

Effect of Reward and Punishment on Employee Performance with Leadership Style as an Intervening Variable (Study on PT Angkasa Pura II International Airport Branch Office Sultan Syarif Kasim II Pekanbaru)

Ahmad Rifqi¹, Prima Andreas Siregar^{2*}, Arya Hadi Ghifary³

Riau University, Indonesia¹

Riau University, Indonesia²

Riau University, Indonesia³

Corresponding Email: prima.andreas@lecturer.unri.ac.id*

Received: 27-12-2024 Reviewed: 10-05-2025 Accepted: 28-01-2025

Abstract

This study aimed to test and determine the effect of *reward* and *punishment* on employee performance with leadership style as an intervening variable at PT Angkasa Pura II International Airport Branch Office Sultan Syarif Kasim II Pekanbaru. The population of this study includes all employees of the *finance* and *human resources* division of PT Angkasa Pura II Pekanbaru. Sampling in this study used a saturated sampling technique (census), which converts all members of the population into samples so that the number of samples in this study was 37. The data analysis method used in this research is the structural equation modelling–partial least square (SEM-PLS) analysis method with WarpPLS software version 7.0. The results of this study indicate that rewards and punishment have a positive and significant influence on employee performance and leadership style. In addition, the mediating role of leadership style also has a significant impact on the effect of rewards and punishments on employee performance.

Keywords: Reward, Punishment, Leadership style, and Employee performance

Introduction

As an archipelago with enthusiasm for progress, Indonesia has great potential for developing air transportation services. Air transportation can reach remote areas and save time compared with land or sea transportation. After being affected by Covid-19, the aviation industry in Indonesia is now entering a recovery phase, with predictions of full awakening by 2024. Effective airport management plays an important role in ensuring smooth operations, customer satisfaction, and local economic growth. With good management, airports can enhance their reputations through optimal service and operational efficiency. The performance of competent and dedicated employees contributes to flight schedule management, security

control, and customer service, which supports efficiency, safety, and passenger satisfaction while strengthening the airline's reputation.

PT Angkasa Pura II is a state-owned enterprise engaged in airport services and airport-related services. The Sultan Syarif Kasim II airport (SSK. II) Pekanbaru. To obtain optimal service operational results, PT Angkasa Pura II needs to implement programs related to its operational activities, namely, improving the quality of employee performance in order to carry out work plans and company work programs.

Employee performance is a result of the work achieved by a person in carrying out duties assigned to him, which is based on skills, experience, seriousness, and time. Based on the assessment of the performance of PT Angkasa Pura II employees in the *finance and human resource* division over the last five years (2019-2023), it is still experiencing fluctuations. From 2019 to 2021, the average performance value of PT Angkasa Pura II employees decreased. This is because the quality of work, quantity of results, timeliness, effectiveness, and responsibility at work are still suboptimal.

Several factors can affect employee performance, such as *rewards* and *punishments*. *Reward* is one of the company's efforts to empower human resources and improve employee performance in the company (Suryadilaga, Musadieq, & Nurtjahjono, 2016). Punishment is an effort to maintain employee performance. *Punishment* (punishment) if used effectively can suppress behavior in the organization, in other words, *punishment* should be given after careful and objective consideration of all aspects relevant to the situation that occurs (Pramesti, Sambul, & Rumawas, 2019).

Based on pre-survey data from 2019 to 2023, the provision of *rewards* at PT Angkasa Pura II fluctuated annually. This incident can occur because of a decrease in employee performance, where the corporate world was affected by the covid-19 event in 2020 and 2021. This affects employee motivation, which can reduce the effectiveness of *rewards*. In addition, another finding in the pre-survey results is the problem of sanctioning the work environment, where employee compliance with regulations is not optimal. Although more severe sanctions are imposed for repeated offenses, some employees consider these sanctions to be less effective in preventing violations. Leaders are also considered less precise in considering sanctions, so improvements are needed in decision making to be fairer and more objective.

