



## **The Influence of Leadership Style and Personality Type on Employee Work Productivity**

**Yuan Badrianto<sup>1</sup>, Apri Andriyani<sup>2</sup>, Felina C. Young**

<sup>1,2</sup>Universitas Pelita Bangsa

<sup>3</sup>Philippine Women's University

Corresponding author: Yuan Badrianto

\*Email : yuan.badrianto@pelitabangsa.ac.id

Submit : 28 May 2024

Review : 20 June 2024

Accept : 19 Agustus 2024

Publish : 28 Agustus 2024

### **Abstract**

This study aims to determine the effect of leadership style and personality type on employee productivity. To increase productivity, of course, a leader is needed who can have a positive influence on his employees, so that they can carry out their duties with the expected results and achieve the goals that have been determined. Apart from leadership, another thing that can increase productivity is personality type. This research uses quantitative methods. The data collection method used in this study includes data derived from distributed questionnaires. The sampling technique distributed is a probability sampling technique by means of saturated sampling, so that the number of samples is the same as the total population of 51 respondents. The results of the study indicate that the leadership style partially affects the work productivity of employees. Personality type partially influences employee work productivity, Leadership Style and Personality Type simultaneously affect employee work productivity.

**Keywords:** Leadership Style, Personality Type, and Work Productivity

### **Introduction**

The rapid evolution of the business landscape compels companies to continuously expand their operational scope to maintain competitiveness. This expansion is driven by the need to enhance the company's competitive edge in an increasingly challenging environment. In light of the fierce competition, strategic planning and effective management become crucial, particularly in the area of Human Resource Management (HRM), which serves as a critical and foundational asset within the organization. Human resources play a pivotal role in determining the success or failure of a company in realizing its established vision and mission. Heryati (2019) emphasized that among all resources, human capital is the most valuable asset, contributing significantly to organizational success.

A company's growing success can be gauged by the improvement in employee productivity, which is essentially the desire and effort to enhance the quality of life and livelihood across various domains. Productivity, in a workplace context, is defined as the ratio between the results achieved and the resources utilized, reflecting effective and



efficient resource management. One key factor in boosting productivity is the presence of leadership capable of influencing and actively engaging employees, as leadership is the backbone of any organization. Regardless of how well-structured an organization is, the presence and role of a leader remain essential in aligning the diverse interests within the company. The leader's role is to harmonize the objectives of various stakeholders, ensuring the organization is guided toward its goals. Effective leadership significantly impacts employee productivity, as external factors that influence work performance often originate from the leader's ability to guide the team. The relationship between leaders and employees is inherently imbalanced, with subordinates relying on leadership direction. However, there are instances where leaders may issue directives that deviate from established procedures, necessitating positive feedback and responses from employees to correct or highlight these discrepancies.

In the professional environment, employees are expected to interact based on the specific nature of their work, involving communication with colleagues, supervisors, and clients. Differences in personality often lead to miscommunication, which can hinder performance. It is within these interactions that personality traits become apparent, directly or indirectly influencing how employees approach challenges and handle assigned tasks. As noted by George R. Terry (1960), achieving organizational goals requires understanding the emotional tendencies and backgrounds of employees, ensuring that their personalities align with the demands of their roles. Horton (in Sri Sundari, 2016) defines personality as a combination of one's traits, feelings, expressions, and temperament, which manifest in attitudes and behaviors when faced with specific situations. Extroverted personalities, for instance, are characterized by a preference for challenges, openness, sociability, and optimism. Conversely, introverted individuals may prefer routine tasks and tend to be conventional in their approach.

Employees with diverse personality types, whether introverted or extroverted, are expected to receive instructions from superiors effectively, enabling them to execute tasks and solve problems with innovative solutions that drive productivity. However, many companies still overlook personality assessments during the hiring process, which could help determine whether candidates are suited to specific roles or can adapt to their environment. Neglecting this aspect can lead to reduced productivity. It is therefore crucial for personnel managers to align employees with positions that match their personality traits, optimizing productivity and overall performance.

