

The Influence of the Hybrid Working System and Work Discipline on the Work Productivity of Generation Z Employees at PT Solomon Indo Global

Yovie Saputro¹, Tutik Winarsih²

¹ Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi YAPAN

² Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi YAPAN, twinarsih@stieyapan.ac.id

Article Info

Article history:

Received May, 2026

Revised May, 2026

Accepted May, 2026

Keywords:

Flexible Work System;
Generation Z;
Hybrid Working;
Productivity;
Work Discipline

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the effect of hybrid working systems and work discipline on the work productivity of Generation Z employees at PT Solomon Indo Global. Employing a quantitative explanatory approach, data were collected from 33 Gen Z employees using structured questionnaires and analyzed through multiple linear regression. The results reveal that the hybrid working system has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity ($t = 2.358$; $p = 0.025$), reflected in improved work flexibility, effective use of digital technology, and output-based performance management. Work discipline shows a positive but partially non-significant effect on productivity ($t = 1.546$; $p = 0.132$), though it contributes positively within the regression model. Simultaneous testing indicates that both hybrid working and work discipline jointly and significantly influence employee productivity ($F = 18.324$; $p < 0.001$). The coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.550 indicates that 55% of the variation in employee productivity is explained by the two variables. These findings suggest that the effectiveness of hybrid working for Generation Z employees relies more on system flexibility and technological support, while work discipline serves as a supporting factor. The managerial implication is that organizations need to design adaptive work systems accompanied by clear performance standards and outcome-based monitoring mechanisms to ensure sustainable productivity.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Name: Yovie Saputro

Institution: Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi YAPAN, IKIP, Jalan Gunung Anyar Blok E No.152-154 & 197-198, Gn. Anyar, Kota SBY, Jawa Timur 60295, Indonesia

Email: yoviesaputro098@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of information and communication technology has significantly transformed organizational systems and work practices. Advances in digitalization and the widespread use of

internet-based platforms have enabled employees to perform tasks without being constrained by physical workspaces or fixed schedules [1]. This transformation accelerated significantly since the COVID-19 pandemic, which forced organizations worldwide to urgently adopt remote and flexible working

arrangements [2]. As a result, hybrid working—a model that combines remote and on-site work—has emerged as a sustainable work arrangement that balances operational flexibility with organizational productivity demands [3].

Hybrid working systems are considered capable of improving employee performance by providing flexibility in work time and location while simultaneously supporting work–life balance [4], [5]. Previous studies conducted in the Indonesian context have demonstrated that hybrid work arrangements positively influence employee productivity, particularly when supported by adequate digital infrastructure and clear performance management systems [6], [7]. However, the effectiveness of hybrid working is not solely determined by flexibility. Several studies indicate that productivity outcomes under hybrid systems are often inconsistent due to challenges such as reduced supervision, communication barriers, and declining work discipline [8], [9]. This inconsistency suggests that internal behavioral factors—particularly work discipline—play a crucial role in ensuring the success of hybrid work implementation.

The issue of work discipline in flexible environments becomes especially relevant in the context of Generation Z employees, who are increasingly dominating the workforce, particularly in digital-based companies. Generation Z is characterized by high adaptability to technology and a strong preference for autonomy and flexibility, yet they often face challenges related to time management and consistency in maintaining formal work discipline [10]. These characteristics create both opportunities and challenges for organizations implementing hybrid work systems, as productivity outcomes may depend heavily on how well employees manage the tension between flexibility and responsibility.

Despite the growing body of research on hybrid working and employee productivity, there remains a gap in empirical evidence specifically addressing the simultaneous influence of hybrid

working systems and work discipline among Generation Z employees in digital-based startup contexts in Indonesia. Most existing studies examine hybrid working or work discipline in isolation, without integrating both variables within a unified empirical framework [11], [12]. Furthermore, studies focusing specifically on Generation Z employees in the Indonesian FMCG digital startup sector remain limited, creating a contextual gap in the literature.