Any discussion on employee performance in a company is inseparable from the name of leadership. A leader runs and manages a company. Leadership is a process that influences the determination of organizational goals, motivating follower behavior to achieve goals and influencing groups and culture. In addition, leadership also influences the interpretation of events of its followers, organizing and activities to achieve goals, maintaining cooperative relationships and group work, and obtaining cooperation support from other people or organizations (Rivai, 2004). Based on the results of the pre-survey, most employees considered that the leadership style at Angkasa Pura II was still not optimal in making decisions, motivating employees, communicating, and controlling subordinates.

This study has important value in the context of human resource management and organizational strategy development. By understanding the relationship between *reward*,

Effect of Reward and Punishment on Employee Performance with Leadership Style as an Intervening Variable

punishment, leadership style, and employee performance, companies can allocate resources more efficiently and help organizations face challenges and changes in the work environment.

Based on the explanation above, as well as from the data obtained at PT Angkasa Pura II, the researcher desires to analyze the extent of the success of PT Angkasa Pura II in utilizing its workforce by looking at employee performance. That way, researchers conducted research on employee performance issues with the title "The Effect of *Reward* and *Punishment* on Employee Performance with Leadership Style as an Intervening Variable at PT Angkasa Pura II Sultan Syarif Kasim II International Airport Branch Office Pekanbaru."

Literature Review

Employee Performance

Performance is a set of results achieved, and refers to the act of achieving and performing a required job. Performance can also be interpreted as the work performance or work results. According to Mangkunegara (2017), performance is the quality and quantity of work achieved by an employee in carrying out his/her duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him. Meanwhile, according to Hasibuan (2016), performance can be defined as the result of work that a person has achieved in carrying out the tasks assigned to him, which are based on skills, experience, seriousness, and timeliness. According to Rahmasari (2012), several indicators affect performance.

- a. Quality
- b. Quantity
- c. Timeliness
- d. Effectiveness
- e. Independence

Reward

Reward is a form of appreciation for efforts to obtain a professional workforce in accordance with the demands of the position required to carry out tasks effectively and efficiently (Handoko, 2008). In the management concept, *rewards* are one of the tools used to increase employee motivation. According to Victor Vroom's expectation theory, motivation is the result of an outcome that a person wants to achieve and estimates that his actions will lead to the desired result. In addition, according to Thompson (2003), *rewards* include not only quantitative elements but also other elements that are not in the form of money, career opportunities, opportunities to learn and develop, and a decent quality of life in the organization and others. According to Gibson *et al.* (2008), *rewards* can be classified into two broad categories: intrinsic rewards are rewards that come from within oneself in the form of a sense of satisfaction or pride in a job that has been done, and extrinsic *rewards* are rewards that come from outside such as salary, benefits, awards, and promotions.

Punishment

Mangkunegara (2013) explains that *punishment* is a threat that aims to improve the performance of violating employees, maintain applicable regulations, and teach lessons to violators. *Punishment* is a way of directing behavior to conform to generally accepted behavior. *Punishment* is an unpleasant consequence given by superiors for deviant behavior carried out by employees. If *the reward* is positive, then *punishment* is negative. The reinforcement Theory of Motivation was coined by Skinner, who believes that individual behavior is a function of consequences. This theory is based on a kind of law of influence in which behavior with positive consequences tends to be repeated, while behavior with negative consequences tends not to be repeated. According to Purwanto (2009), in giving sanctions or punishment (punishment) is divided into two parts, namely:

1. Preventive punishment is an action taken by a company to prevent violations, including rules, recommendations and orders, prohibitions, coercion, and discipline.
2. Repressive punishment is given by the company to employees who commit violations, including reprimands, termination of benefits, termination of bonuses, restrictions on the use of company facilities and infrastructure, and termination of employment.

Leadership style

According to Uha (2013), leadership style is the ability and art of obtaining results through activities that influence others to achieve predetermined goals. Meanwhile, Rivai (2014) states that leadership style is a set of characteristics that leaders use to influence subordinates to achieve organizational goals. Leadership style is a pattern of behavior and strategies that leaders prefer and often apply. From the definitions put forward by experts, it can be concluded that leadership style is a person's ability to influence others to work together with plans to achieve company goals.