Personality, as described by Scafer and Lamm (in Sundari, 1998), encompasses the consistent pattern of attitudes, needs, traits, and behaviors that define how individuals respond to different situations. Given the varying approaches that different personality types take in problem-solving, studies, such as those by Heru Sriyono (2019) and Purnamie Titisari (2017), confirm a significant correlation between personality type and productivity. These findings suggest that productivity is influenced by how leaders communicate decisions and how employees interpret and respond to those decisions.

Indonesia's large population holds the potential to drive development, provided that quality and productivity are prioritized. According to the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), as of February 2018, the labor force stood at 133.94 million people, with an increase in the Labor Force Participation Rate (TPAK) to 69.20 percent. Despite these improvements, the challenges related to employment scarcity persist, particularly for high-skilled jobs. BPS data from August 2019 highlights that 7.05 million Indonesians



were unemployed, with the majority being vocational school and high school graduates. This situation underscores the importance of addressing workforce competency and productivity issues.

Data from the Asian Productivity Organization (APO) in the 2020 Productivity Databook shows that Indonesia's labor productivity lags behind other ASEAN countries. With an average productivity per worker of \$23,900, Indonesia ranks significantly below Singapore (\$149,100) and Malaysia (\$55,400). Enhancing productivity is therefore imperative, as highlighted by comparisons showing Indonesia's index below Thailand and Vietnam.

In light of these challenges, this study focuses on PT Seoul Precision Metal Indonesia, an automotive company in the Jababeka Industrial Estate. Given the current suboptimal productivity levels amid increasing competition, this research aims to investigate whether leadership delivery and employee acceptance, influenced by personality traits, play a role in shaping productivity outcomes.

PT Seoul Precision Metal Indonesia, as a key player in the automotive industry within the Jababeka Industrial Estate, faces unique challenges in maintaining and improving productivity levels. The company operates in a highly competitive market where efficiency and innovation are paramount. Given the complex interplay between leadership styles, employee personalities, and productivity outcomes, there is a pressing need to examine how these factors specifically impact PT Seoul Precision Metal Indonesia's performance. This investigation is particularly crucial as the company strives to enhance its position in the global automotive supply chain and contribute to Indonesia's overall industrial productivity.

The significance of this study extends beyond the confines of a single company. By delving into the dynamics of leadership delivery, employee acceptance, and the influence of personality traits on productivity, this research aims to provide insights that could be valuable across Indonesia's manufacturing sector. As the country seeks to boost its industrial competitiveness and move up the value chain, understanding these micro-level interactions within companies like PT Seoul Precision Metal Indonesia can inform broader policy decisions and management strategies. This study, therefore, not only addresses a specific company's challenges but also contributes to the larger discourse on improving Indonesia's labor productivity and industrial competitiveness in the ASEAN region and beyond.

## **Method**

The research employs a causal associative design with a quantitative approach to analyze the influence of leadership style and personality type on employee productivity at PT Seoul Precision Metal Indonesia. The study's population comprises all 51 employees, and a saturated sampling technique is used, meaning the entire population is included as the sample. Data is collected through multiple methods: observation, structured interviews, literature review, internet research, and questionnaires. The primary data collection instrument is a structured questionnaire divided into sections assessing leadership style, personality type, and productivity levels. The leadership style is measured based on dimensions such as transformational and transactional styles, while personality type is evaluated using the Big Five Personality Traits model. The data analysis involves several stages. First, validity and reliability tests are conducted to ensure the accuracy and



consistency of the questionnaire items. The Pearson correlation method is applied for validity testing, and Cronbach’s Alpha is used to assess reliability, with a value above 0.70 considered acceptable. Descriptive statistics provide an overview of respondent demographics and variable summaries, while inferential statistics, including multiple linear regression, t-tests, and F-tests, are utilized to evaluate the relationships between variables. The regression model also includes the coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) to measure the impact of leadership style and personality type on productivity. Hypotheses are tested at a significance level of 0.05. The research adheres to ethical standards by ensuring informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary participation of respondents. While acknowledging limitations such as the small sample size and potential self-reporting bias, the study offers valuable insights into how leadership and personality traits influence employee productivity, providing both academic contributions and practical recommendations for enhancing organizational performance.