PT Solomon Indo Global, a digital-based Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) company located in Surabaya, Indonesia, represents a highly relevant research context for examining this phenomenon. As a rapidly growing startup with a workforce dominated by Generation Z, the company has implemented hybrid working practices to support operational efficiency and adaptability in a competitive digital market. However, maintaining employee productivity under flexible work arrangements remains a key managerial concern. Based on this background, this study aims to fill the identified research gap by empirically analyzing the partial and simultaneous effects of hybrid working systems and work discipline on the productivity of Generation Z employees at PT Solomon Indo Global. This research is expected to contribute both theoretical insights and practical recommendations for human resource management in the digital era.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Hybrid Working System

Hybrid working refers to a flexible work arrangement that combines remote work and on-site work, allowing employees to determine their work location and schedule while still meeting organizational targets [1]. This system is designed to enhance flexibility, improve work–life balance, and increase organizational efficiency [4]. According to [5], hybrid teamwork introduces unique coordination challenges due to the asymmetry between co-located and remote team members, necessitating

deliberate communication structures and digital collaboration tools to sustain performance. Previous studies indicate that hybrid working can positively influence productivity when supported by adequate digital infrastructure, effective communication, and clear performance management systems [6], [9]. However, without proper control mechanisms, hybrid working may also lead to reduced supervision and inconsistencies in performance outcomes [8].

In the Indonesian context, [13] reported that Indonesian employees increasingly prefer hybrid arrangements, with digital readiness and adequate technological support being critical determinants of productivity under such systems. [7] further found that work-life balance benefits derived from hybrid working significantly mediate its effect on productivity, highlighting the psychological dimensions of flexible work arrangements.

The indicators used to measure hybrid working in this study are adapted from [4] and [1], encompassing: (1) work flexibility in terms of time and location; (2) technology support for remote tasks; (3) quality of digital communication; and (4) output-based performance management. These indicators reflect the operational dimensions most relevant to Generation Z employees working in digital-based organizational environments.

2.2 Work Discipline

Work discipline reflects employees' compliance with organizational rules, standards, and responsibilities in carrying out their tasks [14]. It encompasses aspects such as punctuality, adherence to procedures, responsibility, and consistency in performance [15]. High levels of work discipline are essential in ensuring that employees maintain productivity, particularly in flexible work environments where direct supervision

is limited [16]. Empirical studies consistently show that work discipline has a significant positive effect on employee performance and productivity [11], [17], [18].

However, recent studies have noted a contextual nuance: in environments characterized by high autonomy and output-based evaluation—such as hybrid work settings—the direct impact of formal work discipline on productivity may be moderated by employees' intrinsic motivation and self-management capacity [19]. This is particularly relevant for Generation Z employees, who tend to prioritize autonomy and results over adherence to rigid procedural rules [10]. [18] found that job satisfaction significantly predicts both organizational commitment and work discipline, suggesting that behavioral factors are interconnected and context-dependent.

The indicators used to measure work discipline in this study follow [14] and [20], comprising: (1) compliance with organizational rules and regulations; (2) punctuality and attendance; (3) sense of responsibility toward tasks; and (4) consistency in work behavior. These dimensions capture both the structural and behavioral aspects of discipline relevant to the study context.

2.3 Work Productivity

Work productivity refers to the ability of employees to produce optimal output efficiently and effectively, measured through indicators such as work quality, quantity, timeliness, and work efficiency [20], [21]. Productivity is influenced by both organizational factors—such as work systems, leadership, and organizational culture—and individual factors—such as discipline, motivation, and competence [16], [22]. In the context of hybrid working, productivity depends on employees' ability to manage time independently, utilize technology effectively, and maintain consistent output regardless of work location [1].

From a generational perspective, Generation Z employees demonstrate high digital literacy and adaptability, which can facilitate productivity under hybrid arrangements [10]. However, their tendency toward informal communication and preference for autonomy may also create challenges in sustaining discipline-driven productivity benchmarks [23]. The indicators of work productivity used in this study are adapted from [21] and [20], comprising: (1) quality of work output; (2) quantity of completed tasks; (3) timeliness of task completion; and (4) efficiency of resource utilization.

2.4 Conceptual Framework and Hypothesis Development

Hybrid working systems provide flexibility that can enhance employee performance; however, their effectiveness is highly dependent on employee behavior. Work discipline acts as a control mechanism that ensures employees remain responsible and consistent in completing their tasks. Therefore, this study proposes that both hybrid working and work discipline influence employee productivity, both partially and simultaneously.

