

The Influence of Democratic Leadership and Individual Characteristics on Employee Productivity

Maria Meydita

University of Jember
Ditaathalla67@gmail.com

Zarah Puspitaningtyas

University of Jember
zarah@unej.ac.id

Anastasia Murdiastuti

University of Jember
a_murdyastuti@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of the applied democratic leadership style and individual characteristics of employees on the workplace productivity of civil servants in the Department of Educational Affairs in Probolinggo Regency. This study employed quantitative approach and involved a total population of 105 people. From the existing population, the researchers used purposive sampling to recruit those who have the status of civil servants, resulting in 51 people recruited for the study. Data were collected through a questionnaire given to respondents. The method of analysis used was multiple linear regression using SPSS 20.0. The independent variables under analysis are democratic leadership style and individual characteristics, while the dependent variable is workplace productivity. The results of the study show that the democratic leadership style is marked with a value of $t \text{ value } 3.03 > t \text{ table } 1.677$. This finding demonstrates that leadership style has an influence on workplace productivity, while the individual characteristics is found to have $t \text{ count } 0.507 < t \text{ table } 1.677$, which evinces that individual characteristics have no effect on employee productivity.

Keywords: Workplace productivity, Leadership, Individual Characteristics

I. INTRODUCTION

Organization is a consciously coordinated social unit, with an identifiable boundary, working continuously to achieve common goals (Robbins, 2010) [1]. Organizations can be divided into two, namely public organizations and business organizations. Public organizations are required to provide quality services needed by society. Public organizations will never be separated from the role of human resources. These human resources regulation refers to the concept of human resource management. Human resource management is a process of utilizing human resources effectively and efficiently through planning, mobilizing and controlling all values that become human strength to achieve goals (Sedarmayanti, 2016: 11) [2]. Management purposes will be

achieved when organization productivity is measured on regular basis, because the productivity measurement can be used to assess the success or failure in implementing activities in accordance with a set of pre-determined goals and objectives in order to realize the organization's vision and mission. An organization cannot be separated from the individuals who are involved in its day-to-day operations. Human resource management is an interesting global issue to study, because humans play an active role in these operational activities as they plan, carry out and determine where the organization will be taken. The organization's goals will be achieved if there is an active role of employees in it. Although an organization has a sophisticated technology, if not offset by active human resources, the whole undertaking will be pointless. Workplace productivity is an indicator measuring the success rate of employees in carrying out their duties. An employee is considered productive if he has the mental attitude to always make improvements as well as innovations, and stimulate and encourage himself so that he is not quickly satisfied with what he has achieved. It is the duty of employees to always develop themselves and improve occupational abilities. According to Simamora (2014: 612) [3], the indicators that can be used to measure productivity include quantity of work, quality of work and timeliness. First, the quantity of work is a result achieved by employees manifested in a certain number against the existing standard as comparison. Second, quality of work is outcome standards related to the quality of products produced. Lastly, timeliness is the extent to which an activity is completed in the specified time.

The spearhead of an organization is in the hands of the leader. Leadership is a series of structuring activities in the form of the ability to influence the behavior of others in certain situations so that they are willing to work together to achieve the stated goals (Sutarto in Rohaeni, 2016) [4]. The existence of a leader in the organization is extremely important, because the leader is the one who moves, regulates and directs the organization to achieve its goals.

Successful organizations have a main characteristic that distinguishes them from unsuccessful organizations, namely dynamic and effective leadership. In an effort to increase organizational success, the choice of leadership model (autocratic, democratic, and free rein leader) is a key process for the effectiveness of a leader. The correct choice of a leadership model is the one that properly connects with the external motivation and can lead to the achievement of both individual and organizational goals. If the selected figure is not appropriate, organizational goals will be disturbed, causing worries, aggressiveness and dissatisfaction of staffs (Hicks and Gullet 1987: 493) [5].

Leadership is the ability to influence a group toward the goal "(Robbins in Andrew et al, 2014: 2) [6]. So, leadership is an initiative in directing and influencing a group of people (subordinates) to achieve certain goals.