## Results and Discussion

### Profil Respond

Table 1. Individual Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics Responden	Person	Propose
Male	14	27,5%
Female	37	72,5%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100%</b>
18-25 years old	31	60,8%
26-35 Years	18	35,3%
36-45 Years	2	3,9%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100%</b>
High school	37	72,5%
D3	4	7,8%
S1	10	19,6%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100%</b>
Working period < 1 Year	9	17,6%
1-2 Years	20	39,2%
3-5 Years	11	21,6%
>5 Years	11	21,6%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Google Form Kuesioner (2024)

Table 3 presents the individual characteristics of the respondents in the study. It reveals that the majority of the respondents were female, constituting 72.5% of the total sample, while male respondents accounted for only 27.5%. Regarding age distribution, a significant portion (60.8%) of the respondents were between 18 and 25 years old, followed by 35.3% aged between 26 and 35 years, and only 3.9% were in the 36-45 age range. In terms of educational background, most respondents (72.5%) had attained a high



school education, while 19.6% held a bachelor's degree, and 7.8% had a diploma. The table also shows the distribution of respondents based on their work experience, with 39.2% having worked for 1-2 years, followed by 21.6% each for those with 3-5 years of experience and those with more than 5 years of experience, and 17.6% having worked for less than a year.

**Validity Test**

**Table 2. Validity Test Results**

Variable	Statement	<sup>R</sup> Hitung	<sup>R</sup> Tabel	Information
Leadership Style	1	0,621	0,275	Valid
	2	0,445	0,275	Valid
	3	0,668	0,275	Valid
	4	0,551	0,275	Valid
	5	0,589	0,275	Valid
	6	0,734	0,275	Valid
	7	0,603	0,275	Valid
	8	0,695	0,275	Valid
	9	0,730	0,275	Valid
	10	0,407	0,275	Valid
	11	0,495	0,275	Valid
	12	0,739	0,275	Valid
	13	0,537	0,275	Valid
	14	0,763	0,275	Valid
	15	0,748	0,275	Valid
	16	0,787	0,275	Valid
	17	0,580	0,275	Valid
	18	0,613	0,275	Valid
Personality Type	1	0,750	0,275	Valid
	2	0,679	0,275	Valid
	3	0,683	0,275	Valid
	4	0,762	0,275	Valid
	5	0,572	0,275	Valid
	6	0,630	0,275	Valid
Productivity	1	0,785	0,275	Valid
	2	0,578	0,275	Valid
	3	0,508	0,275	Valid
	4	0,614	0,275	Valid
	5	0,782	0,275	Valid
	6	0,725	0,275	Valid
	7	0,692	0,275	Valid
	8	0,708	0,275	Valid



9	0,639	0,275	Valid
10	0,772	0,275	Valid
11	0,762	0,275	Valid
12	0,740	0,275	Valid

Sumber : Output Smart PLS 3

Based on table 4, the results of the Validity Test show that all items have a correlation coefficient  $r_{(calculate)}$  positive value and greater than  $r_{tabel} = 0.275$  which means this study is said to be valid.

### Reliability Test

Table 3. Reliability Test Results

Variabel	Alpha	Keterangan
Leadership Style	0,908	Reliabel
Personality Type	0,764	Reliabel
Productivity	0,897	Reliabel

Source: Output Smart PLS 3

Based on table 5, the reliability test results show that all variables have an Alpha > 0.70, so it can be concluded that the measuring instrument is declared reliable.

### T Test

Table 4. T Test (Partial) Results

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	4.353	5.059		.860	.394
	Leadership Style	.324	.082	.440	3.932	.000
	Personality Type	.843	.215	.439	3.924	.000

Sumber : Output Smart PLS 3

Based on the t-test results presented, this study found significant effects of both leadership style and personality type on employee work productivity.

For leadership style, the analysis yielded a significance value of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and a t-value of 3.932, which exceeded the t-table value of 2.011. This indicates that leadership style has a statistically significant partial effect on employee work productivity, supporting hypothesis 1. These findings align with previous research by Abdul Latief, published in the Journal of Management and Finance in 2015, which also found that leadership style positively and significantly impacts productivity in a plantation company setting.

