitian*. Ghalia Indonesia.

Ngalim, P. (2007). Ilmu pendidikan teoritis dan praktis. *PT Remaja Rosdakarya, Bandung*.

Omtinah, O. (2013). *Pengaruh Penghargaan (Reward) terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Muslim BNI Syari'ah Cabang Semarang* [PhD Thesis]. IAIN Walisongo.

Rivai, V., & Bacthiar, R. A. (2013). *Pemimpin dan Kepemimpinan dalam Organisasi*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Sadulloh, U. (2010). Pedagogik (ilmu mendidik). *Bandung: Alfabeta*.

Subri, M. (2003). *Ekonomi Sumber Daya Manusia*. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Dan R&D*. CV Alfabeta.

Sujarweni, V. W. (2015). *Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis & Ekonomi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka baru press.

Sutrisno, S., Fathoni, A., & Minarsih, M. M. (2016). Pengaruh Motivasi Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Di Kantor Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja Kota Semarang. *Journal of Management*, *2*(2), Article 2.

Tampi, B. J. (2014). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan dan Motivasi terrhadap Kinerja karyawan pada PT. Bank Negara Indonesia, tbk (regional sales manado). *Acta Diurna Komunikasi*, *3*(4).

Trang, D. S. (2013). Gaya kepemimpinan dan budaya organisasi pengaruhnya terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, *1*(3).

Widodo, D. (2017). Metodologi Penelitian Populer & Praktis. *Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada*.

Copyrights