One of the factors that will influence the behavior of employees is their characteristics. Any attempt to study why people behave the way they do in organizations requires an understanding of individual differences [7]. Individual characteristics can be measured by attitudes, interests, and needs. Individuals carry

values that are formed by the environment they live in, and these values are later carried out in work situations [8].

The phenomenon that occurs in The Department of Educational Affairs is that many jobs are not completed on time. The preliminary findings of the study indicate that this is influenced by delay in the proposed promotion of functional ranks of teachers as of April 2016. Approximately, 1,023 teachers' promotions had to be delayed until the October 2017 because up until the deadline the department was not able to complete the procedure. The delays in the management of this promotion resulted in employees losing time in carrying out their work. What is more, there were still many incomplete documents after being submitted and checked by the teams in the department, resulting in another delay in evaluating promotion proposals. The promotion was processed by 6 (six) members of the secretariat team with different individual characteristics. Those who partook in this secretariat team were civil servants required to satisfy their Employee Performance Targets (SKP) at the beginning of each year. This benchmark contains performance targets, and at the end of the year they have to take responsibility of their performance. The same thing also happened to proposals for regular salary raise, where each level of education was handled by a different person. Ironically, there was also delay in its practice.

Based on the background of the problems above, the present study delved into whether the democratic leadership style and individual characteristics affect the workplace productivity of employees at the Departments of Educational Affairs of Probolinggo.

II. METHODS

A. Type of Research

The researchers used an explanatory quantitative approach. The quantitative approach can be interpreted as a research method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to carry out research on certain populations or samples. The research data were collected using research instruments, the results of which were analyzed by statistical data analysis with the aim of testing predetermined hypotheses (Sugiyono, 2018: 15) [10].

B. Population and Sample

The population in this study was all 105 employees at the Departments of Educational Affairs of Probolinggo. The samples were determined using purposive sampling technique, which led to recruiting 51 people as the subjects.

C. Data Sources and Types

According to Arikunto, 2010: 172 [11] data sources are the subjects from which data can be obtained through data sources, as follows:

1. People, namely the source of data obtained from filling out a questionnaire by the respondents.
2. Place, namely the source of data obtained from the research site itself.

3. Paper, namely the source of data in the form of letters, numbers, pictures, or other symbols.

In this study, researchers used the following types of data:

1. Primary data refers to data that is directly collected by researchers from the field, namely data taken from respondents. This data is the answer to the questionnaire distributed to the respondents.
2. Secondary data is data that does not come from its first source.

D. Data Analysis Techniques

The present study employed multiple linear regression analysis to investigate the relationship between two independent variables and one dependent variable, namely the leadership style (X1) and the individual characteristics (X2) on the workplace productivity of Civil Servants (Y) with the following regression equation:

$$Y = a + b_1.X_1 + b_2.X_2 + e$$

Information:

Y = dependent variable (civil servant workplace productivity)

X1 = the first independent variable (leadership style)

X2 = second independent variable (individual characteristics)

a = constant if the value X = 0

b1, b2 = the value of the regression coefficient, which shows the number of increases or decreases in the dependent variable based on changes in the independent variable.

E = residual

Source: Siregar, 2017: 301 [12].

E. Operational Definition of Variables

The operational definitions of variables in this study are formulated as follows:

Table 1. Variables of democratic leadership style

Variable	Indicators	Items
Democratic leadership style (X1)	1. Decision Making Process	1. Getting involved in making and taking decisions 2. Carrying out joint activities for the achievement of an organizational goal.
	2. Appreciating the potential of subordinates	1. Appreciating every potential subordinate 2. Giving awards to subordinates who excel.
	3. Listening to criticism, suggestions, and opinions from subordinates	1. Hearing criticism from subordinates 2. Hearing suggestions from subordinates 3. Hearing opinions from subordinates
	4. Cooperating with subordinates	1. Being able to work with subordinates in achieving organizational goals 2. Leaders go directly to the field to carry out their duties and control subordinates