According to Robbins (2006), four types of leadership style were identified:

1. Charismatic Leadership Style
Followers are spurred on to heroic or extraordinary leadership abilities when they observe certain behaviors of their leader. style
2. Transactional Leadership
Transactional leaders guide or motivate their followers towards set goals by clarifying their roles and task requirements. The transactional leadership style focuses more on the leader-subordinate relationship without any attempt to create change for subordinates.
3. Transformational Leadership Style
Transformational leaders focus on individual followers' concerns and development needs. Transformational leaders change followers' awareness of issues by helping them look at old problems in new ways, and they can excite, arouse, and inspire followers to expend extra effort to achieve group goals.
4. Visionary Leadership Style
The ability to create and articulate a realistic, credible, and compelling vision of the future of a growing and improving organization. If properly selected and implemented, this vision

Effect of Reward and Punishment on Employee Performance with Leadership Style as an Intervening Variable

has the power to cause an initial leap into the future by galvanizing the skills, talents, and resources to make it happen.

Research Methods

This type of research is included in a quantitative approach, namely an associative research strategy used to determine the relationship between two or more variables. The type of data used in this study is primary data. Primary data are taken directly without going through intermediaries. The data collection method used in this study was to distribute questionnaires. The questionnaire is a data collection technique that involves giving a set of questions or written statements to the respondents to answer (Sugiyono, 2014). The data analysis carried out in this study was a Structural Equation Model using the Partial Least Squares (PLS) statistical software Warp PLS.

This research was conducted at PT Angkasa Pura II Sultan Syarif Kasim II International Airport Branch Office Pekanbaru. The population in this study was employees in the Finance & Human Resource section of PT Angkasa Pura II (Persero) Sultan Syarif Kasim II Airport Branch Pekanbaru, totalling 37 employees. The sampling technique in this study used saturated sampling, which is a sampling technique when all members of the population are used as samples. Thirty-seven respondents were 37 respondents.

Results

Validity Test Results

This validity test was conducted in two ways: convergent validity and discriminant validity. Convergent validity is used to indicate the extent to which an instrument or questionnaire can measure a concept that should be measured. The convergent validity value can be seen from the loading factor value with the criteria for each indicator > 0.70 which be said to be valid, and a p-value <0.05 is considered significant.

Table 1.1 Convergent Validity Test Results

| | | R | P | GK | KK | <i>P-value</i> |
|-------------------|-----|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------|----------------|
| <i>Reward</i> | R1 | (0.911) | -0.123 | 0.357 | -0.577 | <0.001 |
| | R2 | (0.827) | 0.366 | 0.215 | -0.227 | <0.001 |
| | R3 | (0.891) | -0.133 | -0.730 | 1.088 | <0.001 |
| | R4 | (0.921) | -0.213 | -0.244 | 0.699 | <0.001 |
| | R5 | (0.898) | 0.138 | 0.414 | -1.002 | <0.001 |
| <i>Punishment</i> | P1 | -0.599 | (0.728) | -1.095 | 1.666 | <0.001 |
| | P2 | -0.068 | (0.830) | 0.313 | -0.538 | <0.001 |
| | P3 | 0.209 | (0.858) | 0.152 | -0.516 | <0.001 |
| | P4 | 0.378 | (0.828) | 0.491 | -0.391 | <0.001 |
| Leadership Style | GK1 | 0.513 | -0.059 | (0.828) | -0.063 | <0.001 |
| | GK2 | -0.495 | 0.166 | (0.787) | 0.491 | <0.001 |
| | GK3 | -0.367 | -0.272 | (0.853) | 0.613 | <0.001 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|--------|--------|----------------|----------------|--------|
| | GK4 | 0.715 | 0.177 | (0.852) | -0.889 | <0.001 |
| | GK5 | -0.589 | 0.084 | (0.839) | 0.705 | <0.001 |
| | GK6 | 0.186 | -0.080 | (0.874) | -0.790 | <0.001 |
| Employee Performance | KK1 | 0.280 | 0.513 | 0.639 | (0.847) | <0.001 |
| | KK2 | -0.351 | -0.386 | -0.799 | (0.823) | <0.001 |
| | KK3 | -0.349 | 0.183 | 0.422 | (0.808) | <0.001 |
| | KK4 | 0.060 | -0.337 | -1.063 | (0.706) | <0.001 |
| | KK5 | 0.340 | -0.032 | 0.615 | (0.856) | <0.001 |