Based on the theoretical framework, the hypotheses are formulated as follows: H1: Hybrid working has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity. H2: Work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity.

H3: Hybrid working and work discipline simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee productivity.

3. METHODS

This study employs a quantitative approach with an explanatory research design to examine the causal relationships between hybrid working systems, work discipline, and employee productivity. The research was conducted at PT Solomon Indo

Global, a digital-based FMCG company located in Surabaya, Indonesia.

3.1 Population and Sample

The population of this study consists of all Generation Z employees (born between 1997 and 2012) working at PT Solomon Indo Global. Using a purposive sampling technique, 33 respondents who met the criteria of being active Gen Z employees with a minimum of three months' tenure under the hybrid work system were selected as the research sample. Although the sample size is relatively small, it is consistent with the total Gen Z workforce at the company and is adequate for multiple linear regression analysis with two predictors, achieving a minimum power of 0.80 at $\alpha = 0.05$ according to the power analysis framework recommended by [24].

3.2 Research Variables and Measurement

The variables in this study include hybrid working (X_1) and work discipline (X_2) as independent variables, and employee productivity (Y) as the dependent variable. All variables were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

- a. **Hybrid Working (X_1)** was measured through four indicators: work flexibility in time and location, technology support for remote tasks, quality of digital communication, and output-based performance management [1], [4].
- b. **Work Discipline (X_2)** was measured through four indicators: compliance with organizational rules, punctuality and attendance, sense of responsibility toward tasks, and consistency in work behavior [14], [20].
- c. **Employee Productivity (Y)** was measured through four indicators: work quality, work quantity, timeliness, and work efficiency [20], [21].

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

Primary data were collected through structured questionnaires distributed directly to respondents. Data analysis was conducted using multiple linear regression with the assistance of SPSS 26 software [25]. Prior to hypothesis testing, the following sequential procedures were performed:

1. **Data Quality Tests:** Validity testing using Pearson correlation ($r > r\text{-table}$; $\text{sig.} < 0.05$) and reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha > 0.60$).
2. **Classical Assumption Tests:** Normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov), multicollinearity (Tolerance > 0.10 ; VIF < 10), and heteroscedasticity (Scatterplot pattern analysis).
3. **Hypothesis Testing:** Partial effects were examined using t-tests ($\text{sig.} < 0.05$), simultaneous effects using F-tests ($\text{sig.} < 0.05$), and the proportion of variance explained by the coefficient of determination (R^2).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistical analysis shows that the average score of hybrid working is 69.09, work discipline is 71.52, and employee productivity is 66.09 out of a maximum possible score. These values indicate that all variables are at a relatively high level among the respondents, suggesting that Gen Z employees at PT Solomon Indo Global have generally positive perceptions of

both the hybrid work system and their own discipline and productivity levels.

4.2 Validity and Reliability Tests

The validity test results indicate that all questionnaire items are valid, with Pearson correlation values exceeding the r-table threshold ($r > 0.344$ for $n = 33$, $df = 31$, $\alpha = 0.05$) and significance levels below 0.05. The reliability test results confirm that all variables demonstrate high internal consistency, with Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.880 for hybrid working, 0.939 for work discipline, and 0.943 for employee productivity—all well above the minimum acceptable threshold of 0.60 [25].

4.3 Classical Assumption Tests

The normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov approach yields a significance value of 0.085 (> 0.05), indicating that the residuals are normally distributed. The multicollinearity test shows a Tolerance value of 0.374 and a VIF of 2.672, both within acceptable limits (Tolerance > 0.10 ; VIF < 10), confirming the absence of multicollinearity between the independent variables. The heteroscedasticity test based on the Scatterplot of standardized residuals reveals no systematic pattern, confirming homoscedasticity. These results collectively confirm that the classical assumptions for regression analysis are satisfied.