Table 2. Variables of Individual Characteristic

Variable	Indicators	Items
Individual Characteristics (X2)	1. Gender	1. Male's workplace productivity is higher than women. 2. Female's workplace productivity is higher than male
	2. Age	1. The pioneer age has high workplace productivity. 2. The age of early withdrawal / acceptance has low productivity
	3. Working Period	1. Employees who have a service period of more than 10 years have higher workplace productivity. 2. Employees who have a service period of less than 10 years have lower workplace productivity.
	4. Education Level	1. Staffs with a bachelor's degree produce higher workplace productivity. 2. Employees with non-graduate education produce lower workplace productivity.
	5. Family dependents	1. Employees who have many family dependents produce higher workplace productivity 2. Employees who do not have many family dependents produce lower workplace productivity.

Table 3. Variables of Workplace productivity

Variable	Indicators	Items
Employee productivity (Y)	1. Work Quality	1. In carrying out my assignments, I am oriented to do my best. 2. I prioritize thoroughness and precision in my work.
	2. Work quantity	1. The results of the work that I have done are in accordance with the predetermined plan. 2. The results of the work that I have done are in accordance with the programmed development.
	3. Time punctuality	1. I am always fast in carrying out work according to a predetermined schedule. 2. I maximize the time available for other activities

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis is used to see the level of influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable, while what the authors will see is the effect of organizational restructuring and leadership style on performance variables. Based on the results of the SPSS Statistics 20.0 test, the following data were obtained:

Table 4. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Test

Variables	B	t _{value}	t _{table}	Sig.
Constant	13,16	2,929	1,677	0,005
Democratic leadership style (X1)	0,287	3,03	1,677	0,004
Individual Characteristics (X2)	0,04	0,507	1,677	0,614
	R	=	0,416	
	R2	=	0,173	
Variable	B	t _{value}	t _{table}	Sig.
	Error Standard	=	1,776	
	F count	=	5,014	
	Fsig.	=	0,011	
	N	=	51	

From the results of table 4, a multiple linear regression equation can be made as the following:

$$Y = 13.160 + 0.287 X1 + 0.040 X2 + e$$

From the above equation, several things can be analyzed such as:

- Employee workplace productivity (Y), without a democratic leadership style and individual characteristics (X1, and X2 = 0), then employee productivity is only worth 13.160. By contrast, if each respondent increases 1 point for the answer to democratic leadership style and individual characteristics (X1 and X2 = 51), it can be estimated that the performance level will increase to:

$$Y = 13.160 + 0.287 X1 + 0.040 X2$$

$$Y = 13.160 + 0.287 (51) + 0.040 (51)$$

$$Y = 13,160 + 14,637 + 2,040$$

$$Y = 29,837$$
- Multiple linear regression coefficients of (0.287) and (0.040) indicate the increase in the level of employee productivity (Y) for each increase in respondents' answers regarding democratic leadership style (X1) and individual characteristics (X2).
- The multiple linear regression equation $Y = 13,160 + 0.287 X1 + 0.040 X2 + e$ is used as the basis for estimating the level of employee productivity which is influenced by democratic leadership style (X1) and individual characteristics (X2) whether it is valid to be tested and used.

B. Discussion

1. *The Effect of Democratic Leadership Style on Employee productivity*

In the partial test (t test) between democratic leadership style (X1) on employee productivity (Y), the significance value is obtained = 0.004. Due to t value < 0.05 , H_0 is rejected. This value indicates a strong positive relationship between (X1) and (Y). The strong and positive intention here presumes that there is a unidirectional relationship between the variables of democratic leadership style and productivity, meaning that if the value of the democratic leadership style increases, the level of employee productivity will increase significantly. There are 4 (four) indicators used in measuring the democratic leadership style, namely the decision-making process, respecting subordinates' potentials, hearing criticism, suggestions and opinions from subordinates, and collaborating with subordinates.

