

The Effect of Democratic Leadership and Individual Characteristics on Employee Work Productivity

Maria Meydita

*Faculty of Social and Political Science
University of Jember, Jember, East Java, Indonesia*

Zarah Puspitaningtyas

*Faculty of Social and Political Science
University of Jember, Jember, East Java, Indonesia*

Anastasia Murdiastuti

*Faculty of Social and Political Science
University of Jember, Jember, East Java, Indonesia*

Abstract- This study aims to analyze the effect of democratic leadership and individual characteristics on the work productivity of Civil Servants in the Departments of Education of Probolinggo. This study was conducted with a quantitative approach with 105 total population, then the sample was selected by purposive sampling technique and obtained respondents totaled 51 people. Data were collected through a questionnaire given to respondents. The collected data were then analyzed using multiple linear regression. The results of the study indicate that democratic leadership affects employee work productivity, while individual characteristics do not affect employee work productivity.

Keywords – Work 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 measuring the productivity of an organization, because the productivity measurement can be used to assess the success or failure of implementing activities in accordance with the goals and objectives that have been set in order to realize the organization's vision and mission. An organization cannot be separated from the individuals within it who are involved in day-to-day operations. Human resource management is an interesting global issue to study, because humans play an active role in these operational activities. Humans who 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 the organization has a sophisticated technology, if not offset by an active human resources, then there would be no point. Work 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, innovations, always stimulates and encourages 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 work abilities. According to Simamora (2014: 612) [3] indicators that can be used to measure productivity include quantity of work, quality of work and timeliness: 1) The quantity of work is a result achieved by employees in a certain number with the existing standard comparison; 2) Quality of work is an outcome standards related to the quality of products produced; and 3) Timeliness is the level of activity 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 connects properly with the external motivation, and can lead to the achievement of goals both individual and organization. If the selected model 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 application 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, these values are later carried out in work situations [8].

The phenomenon that occurs in the Education Office 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 for the period of April 2016, as many as 1,023 teachers who had to be delayed until the October 2017 period, because up until the deadline, the Probolinggo District Education Office could not complete it. The occurrence of delays in the management of this promotion resulted in employees losing time in carrying out their work, and not only that, there were still many documents that were insufficient or incomplete after being submitted and checked by the Education Office team, so that there was another delay in proposing promotions. The promotion is entried by 6 (six) members of the secretariat team who have different individual characteristics, and those who become this secretariat team are civil servants who have Employee Performance Targets (SKP) which must be made at the beginning of each year which contains performance targets and at the end of the year they had to take responsibility of their performance. The same thing also happened to proposals for regular salary increases where each level of education was handled by a different person, but in reality there was also a delay.

Based on the background of the problems above, it is clear that the problem in this study is whether the democratic leadership style and individual characteristics affect the work productivity of employees at the Departments of Educations of Probolinggo.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

2.1 Type of Research

Researchers use an explanatory type of research with a quantitative approach. The quantitative approach can be interpreted as a research method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to research on certain populations or samples, data collection using research instruments, quantitative / statistical data analysis with the aim of testing predetermined hypotheses (Sugiyono, 2018: 15) [10].

2.2 Population and Sample

The population in this study were all 105 employees at the Probolinggo District Education Office. The samples were determined using purposive sampling technique so that the respondents obtained were 51 people.

2.3 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 respondent.
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, is 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.

2.4 Data Analysis Techniques

Research using multiple linear regression analysis which analyzes the relationship between two independent variables and one dependent variable, namely the leadership style variable (X1) and the individual characteristics variable (X2) on the work productivity variable 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 work 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].

2.4 Operational Definition of Variables

The operational definitions of variables in this study are:

Table 1. Variables of democratic leadership style

Variable	Indicator	Item
Democratic leadership style (X1)	1. Decision Making Process	1. Get involved in making and taking decisions 2. Carry out joint activities for the achievement of an organizational goal.
	2. Appreciate the potential of his subordinates	1. Appreciate every potential subordinate 2. Give awards to subordinates who excel.
	3. Listen 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	Indicator	Item
Individual	1. Gender	1. Men work productivity is higher than women. 2. Female work productivity is higher than men
	2. Age	1. The pioneer age has high work 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

Characteristics (X ₂)		years have higher work productivity. 2. Employees who have a service period of less than 10 2. years have lower work productivity.
	4. Education Level	1. Staff with a bachelor's degree produce higher work productivity. 2. Employees with non-graduate education produce lower work productivity.
	5. Family dependants	1. Employees who have many family dependants produce higher work productivity 2. Employees who do not have many family dependants produce lower work productivity.

Table 3. Variables of Work Productivity

Variable	Indicator	Item
Employee productivity (Y)	1. Work Quality	1. In carrying out my assignments, I am oriented to do the 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 accuracy	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

3.1 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 variables 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 Calculations

Variable	B	t _{count}	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 (X ₂)	0,04	0,507	1,677	0,614
	R	=	0,416	
	R ²	=	0,173	
Variable	B	t _{count}	t _{table}	Sig.
	Error Standart	=	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 below:

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

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

- a. Employee work productivity (Y), without a democratic leadership style and individual characteristics (X1, and X2 = 0), then employee work productivity is only worth 13.160, whereas 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:

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

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

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

$$Y = 29,837$$

- b. 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 to the variable democratic leadership style (X1) and individual characteristics (X2).
- c. 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.