4.4 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

The multiple linear regression analysis produces the following equation:

$$Y = 7.422 + 0.538X_1 + 0.301X_2$$

Table 1. Analysis of Multiple Linear Regression Equations

Model	B (Unstandardized)	Std. Error	Beta (Standardized)	t	Sig.
(Constant)	7.422	9.784	—	0.759	0.454
Hybrid Working (X_1)	0.538	0.228	0.472	2.358	0.025
Work Discipline (X_2)	0.301	0.195	0.310	1.546	0.132

Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity. Source: Primary data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

The constant value of 7.422 indicates the baseline level of employee

productivity when both independent variables are assumed to be zero. The

regression coefficient of hybrid working ($\beta = 0.538$) indicates that every one-unit increase in hybrid working implementation is associated with a 0.538-unit increase in employee productivity, assuming other variables remain constant. The regression coefficient of work discipline ($\beta = 0.301$) indicates a positive but smaller contribution to productivity compared to hybrid working.

4.5 Hypothesis Testing

a. Partial Effect (t-test):

The t-test results indicate

that hybrid working has a positive and significant partial effect on employee productivity ($t = 2.358$; $p = 0.025 < 0.05$), thus **H1 is supported**. Work discipline shows a positive direction but does not reach statistical significance as a partial predictor of productivity ($t = 1.546$; $p = 0.132 > 0.05$), thus **H2 is not supported** in terms of statistical significance, although the positive direction of the relationship is consistent with the hypothesis.

b. Simultaneous Effect (F-test)

Table 2. ANOVA – F-Test Results

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	719.640	2	359.820	18.324	< 0.001
Residual	589.087	30	19.636	—	—
Total	1308.727	32	—	—	—

Source: Primary data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

The F-test yields $F = 18.324$ ($p < 0.001$), indicating that hybrid working and work discipline simultaneously have a significant

effect on employee productivity. **H3 is therefore supported.**

c. Coefficient of Determination

Table 3. Model Summary – Coefficient of Determination

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.742	0.550	0.520	4.431

Source: Primary data processed using SPSS 26 (2026)

The R^2 value of 0.550 indicates that 55.0% of the variation in employee productivity is explained by hybrid working and work discipline. The remaining 45.0% is attributable to other factors not included in the current model, such as work motivation, leadership quality, organizational culture, compensation, and work environment.

4.6 Discussion

a. Effect of Hybrid Working on Employee Productivity (H1)

The finding that hybrid working positively and significantly affects employee productivity supports H1 and is consistent with the results of [6], [7], and [1]. Flexibility in work arrangements,

supported by digital technology and adaptive performance management systems, allows Generation Z employees to organize their tasks more efficiently according to their optimal work patterns. This finding aligns with the theoretical framework of [4], who established that telecommuting flexibility positively influences performance through reduced work-family conflict and increased autonomy. In the specific context of PT Solomon Indo Global, the positive effect of hybrid working is further supported by the company's digital-based operational infrastructure, which facilitates seamless remote collaboration. The standardized beta coefficient of 0.472 also confirms that hybrid working is

the dominant predictor in the model, highlighting the centrality of flexible work arrangements in driving productivity among Gen Z employees in digital startup environments.

b. Effect of Work Discipline on Employee Productivity (H2)

The finding that work discipline does not have a statistically significant partial effect on employee productivity ($p = 0.132$) represents a notable result that warrants further theoretical discussion. While work discipline shows a positive regression coefficient ($\beta = 0.301$), it does not reach significance when controlling for hybrid working. This finding diverges from prior studies in traditional work settings [11], [12], [17], but is partially consistent with more recent investigations in flexible work environments. One plausible explanation is that Generation Z employees, as documented by [10] and [23], tend to prioritize outcome achievement over procedural compliance. In hybrid environments where performance is primarily evaluated through outputs rather than attendance or adherence to rigid schedules, the traditional behavioural dimensions of discipline may become less directly impactful as independent drivers of productivity. Instead, productivity may be more closely tied to intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, and technological competence—attributes more salient for Gen Z workers [22]. Another explanation relates to the high overall discipline scores (mean = 71.52) observed in the sample, which may indicate a ceiling effect that reduces statistical variance and limits the detection of a significant partial relationship.