The most influential factor driving employee productivity is appreciating the potential of subordinates, as marked with a total value of 43.04%. If a leader is not able to appreciate every potential that employees have, it is possible that they too will do the same. The resulting outcome will certainly decrease the leader's credibility in the eyes of his employees.

The second most influential indicator is hearing criticism of suggestions and opinions from subordinates, with a total value of 37.97%. Respondents agreed that a good leader must also be able to listen to the opinions or input of employees, so that a problem that occurs in the organization can be resolved properly. In addition, the leader will become a role model for their subordinates.

The next influencing indicator is the decision making process, marked with a total value of 34.18%. Respondents agree that if the decision-making process is carried out together, it will be considered more effective. Employee involvement in decision making will greatly help leaders to sort and consider a decision. Although in the end it is the leader who makes a decision, but before the decision is taken, the employees will first provide ideas to help achieve organizational goals.

The last influencing indicator is cooperating with subordinates, as marked with a total value of 31.65%. To build a good team, a leader must be able to work together with all staff members. To that end, all the energies from both employees and leaders are not wasted in a conflict, but rather will be utilized effectively and efficiently to carry out their respective duties and jobs. If a leader is oriented towards cooperation with employees, then the division of tasks assigned to employees can be carried out well in order to achieve organizational goals.

The results of this study support previous research conducted by Gunawan Laliasa, et al (2018) who partially state that democratic leadership style affects employee workplace productivity [13].

2. *The Influence of Individual Characteristics on Employee Workplace productivity*

In partial hypothesis test (t test) between individual characteristic variables (X2) on employee workplace productivity (Y), a significance value of 0.614 is obtained. The

significance value of $t > 0.05$ then H_0 is accepted, which means that there is no influence of the variable (X2) on the variable Y. This value shows a negative relationship between (X2) and (Y). The negative point here is that there is an opposite relationship between individual characteristics and employee productivity, meaning that if the value of individual characteristics increases, the level of employee productivity should increase significantly. However, the results of data processing show the opposite results. There are 5 (five) indicators used in measuring individual characteristics, including gender, age, years of service, level of education, and family dependents.

The most influential factor affecting employee productivity is age, marked with a total value of 43.04%. Relatively young employees have high productivity compared to older employees because younger employees have more energy, both physically and mentally.

Furthermore, the second influencing indicator is tenure with a total value of 40.51%. Employees who have a service period of more than 10 years are considered to have the best work experience and ability compared to employees who have worked under 10 years. Although it is possible that employees who have shorter tenure will also have better abilities, as long as they are willing to work hard.

The next most influential indicator is the level of education with a total value of 34.18%. Employees who study up to bachelor's degree will produce high workplace productivity. This is because employees who study up to undergraduate level have different abilities and mindsets compared to employees who have graduated from ordinary high schools. The next most influential indicator is gender with a total value of 32.91%. Respondents agree that women's productivity is better than men's. This is due to several factors, including because women usually need time to think long enough to complete their work. They tend to be conscientious and do not want to repeat the slightest mistake in order to get maximum results. Furthermore, the indicator of family dependent is marked with a total value of 26.58%. Respondents agree that employees who have more family dependents will result in higher workplace productivity. If an employee is able to work well, it is possible for them to get a promotion or reward from a leader. This will affect the income they get, to meet all the needs of family members for more prosperity.

This study is in harmony with the results of previous research conducted by Fajar Pasaribu (2018) concerning employee influence on workplace productivity. Age (X1), gender (X2), marital status (X3), and tenure (X4) are found to have a significant effect on employee productivity. This study shows that people who have no effect on employee productivity. This is supported by the results of Employee Performance Targets (SKP) at the Department of Educational Affairs of Probolinggo.