Similarly, for personality type, the analysis showed a significance value of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and a t-value of 3.924, again exceeding the t-table value of 2.011. This supports hypothesis 2, demonstrating that personality type has a significant partial effect on employee work productivity. These results corroborate earlier work by Devi Maisaroh,





published in the Management and Finance journal in 2009, which found that both extroverted and introverted personality types significantly influenced employee productivity at a textile company.

The study also examined the simultaneous effect of leadership style and personality type on employee work productivity. The F-test results yielded a significance value of 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and an F-value of 39.725, which surpassed the F-table value of 3.18. This indicates a significant simultaneous influence of both independent variables on employee work productivity. These findings are consistent with research conducted by Heru Sriyono, published in the Herodotus Journal of Social Studies Education in 2018-2019, which demonstrated a significant combined influence of perceptions of leadership style and personality type on teacher productivity across multiple vocational schools.

In summary, this study's results emphasize the importance of both leadership style and personality type in influencing employee work productivity. The findings suggest that organizations should consider these factors in their management strategies to enhance overall productivity. Future research could explore the specific mechanisms through which leadership style and personality type impact productivity, as well as investigate potential moderating variables in these relationships.

**Table 5. T Test (Simultan) Results**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	851.980	2	425.990	39.725	.000b
	Residual	514.726	48	10.723		
	Total	1366.706	50			

Source: Output Smar PLS 3

The test results indicate that the variables of Leadership Style and Personality Type have a simultaneous influence on Employee Work Productivity, with a significant value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05 ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ). Additionally, the  $F_{\text{calculated}}$  value of 39.725 exceeds the  $F_{\text{table}}$  value of 3.18. These findings confirm a joint influence of Leadership Style (X1) and Personality Type (X2) on Work Productivity (Y).

These findings emphasize that both leadership style and personality type are crucial factors that jointly impact overall productivity levels within an organization. When these variables are positively aligned, they create a work environment conducive to higher performance and efficiency. The statistical evidence, supported by the significant  $F_{\text{calculated}}$  value, strengthens the assertion that leadership style and personality cannot be viewed in isolation when assessing their influence on productivity outcomes. Organizations should therefore focus on fostering effective leadership while considering individual personality traits to optimize employee performance. The correlation between these factors suggests that targeted management strategies can significantly improve productivity, which is consistent with the conclusions drawn from previous studies. This further reinforces the importance of comprehensive HR management practices that integrate leadership development and personality assessments to achieve sustained productivity enhancements across diverse work settings.



## **Conclusion**

This study investigated the influence of leadership style and personality type on employee work productivity at PT. Seoul Precision Metal Indonesia. The findings revealed that leadership style and personality type both partially and simultaneously affected employee productivity. Specifically, the leadership style variable had a significant partial effect, aligning with prior research indicating that effective leadership positively impacts productivity. Similarly, personality type exhibited a significant partial influence, corroborating previous studies that demonstrated how extroverted and introverted personality traits can impact employee output. When examined together, leadership style and personality type simultaneously exerted a significant effect on work productivity. These results underscore the importance of cultivating appropriate leadership approaches and considering individual personality characteristics when aiming to enhance employee productivity within an organization. By fostering suitable leadership styles and ensuring compatibility between employee personality and job roles, companies can create favorable conditions for increased productivity, efficiency, and overall organizational performance.