Source: Processed WarpPls 7.0 output, 2024

From the convergent validity test results, as recorded in Table 1.1, it can be seen that the p-value for all constructs is <0.001, which indicates that all constructs have a good level of validity, with significance <0.05. This analysis indicates that all the measured constructs are reliable and valid indicators of the variables of interest. The combined loading and cross loading value of 0.7 indicates optimal validity results.

Discriminant validity aims to ensure that constructs or variables that are different can be measured and distinguished from each other by instruments or measurement tools. To measure discriminant validity, the cross-loading of measurements with constructs and the square roots of the average variance extracted (AVE) were used.

Table 1.2 Discriminant Validity Test Results

| | <i>Reward</i> | <i>Punishment</i> | Leadership Style | Employee Performance |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Reward</i> | (0.890) | 0.806 | 0.780 | 0.874 |
| <i>Punishment</i> | 0.806 | (0.866) | 0.801 | 0.813 |
| Leadership Style | 0.780 | 0.801 | (0.897) | 0.810 |
| Employee Performance | 0.874 | 0.813 | 0.810 | (0.897) |

Source: Processed WarpPls 7.0 output, 2024

Table 1.2 shows that the square root of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values are 0.890, 0.866, 0.897, and 0.897. These values are greater than the correlations between constructs and thus show good discriminant validity.

Reliability Test Results

The reliability test is a measurement method used to evaluate the extent to which a measuring instrument or data collection instrument is reliable or consistent in measuring a concept or variable. Cronbach's alpha was used to test construct reliability, with a lower value than that of Composite Reliability. Data are declared reliable if Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability are greater than 0.70, then the instrument is said to have reliability.

Table 1.3 Table of Reliability Test Results

| | Cronbach's Alpha | Composite Reliability | Description |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| <i>Reward</i> | 0.934 | 0.950 | Reliable |
| <i>Punishment</i> | 0.827 | 0.886 | Reliable |
| Leadership Style | 0.916 | 0.935 | Reliable |
| Employee Performance | 0.867 | 0.905 | Reliable |

Effect of Reward and Punishment on Employee Performance with Leadership Style as an Intervening Variable

Source: Processed WarpPls 7.0 output, 2024

Based on Table 1.3, it can be concluded that all *reward*, *punishment*, leadership style, and employee performance variables met the criteria that showed the consistency value of each indicator in measuring their constructs.

Coefficient of Determination

The coefficient of determination uses R-squared or adjusted R², which shows the percentage of variation in the endogenous/criterion construct and can be explained by the constructs hypothesized to affect it (exogenous/predictors).

Table 1.4 Test Results of the Coefficient of Determination Adjusted R-Squared

| | Adjusted R-squared |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Reward</i> | |
| <i>Punishment</i> | |
| Leadership Style | 0.742 |
| Employee Performance | 0.887 |

Source: Processed WarpPls 7.0 output, 2024

The output results in table 1.4 show the R-squared value of the Leadership Style is 0.742, which means that the leadership style is influenced by *rewards* and *punishments* by 74.2%, while the remaining 0.258 (25.8%) is influenced by other variables.

Model Fit and Quality Indices

To evaluate the model fit, it can be determined by several fit indicators, namely the average path coefficient (APC), average R-squared (ARS), and average adjusted R-squared (AARS). The overall fit index or quality indices can use Goodness of Fit criteria.