IV. CONCLUSION

In reference to the findings, the present study has drawn several conclusions. Democratic leadership style affects employee performance. Employees will feel encouraged when leaders always carry out joint activities for achieving an

organizational goal. It is also important that the head of a department always exposes every activity, both for recipients of educational services and for those that focus on a policy. Those initiatives are presumed to encourage the civil servants and make them feel involved in achieving the goals of the organization as a whole for better productivity. Furthermore, individual characteristics do not affect employee productivity. This shows that gender, age, years of service, level of education, and family dependents are not the most dominant factors in influencing employee productivity. In carrying out their duties, civil servants already have a work plan in which there are targets and realizations that must be achieved. The work plan is measured against the existing benchmarks. Also, every civil servant at the beginning of each year must formulate a Main Performance Indicator which is intended to control their productivity within a particular field and maintain Individual Performance Indicators. With these frameworks, every employee must have good productivity so that the target of Main Work Indicators and Individual Work Indicators can be achieved.

For increasing employee productivity, The Department of Educational Affairs is suggested to motivate employee productivity, for example by giving awards to employees and teams whose individual performance indicators and main performance indicators are in par with specified targets. Likewise, the head of department must maintain a democratic leadership so that every activity and policy can be implemented responsibly by all parties.

REFERENCES

Books:

- Arikunto. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta.
- Robbins. (2010). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Rohaeni Heni. (2016). *Model Gaya Kepemimpinan Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai*.
- Sedarmayanti. (2016) *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Reformasi Birokrasi dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil Edisi Revisi*. Bandung : Refika Aditama
- Simamora, Henry. (2014). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Bagian Penerbitan Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi YKPN.
- Siregar. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta : Kencana
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung : Alfabeta

Journals:

- Ardika Sulaeman. (2014). Pengaruh Upah dan Pengalaman Kerja terhadap Produktivitas, Karyawan Kerajinan Ukiran Kabupaten Subang. *Trikonomika* Volume 13, No 1 Hal 91-100 ISSN 1411-514X.
- Ariani, Novi. (2015). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Demokratis terhadap Disiplin Kerja Karyawan Pada PT.PP London Sumatera Indonesia, Tbk. Wilayah Bulukumba. *Jurnal Administrasi Perkantora FIS UNM*

- Damuri, Swasono, Musafik. (Juni.2017) Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Karakteristik Individu Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Yayasan Nurul Hayat Kediri. *Jurnal Revitalisasi*, Vol. 06, Nomor 02, pp. (15), Juni
- Fajar Pasaribu. (Maret 2018). Pengaruh Karakteristik Pegawai Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja. *Prosiding Konferensi Nasional Ke- 7, Asosiasi Program Pascasarjana Perguruan Tinggi Muhammadiyah Aisyiyah (APPPTMA)*, pp. 231-242, Jakarta, 23-25
- Gunawan Laliasa, Muh. Nur. Rince Tambanan. (January 2018). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Demokratis, Lingkungan Kerja, dan Motivasi Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dinas Perkebunan dan Holtikultura Provinsi Sulawesi Tenggara. *Sigma: Journal of Economic and Business* Vol. 1 (1), pp. 83
- Inaray, Jelita Caroline, dkk. (2016). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Amanah Finance di Manado. *Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisiensi* Volume 16 Nomor 02.
- Moses, Astuti, Hakam. (Juli 2014). Pengaruh Karakteristik Individu Dan Karakteristik Pekerjaan Terhadap Prestasi Kerja Karyawan (studi pada karyawan PT. Inti Bara Mandiri Tuban). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB)*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 2,
- Puspawati, Ani Agus. (2016). Penerapan New Publik Managemen (NPM) di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Publik PUBLISA*, vol 2 no.1
- Sunar. (2012) Pengaruh Faktor Biografis (usia, masa kerja dan gender) terhadap Produktivitas Karyawan (Studi Kasus Bank X), *Forum Ilmiah* Volume 9, No.1.
- Sulastiningsih, Enderwati dan Winoto. (2014). Analisis Pengaruh Karakteristik Individu dan Lingkungan Kerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil di Dinas Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan kab. Purworejo. *Jurnal Kajian Bisnis* VI. 22 No. 1, p. 69-78