3.2 Discussion

The Effect of Democratic Leadership Style on Employee Work Productivity

In the partial test (t test) between the variable democratic leadership style (X1) on employee work productivity (Y), the significance value is obtained = 0.004. This value indicates a strong positive relationship between (X1) and (Y). The strong and positive intention here is that there is a unidirectional relationship between organizational restructuring variables and performance, meaning that if the values of democratic leadership increase, the level of employee work productivity will increase significantly. There are 4 (four) indicators used in measuring the democratic leadership style, namely the decision-making process, respecting the potential of subordinates, hearing criticism, suggestions, and opinions from subordinates, and cooperating with subordinates.

The order of the indicators that most influence on employee productivity is the indicator of appreciating the potential of his subordinates 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 result 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 and become a role model for their subordinates.

The next influencing indicator is the decision making process 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 decides 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 his subordinates with a total value of 31.65%. To build a good team, a leader must be able to work together with all staff members. So that all the energy from both employees or leaders is not wasted in a conflict, but 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) which states partially that democratic leadership style affects employee work productivity [13].

The Influence of Individual Characteristics on Employee Work Productivity

In a partial test (t test) between individual characteristic variables (X2) on employee work productivity (Y), a significance value of 0.614 was obtained. This value indicates a negative relationship between (X2) and (Y). The negative point here is that there is an opposite relationship between individual characteristics variables and employee work productivity, meaning that if the value of individual characteristics increases, the level of employee work productivity should increase significantly, but the results of data processing show the opposite results. There are 5 (five) indicators used in measuring individual characteristics, namely gender, age, years of service, education level, and family dependents.

The order of the indicators that get the highest score on employee work productivity is age with a total value of 43.04%. Relatively young employees have high work productivity compared to older employees, this is because employees who are younger have more energy, both physically and in mind.

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 less tenure will also have better abilities, as long as they are willing to try and 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 work 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 work 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 dependents with a total value of 26.58%. Respondents agree that employees who have more family dependents will result in higher work 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 to be more prosperous.

The results of previous research conducted by Fajar Pasaribu (2018) with the influence of employee influence on work productivity. Age as a variable (X1), gender variable (X2), marital status variable (X3), and tenure variable (X4), all of these variables have a significant effect on employee work productivity. In this study shows that people who have no effect on employee work productivity, this is supported by the results of Employee Performance Targets (SKP) at the Office of the Departments of Educations of Probolinggo.

IV. CONCLUSION

The conclusions in this study are as follows: Democratic leadership style affects employee performance. Employees feel encouraged, this is indicated by the assumption that leaders always carry out joint activities for the achievement of an organizational goal, the head of the department always exposes every activity, both general in nature for recipients of education services or those that focus on a policy. From this, civil servants in the Education Office feel involved and take part in achieving organizational goals as a whole so that productivity is better. Furthermore, individual characteristics have no effect on employee performance. This shows that gender, age, years of service, level of education, and family dependents are not the most dominant factors in influencing employee work productivity. In carrying out its duties civil servant already has a work plan in which there are targets and realizations that must be achieved. The work plans (renja) is measurable with existing resources. And every civil servant at the beginning of each year must make Main Performance Indicators which are intended to control the productivity of a field and make Individual Performance Indicators which are of course to control the productivity of that individual. So that every employee is required to have good productivity so that the Main Performance Indicators and Individual Performance Indicators targets can be achieved.

REFERENCES

- [1] Robbins, "Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia", Alfabeta, Bandung, 2010.
- [2] Sedarmayanti, "Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Reformasi Birokrasi dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil Edisi Revisi", Refika Aditama, Bandung, 2016.
- [3] Simamora, Henry, "Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia", Bagian Penerbitan Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi YKPN, Yogyakarta, 2014.
- [4] Rohaeni Heni, "Model Gaya Kepemimpinan Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai", 2016.
- [5] Hicks, Herbert. G dan Gullet G. Roy, "Organisasi Teori dan Tingka Laku", Bina Aksara, Jakarta, 1987.
- [6] Andreas, Lak, "Dekonstruksi CSR dan Reformasi Paradigma Bisnis dan Akuntansi", Erlangga, Jakarta, 2014.
- [7] Damuri, Suwasono, Musafik, "Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Karakteristik Individu Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Yayasan Nurul Hayat Kediri", Jurnal Revitalisasi, Vol. 06, Nomor 02, pp. 15, Juni 2017
- [8] Moses, Astuti, Hakam, "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, Juli 2014.
- [9] Badan Kepegawaian Daerah Kabupaten Probolinggo, "Laporan Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah", 2018.
- [10] Sugiyono, "Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif", Alfabeta, Bandung, 2018.
- [11] Arikunto, "Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek", Rineka Cipta, Jakarta, 2010.
- [12] Siregar, "Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif", Kencana, Jakarta, 2017.
- [13] Gunawan Laliasa, Muh. Nur. Rince Tambanan, "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, January 2018.
- [14] Fajar Pasaribu, "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 Maret 2018.