Table 1.5 Model Fit Test Results and Quality Indices

| Model fit and Quality Indices | Criteria | P-value | Index | Description |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------|-------|-------------|
| APC | Good if $P < 0.05$ | $P = 0.002$ | 0.385 | Accepted |
| ARS | Good if $P < 0.05$ | $P < 0.001$ | 0.826 | Accepted |
| AARS | Good if $P < 0.05$ | $P < 0.001$ | 0.814 | Accepted |
| Goodness of Fit | small ≥ 0.1 , medium ≥ 0.25 , large ≥ 0.36 | | 0.762 | Accepted |

Source: Processed WarpPls 7.0 output, 2024

Based on Table 1.5, the results of the Model Fit and Quality Indices analyses are as follows:

- a. The Average Path coefficient (APC) value has an index value of 0.385, with a P-value = 0.002 or <0.05, which indicates that the Average Path coefficients (APC) value meets the criteria for indicator fit indices.
- b. The Average R-Squared (ARS) value has an index value of 0.826 with a P-value of <0.001 or <0.05, so that the average R-squared (ARS) value meets the criteria.
- c. The Average Adjusted R-Squared (AARS) value has an index value of 0.814 with a P-value of <0.001 or p <0.05; therefore, the Average Adjusted R-Squared (AARS) value meets the criteria.
- d. The Tenenhaus Goodness of Fit (GoF) value has a value of 0.762 or ≥ 0.36 ; therefore, the value is classified as a large category. This means that the feasibility level of the research model has a large level of feasibility, which is worth 76.2%.

Hypothesis Test

Table 1.6 Hypothesis Test Results

| Hypothesis | Path coefficient | P-value | Explanation |
|--|------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| H ₁ <i>Reward</i> → Employee Performance | 0.280 | 0.031 | H ₁ Accepted |
| H ₂ <i>Punishment</i> → Employee Performance | 0.272 | 0.035 | H ₂ Accepted |
| H ₃ <i>Reward</i> → Leadership Style | 0.489 | <0.001 | H ₃ Accepted |
| H ₄ <i>Punishment</i> → Leadership Style | 0.429 | 0.002 | H ₄ Accepted |
| H ₅ Leadership Style → Employee Performance | 0.456 | <0.001 | H ₅ Accepted |
| H ₆ <i>Reward</i> → Leadership Style → Employee Performance | 0.223 | 0.020 | H ₆ Accepted |
| H ₇ <i>Punishment</i> → Leadership Style → Employee Performance | 0.196 | 0.037 | H ₇ Accepted |

Source: Processed WarpPls 7.0 output, 2024

Discussion

The Effect of Reward on Employee Performance

Based on Table 1.6, it can be seen that the path coefficient sign of 0.280 has a positive value, and the effect is declared significant because the *P-value* is 0.031, which means <0.05. Thus, the first hypothesis (H₁) which states that *rewards* affect employee performance, was accepted. This can be interpreted that giving *rewards* can improve employee performance

Effect of Reward and Punishment on Employee Performance with Leadership Style as an Intervening Variable

Rewards are raised to motivate someone to be active in carrying out their responsibilities because there is an assumption that by giving a reward for the results of their work, employees will work more optimally, which means that they will improve their performance. Essentially, rewards are needed to stimulate employees to improve the quality of their work. According to Febrianti (2014), the reward system is used as a form of leadership reaction to employee performance. The results of this study are in line with previous research conducted by Forbeshu and Edalmen (2023), Desiyani, Agustiansyah, and Febriani (2023), and Azizah and Betari (2023), which states that *rewards have* a significant effect on employee performance.

The Effect of *Punishment* on Employee Performance

Based on Table 1.6, it can be seen that the path coefficient sign of 0.272 has a positive value, and the effect is declared significant because the P-value is 0.035, which means <0.05 . Thus, the second hypothesis (H_2), which states that *Punishment Affects Employee Performance*, is supported. This means that an increasing proportion of punishments has a significant impact on employee performance.

This shows that the fairer the punishment given to PT Angkasa Pura II Pekanbaru in accordance with the mistakes made by employees, the more it improves employee performance. This indicates that punishing employees who violate it can actually increase employee discipline again, which, of course, can increase employee discipline again, which will further improve their performance. This research is in line with research conducted by Nia (2023), Silva, Agus, and Safitri (2023), and (Adityarini, 2022) showing that *punishment* has a significant effect on employee performance.