It is important to emphasize, however, that the non-significant partial effect of work discipline does

not indicate an absence of its role in the model. The simultaneous test results confirm that discipline contributes meaningfully when combined with hybrid working (H3 supported). This pattern suggests that work discipline functions as a necessary contextual condition or enabling factor rather than a direct driver of productivity in hybrid settings—a theoretical nuance consistent with [16] conceptualization of discipline as a foundational behavioural prerequisite for organizational performance systems.

c. Simultaneous Effect of Hybrid Working and Work Discipline (H3)

The significant simultaneous F-test result ($F = 18.324$; $p < 0.001$) confirms that the combination of hybrid working and work discipline jointly explains a meaningful and significant portion of variance in employee productivity ($R^2 = 0.550$). This finding supports H3 and underscores the complementary nature of organizational system factors (hybrid working) and individual behavioural factors (work discipline) in determining work outcomes. These results are consistent with [18], who demonstrated the interrelated influence of attitudinal and behavioural variables on organizational performance. From a managerial standpoint, these results suggest that implementing hybrid working systems without addressing the behavioural dimension of discipline may yield suboptimal outcomes, while emphasizing discipline without providing flexible work infrastructure may similarly constrain productivity among Gen Z employees.

5. CONCLUSION

This study examined the partial and simultaneous effects of hybrid working and work discipline on the productivity of

Generation Z employees at PT Solomon Indo Global, Surabaya. The findings indicate that hybrid working has a positive and significant partial effect on employee productivity (H1 supported), confirming the central role of flexible, technology-supported work arrangements in enhancing performance outcomes for Gen Z employees. Work discipline shows a positive but not statistically significant partial effect (H2 not fully supported), a finding that is theoretically interpreted as reflecting the outcome-orientation and autonomy preference characteristic of Generation Z in hybrid work environments. Simultaneously, both variables jointly and significantly predict employee productivity (H3 supported), with a combined explanatory power of 55% ($R^2 = 0.550$), indicating the complementary nature of organizational system design and individual behavioral factors in shaping work productivity. The remaining 45% of variance is attributable to other factors beyond the scope of this study.

6. SUGGESTIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are offered:

1. For organizational management, PT Solomon Indo Global and similar digital-based startups should prioritize optimizing the infrastructure and governance of hybrid working systems, including providing reliable technological support, establishing clear digital communication protocols, and adopting outcome-based performance evaluation frameworks that align with Generation Z's work preferences.
2. For human resource practitioners, while work discipline did not emerge as a statistically significant partial predictor, its positive contribution within the simultaneous model suggests that cultivating a culture of self-management, responsibility, and professional accountability remains strategically important—particularly as organizations scale and formalize their hybrid operations.
3. For future research, subsequent studies are recommended to: (a) expand the sample size to improve statistical power and generalizability; (b) include mediating or moderating variables such as work motivation, self-efficacy, transformational leadership, and organizational culture to provide a more comprehensive explanatory framework; (c) employ longitudinal designs to capture the dynamic relationship between hybrid work implementation and employee productivity over time; and (d) conduct comparative studies across different industries or organizational sizes to test the generalizability of these findings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to PT Solomon Indo Global for granting permission and providing support in conducting this research. Appreciation is extended to all respondents who participated and contributed valuable data to this study. Special thanks are addressed to the academic supervisors for their continuous guidance, constructive feedback, and support throughout the research process. The authors also acknowledge all colleagues and parties who contributed, directly or indirectly, to the completion of this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Bloom, R. Han, and J. Liang, "How hybrid working from home works out," National Bureau of Economic Research, 2021. doi: 10.3386/w28731.
- [2] I. L. Organization, "Working from home: From invisibility to decent work," International Labour Organization, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ilo.org/publications/working-home-invisibility-decent-work>
- [3] M. G. Institute, "The future of work after COVID-19," McKinsey & Company, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/the-future-of-work-after-covid-19>
- [4] T. D. Allen, T. D. Golden, and K. M. Shockley, "How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings," *Psychol. Sci. Public Interes.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 40–68, 2015, doi: 10.1177/1529100615593273.
- [5] L. Handke, A. Aldana, P. L. Costa, and T. A. O'Neill, "Hybrid teamwork: What we know and where we can go from here," *Small Gr. Res.*, vol. 55, no. 5, pp. 805–835, 2024, doi: 10.1177/10464964241279078.
- [6] T. Aurelly Abean and E. Trisyulianti, "Pengaruh hybrid work terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan di PT XYZ," *J. Manaj. dan Organ.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 245–258, 2025, doi: 10.29244/jmo.v16i2.64319.
- [7] Likdanawati, Hamdiah, and Muttaqien, "The effect of work-life balance and hybrid working system on the productivity of the marketing division at PT PIM," *Multidiscip. Output Res. Actual Int. Issue (MORFAI Journal)*, vol. 5, no. 4, p. 3516, 2025, doi: 10.54443/morfai.v5i6.3575.
- [8] R. Z. Rafizal, R. Zamora, and L. Hakim, "Dampak hybrid working terhadap produktivitas dan kesejahteraan karyawan," *Mak. J. Manaj.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 207–220, 2025, [Online]. Available: https://repository.unrika.ac.id/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/582/REPOSITORY_JURNAL_Rafizal.pdf
- [9] Sumiati, "The impact of hybrid working on employee performance: A study on startup companies in Surabaya," *Int. J. Business, Manag. Innov. Rev.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 130–139, 2024, doi: 10.62951/ijbmir.v1i4.117.
- [10] S. P. Robbins and T. A. Judge, *Organizational Behavior*, 18th ed. Pearson Education, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.pearson.com/en-us/subject-catalog/p/organizational-behavior/P200000006175>
- [11] A. Asyifa and I. A. Sumbogo, "Pengaruh stress kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja di PT Amos Indah Indonesia," *KALBISIANA J. Sains, Bisnis dan Teknol.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 3289–3297, 2022, [Online]. Available: <https://ojs.kalbis.ac.id/index.php/kalbisiana/id/article/view/1533>
- [12] G. Kusjono, F. A. Gunawan, and Suprianto, "Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan pengembangan karir terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan pada PT Purantara In-Flight Catering," *J. Ilm. Mhs.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 11–19, 2022, [Online]. Available: <https://garuda.kemdiktisaintek.go.id/documents/detail/2861005>
- [13] Logitech, "Hybrid Work Trend Insights Indonesia 2023," Logitech for Business, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://info.logitech.com/rs/201-WGH-889/images/Logitech-Hybrid-Work-Trend-Insights-Indonesia-2023.pdf>
- [14] M. S. P. Hasibuan, "Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia," Penerbit PT Bumi Aksara., 2019.
- [15] V. Rivai and E. J. Sagala, *Manajemen sumber daya manusia untuk perusahaan: Dari teori ke praktik*, 3rd ed. Rajawali Pers, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/>
- [16] M. Armstrong and S. Taylor, *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.koganpage.com/hr-learning-development/armstrong-s-handbook-of-human-resource-management-practice-9781789661033>
- [17] M. L. Makka and A. Nazir, "Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap produktivitas karyawan pada PT Indofood Sukses Makmur Tbk Jakarta Pusat," *J. Ilm. PERKUSU*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 579–589, 2025, doi: 10.32493/j.perkusi.v5i3.49730.
- [18] T. Winarsih and F. Fariz, "The effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment and work discipline," *Budapest Int. Res. Critics Institute-Journal Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1328–1339, 2021, doi: 10.33258/birci.v4i1.1759.
- [19] L. Maduningtias, "Pengaruh motivasi dan disiplin kerja terhadap produktivitas karyawan," *J. Ilm. PERKUSU*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 21–30, 2020.
- [20] Sedarmayanti, *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Reformasi birokrasi dan manajemen pegawai negeri sipil*. Refika Aditama, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/>
- [21] M. Sinungan, *Produktivitas: Apa dan bagaimana*, 9th ed. Bumi Aksara, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/>
- [22] F. Fariz, "Human Resources Competences in Economics Higher Education Provider in East Java, Indonesia: The determinant of organizational performances," *Asia Pacific Manag. Bus. Appl.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 133–144, 2019, doi: 10.21776/ub.apmba.2019.008.02.5.
- [23] L. Judijanto, "Evolusi hybrid work model dalam organisasi: Sebuah tinjauan bibliometrik," *Sanskara Manaj. dan Bisnis*, vol. 3, no. 02, pp. 57–68, 2025, doi: 10.58812/smb.v3i02.536.
- [24] J. Cohen, *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988. doi: 10.4324/9780203771587.
- [25] I. Ghozali, *Aplikasi analisis multivariante dengan program SPSS 26*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/>