## **Daftar Pustaka**

- Amstrong. (2014). *Human Capital*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Widiatama.
- Azhari Fahmia Maliki. (2019). Penaruh gaya Kepemimpinan dan Kompensasi Terhadap Produktivitas Pt Rolu Indojoya. *bisnis dan Manajemen*, 14.
- Eysenk, Hans. (1947). *Dimension of Personaity*. Kagen , Paul: Trubner Ca, Ltd.
- George R Terry. (1960). *Building Human REsources* (2 ed.). New York: Oxford University Publiser.
- Greendberg, Sinungan L;. (2003). *Management*. New York: HoughtonMifflin Company.
- Hanasya. (2016). *managemen and bussines*. jakarta: Matahari dari Timur.
- Hanasya. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia ( Kepegawaian )*. Bandung: CV Mandar Mundur.
- Handoko, T. H. (2009). *Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: BPFE-UGM.
- Harton. (1982).
- Harton. (1982). *Jurnal of Applied Pschicology*. New York: MarkWilliam Publiser.
- Heru Sriyono. (2019). Persepsi Atas Gaya Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah terhadap kinerja Guru. *Jurnal Pendidikan IPS*, 198.
- Hj. Surya Bintarti, S.E.,M.M. (2015). Metodologi Penelitian Ekonomi Manajemen. Dalam S. Bintarti, *Metododlogi Penelitian* (hal. 97). Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media dan Pelita Bangsa PRESS.
- Horton,189:12 dala Sri Sundari. (2016). Seminar Nasional dan Call for Paper. *Tipe Kepribadian dalam Meningkatkan Kinerja Organisasi*, 390.
- J , Rivianto;. (1994). *Productivity Change without Formal Training*. Chicago: University of Chicago Conference.
- Mangkunegara, A. P. (2009). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Mnusia*. Jakarta: BPFE-UI.
- Maurits, L S K;. (2010). *Selintas Tentang Kelelahan Kerja*. Yogyakarta: Amara Book.
- Purnamie Titisari. (2017). Pengaruh Tipe Kepribadian,Komitemn Organisasi Yerhadap OBC dan Produktivitas Karyawan. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Mangement*, 14.
- QUO VADIS KOMPETENSI, PRODUKTIVITAS & DAYA SAING SDM





- INDONESIA. (2021, 05 28). *Dakta.com*. Diambil kembali dari [www.dakta.com](http://www.dakta.com): <http://www.dakta.com/opini/28093/quo-vadis-kompetensi-produktivitas-daya-saing-SDM-Indonesia>
- Ranftl dalam Tlime. (2000). *Sumber Daya Mnesia Produktivitas*. Cetakan ke Lima Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Ristiani Catur Adi Prianto. (2018). Pengaruh gaya Kepemimpinan Otoriter, Motivasi Organisasi dan Komunikasi terhadap Produktivitas karyawan PT Asia Paramita Indah Tbk. Mandom diSurakarta. *Bisnis and Mangement*, 5.
- Rivanto, J. (1985). *Productivity*. Chicago: Advedture Work Press.
- Rivianto, J;. (1994). *Productivity Change without Product Training*. Confrence: University og Chicago.
- Robbins, S. P. (2008). *Prinsip Prinsip Perilaku Organisasi*. jakarta: Erlangga.
- Salusu. (1996). *Format format Penelitian Sosial*. Jakarta: Raja granfindo Persada.
- Scaffer dan Lamm. (1998). *Managerial Attitude and Behavior*. Homewoode III: Richard D Irwin.
- Scafer dan Lamm (1998;97) dalam Sundari . (2016). Tipe Kepribadian Karyawan dalam Meningkatkan Produktivitas Organisasi. *Seminar Nasional dan Call for Paper*, 190.
- Sigian, sondang;. (2008). *Manajemen Internasional*. Jakarta: Pt Bumi Aksara.
- Soiah. (2001). *Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.
- Soiah. (2008). *Productivity*. Semarang: Gemilang Buana.
- Statistik, B. P. (2021, 05 05). *Laju Pertumbuhan Ekonomi*. Diambil kembali dari [www.bps.go.id](http://www.bps.go.id): <https://www.bps.go.id/indicator/11/104/1/-seri-2010-laju-pertumbuhan-p>
- Sujanda. (2001). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia dan Personalia*. Yogyakarta: PT Indeks.
- Sukirno, Sandono;. (2003). *Pengantar Ekonomi Mikro*. Jakarta: Rajawali Post.
- Surya Bintarti. (2015). *Metodologi penelitian Ekonomi Manajemen*. Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media.
- Surya Bintarti. (2015). *Metodologi Penelitian Ekonomi Manajemen*. Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media.
- Suwatno, T. &. (2009). *Indikator kepemimpinan*.
- Tanjaya dan Sri Mulyani (1995) dalam Agustina Heryati (2019). (2018). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Otoriter, Stress Kerja dan LoylitasMeningkatkan Produktivitas Karyawan. *Jurnal Pasti VOLUME*, 99-100.
- Tjtutju dan Suwanto. (2010). *Wawasan Sumber Daya Mnesia*. jakarta: Pustaka Untma Grafity.