The Effect of Reward on Leadership Style

Based on Table 1.6, it can be seen that the path coefficient sign of 0.489 has a positive value, and the effect is declared significant because the P-value <0.001 , which means <0.05 . Thus, the third hypothesis (H_3) which states that *Reward Affects Leadership Style*.

Rewards, both material and non-material, are believed to influence leaders' behavior in determining the leadership style they apply. Leaders who provide rewards or incentives to team members who perform well tend to adopt a more supportive and motivating leadership style, such as transformational leadership. Conversely, inappropriate or inconsistent rewards may cause leaders to adopt a more authoritarian or supervision-oriented style. In this case, rewards serve as a motivating factor that can shape leaders' attitudes and approaches to team management, and how they encourage subordinate performance and motivation.

The Effect of Punishment on Leadership Style

Based on Table 1.6, it can be seen that the path coefficient sign of 0.429 has a positive value, and the effect is declared significant because the P-value is 0.002, which means <0.05 . So that the fourth hypothesis (H_4) which states that *Punishment Affects Leadership Style* is accepted

Punishment, whether in the form of direct punishment or negative consequences, encourages leaders to adopt an authoritarian leadership style, with close supervision, to ensure compliance. While effective for short-term compliance, excessive or unfair use of punishment can decrease motivation, trust, and the quality of relationships between leaders and subordinates, ultimately negatively affecting leadership performance and effectiveness.

The Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Performance

Based on Table 1.6, it can be seen that the path coefficient sign of 0.456 has a positive value, and the effect is declared significant because the P-value < 0.001 , which means < 0.05 . Thus, the fifth hypothesis (H_5), which states that Leadership Style Affects Employee Performance, was accepted. This can be interpreted that providing leadership style can improve employee performance

Leadership style is a pattern of behavior that leaders prefer in the process of directing and influencing workers. Every leader has his own leadership style. The success of the company is basically supported by its effective leadership, in which he can influence his subordinates to arouse their work motivation to participate in common goals. This research is in line with research conducted by Mukti (2021) and Elazhari et al. (2021), showing that leadership style has a significant effect on employee performance.

The Effect of Reward on Employee Performance Mediated by Leadership Style

Based on Table 1.6, it can be seen that the path coefficient sign of 0.223 has a positive value, and the effect is declared significant because the P-value is 0.020, which means < 0.05 . Thus sixth hypothesis (H_6) which states that rewards affect employee performance mediated by leadership style, is accepted.

When rewards are delivered with the right strategy and supported by an appropriate leadership style, their positive influence on employee performance becomes more significant. Empirical studies have shown that leaders who are able to integrate reward delivery with supportive leadership approaches, such as good communication, trust, and motivation, tend to result in higher employee performance. Therefore, a leadership style effectively strengthens the relationship between rewards and employee performance.

The Effect of Punishment on Employee Performance Mediated by Leadership Style

Based on Table 1.6, it can be seen that the path coefficient sign of 0.196 has a positive value, and the effect is declared significant because the P-value is 0.037, which means < 0.05 . Thus, the seventh hypothesis (H_7) which states that punishment affects employee performance through leadership style, is accepted.

Appropriately applied punishment can be a tool to correct employee behavior that is not in accordance with company standards. Leadership style plays an important role in determining how punishments affect employees. Leaders who apply an authoritarian style use punishment to ensure compliance through tight control, whereas democratic or transformational leaders may use punishment as part of a developmental approach, providing opportunities for employees to learn from mistakes. If punishment is applied through an

Effect of Reward and Punishment on Employee Performance with Leadership Style as an Intervening Variable

effective leadership style in accordance with the needs of the organization, employee performance will improve.

Conclusion

The following conclusions were drawn based on the results of this study.

1. Reward has a significant effect on the performance of PT Angkasa Pura II Pekanbaru employees. The more effective the reward, the more employee performance will increase.
2. Punishment had a significant effect on the performance of PT Angkasa Pura II Pekanbaru employees. The more appropriate the punishment, the more employee performance increases.
3. Reward has a significant effect on PT Angkasa Pura II Pekanbaru's leadership style. The more effective the reward, the more ideal the leadership style.
4. Punishment has a significant effect on PT Angkasa Pura II Pekanbaru's leadership style. The more appropriate the punishment, the more ideal the leadership style will be.
5. Leadership style has a significant effect on the performance of PT Angkasa Pura II Pekanbaru employees. The more ideal the leadership style is, the more employee performance will increase.
6. Reward has a significant effect on employee performance, with leadership style as an intervening variable in PT Angkasa Pura II Pekanbaru. The more effective the reward, the more ideal the leadership style, and in turn, will improve employee performance.
7. Punishment has a significant effect on employee performance, with leadership style as an intervening variable in PT Angkasa Pura II Pekanbaru. The more appropriate the punishment given, the more ideal the leadership style, and in turn, will improve employee performance.

Suggestion

Based on this discussion, several suggestions can be put forward that need to be considered by the Angkasa Pura II Pekanbaru Company, including: (1) Evaluate the amount of incentives to be more competitive and proportional, and socialize the mechanism for providing incentives clearly. (2) Increase socialization and regular training so that employees understand the purpose and benefits of creating SOP regulations and carry out consistent monitoring to provide optimal results. (3) Pay attention to leaders' attitudes to be more actively involved in helping employees who are experiencing difficulties, encourage open two-way communication, and provide leadership training. (4) Provide training and clear guidance on performance standards, and improve supervision and feedback. Socialize the importance of quality work, create a supportive work environment, and reward employees who consistently demonstrate optimal work results.

Suggestions for further research are expected to develop this research by examining other factors that are considered to have a greater relationship and make a major contribution,

such as motivation and the work environment. Future researchers can examine the same variables but in different locations, and expand the area under study so that the results achieved are more optimal.

References

- Adityarini, C. (2022). Pengaruh Reward dan Punishment Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 1(6), 1430–1439.
- Azizah, S. N., & Betari, G. S. (2023). Pengaruh Penghargaan dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Studi pada Penjualan Produk CV. Primarasa Sejahtera). *Al Qalam: Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan dan Kemasyarakatan*, 17(2), 712.
- Desiyani, R. E., Agustiansyah, L. D., & Febriani, P. (2023). Pengaruh Reward dan Punishment Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Indomarco Prismaatama Area Kabupaten Serang. *Indonesian Journal of Business and Management*, 3(2), 848–857.
- Forbeshu, C., & Edalmen, E. (2023). Pengaruh Reward, Punishment dan Kepemimpinan terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Air Emas. *Jurnal Manajerial Dan Kewirausahaan*, 5(1), 231–240.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, J. H., & Konopaske, R. (2008). *Organizations Behavior Structure Processes*. Thirteenth Edition.
- Handoko, T. H. (2008). *Manajemen personalia dan sumberdaya manusia*.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2013). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*.
- Nia, M. S. (2023). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan, Reward dan Punishment Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Di Masa Pandemi Covid-19 Pada Pt Buton Mandiri Perdana. *jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Manajemen*, 12.
- Pramesti, R. A., Sambul, S. A. P., & Rumawas, W. (2019). Pengaruh Reward Dan Punishment Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan KFC Artha Gading. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 9(1), 57–63.
- Rivai, V. (2004). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Untuk Perusahaan*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Robbins, S. P. (2006). *Perilaku organisasi*, edisi bahasa indonesia. Jakarta: PT. Indeks Kelompok Gramedia.
- Silva, S., Agus, A., & Safitri, H. M. (2023). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Reward Dan Punishment Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Di Dinas Pertanian Kabupaten Aceh Barat Daya. *Jurnal Visioner & Strategis*, 12(1), 31–39.
- Suryadilaga, R. M., Musadieg, M. Al, & Nurtjahjono, G. E. (2016). Pengaruh Reward Dan Punishment Terhadap Kinerja (Studi Pada Karyawan PT Telkom Indonesia Witel Jatim Selatan Malang). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB)*, 39(1), 156–163.
- Thompson, M. (2003). *High Performance Work Organisation in UK Aerospace*.