Research Article

The Effect of Work Environment, Leadership Styles, and Work Ethics on Employee Productivity at Pt XYZ

[1]Suhendra, Wiko, [2]Abdulah Rakhman
[1,2]Management Department, Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Kwik Kian Gie, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Abstract: This study investigates the effect of work environment, leadership styles, and work ethics on employee productivity at PT XYZ, focusing on identifying how these factors collectively influence performance. The research employs Social Exchange Theory (SET), Job Characteristics Theory (JCT), Work Value Theory (WVT), and Transformational Leadership Theory (TLT) to explore the interplay between work environment, leadership approaches, and ethical standards in driving productivity. A quantitative approach using survey data highlights that a supportive work environment and strong work ethics significantly enhance employee productivity. However, the impact of leadership styles was inconclusive, suggesting the need for more adaptable leadership practices. These findings emphasize the importance of aligning leadership styles and ethical practices with employee needs to foster a high-performing organizational culture.

Keywords: Work Environment, Leadership Styles, Work Ethics, Employee Productivity, Organizational Culture.

I. INTRODUCTION

Organizations like PT XYZ face increasing challenges in optimizing employee productivity in today's competitive healthcare environment. A supportive work environment, effective leadership styles, and strong work ethics are crucial factors influencing productivity, especially amidst the diverse expectations of a multigenerational workforce. Social Exchange Theory (SET) [1] emphasizes the importance of reciprocal relationships between employees and the organization, suggesting that a positive work environment and strong work ethics foster employee engagement and enhanced productivity. Job Characteristics Theory (JCT) [2] further underscores the impact of work environment design, suggesting that job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation, driven by job enrichment, are key to improving productivity. Additionally, Workplace Value Theory (WVT) [3] emphasizes that aligning personal and organizational values can enhance work ethics, thereby boosting productivity. Transformational Leadership Theory (TLT) [3] also plays a pivotal role by asserting that leadership behaviours—such as vision-setting, motivation, and individualized consideration—can inspire employees to exceed their performance expectations.

While existing literature has acknowledged the significant role of work environment and work ethics in driving employee productivity [1] [3], limited research has explored the interaction between these factors and leadership styles within healthcare organizations. Most studies have focused on isolated effects or have been conducted in non-healthcare contexts, overlooking the complex interplay of work environment, leadership practices, and work ethics in influencing productivity [4] [5]. This gap is particularly critical for healthcare organizations like PT XYZ, which face unique challenges that require a holistic approach to enhancing employee productivity. Integrating these dimensions can lead to more targeted and effective strategies for improving organizational performance [3].

The theoretical framework of this study integrates four key perspectives. First, Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Blau, 1964) focuses on how reciprocal relationships between employees and the organization enhance motivation and productivity. Second, Job Characteristics Theory (JCT) [2] highlights the importance of job design in fostering job satisfaction and increasing performance. Third, Workplace Value Theory (WVT) [3] examines how aligning personal and organizational values enhances work ethics, thus improving employee performance. Finally, Transformational Leadership Theory (TLT) [3] underscores the impact of leadership styles on employee engagement and productivity through vision setting and individualized support. This integrated theoretical approach provides a comprehensive framework for analysing the relationships between work environment, leadership styles, and work ethics, allowing PT XYZ to develop more context-sensitive and effective strategies for improving employee productivity.

The primary goal of this research is to examine how the work environment, leadership styles, and work ethics influence employee productivity at PT XYZ. By applying SET, JCT, WVT, and TLT, the study investigates how the work environment's physical, psychological, and social dimensions contribute to job satisfaction and productivity. It also evaluates how different leadership styles impact performance, providing valuable insights into the drivers of employee productivity. Additionally, the

research emphasizes the role of work ethics, which includes the intrinsic commitment to integrity, responsibility, accountability, and collaboration. This study offers a comprehensive perspective on productivity by exploring how work ethics, as influenced by organizational culture and individual values, contribute to motivation and work performance. This integrative approach aims to inform strategies to optimize organizational effectiveness, strengthen work ethics, and improve performance in a diverse and modern workplace.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A) Social Exchange Theory

initially developed by Blau [3], posits that social behavior is the result of an exchange process where individuals engage in interactions that provide reciprocal benefits. According to SET, employees assess the costs and rewards of their interactions with the organization and are motivated by the expectation of positive outcomes such as rewards, support, and recognition (Blau, 1964). In this context, the work environment, including physical and social elements, plays a critical role in shaping these exchanges, where fair treatment, trust, and mutual respect between employees and the organization enhance engagement and productivity. SET emphasizes the importance of perceived organizational support and the reciprocal nature of work relationships, which foster employee commitment and contribute to higher levels of organizational performance [6]. In this research, SET categorizes work-related behaviors as a continuous cycle of give-and-take, where employees' positive perceptions of their work environment and leadership lead to enhanced job satisfaction and productivity.

B) Job Characteristics Theory

Job Characteristics Theory (JCT), developed by Hackman and Oldham [6], posits that the design of a job plays a crucial role in shaping employee motivation, satisfaction, and performance. According to JCT, five core job dimensions—skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback—are central to determining the psychological states that lead to improved job satisfaction and productivity. When jobs are designed to offer employees opportunities for skill utilization, meaningful work, and autonomy, they are more likely to experience intrinsic motivation, which enhances overall performance [2] [7]. In this study, JCT is categorized into two key areas: the structural characteristics of the job (i.e., the job's design elements) and the psychological states that result from those characteristics (e.g., experienced meaningfulness and responsibility). These dimensions are expected to contribute to employee productivity by fostering engagement and commitment, especially in complex, dynamic work environments like PT XYZ.

C) Workplace Value Theory

Workplace Value Theory (WVT) focuses on the alignment between individual employees' and organizational values and how this alignment influences employee behavior and outcomes. According to Schneider et al. (2017), when there is congruence between an individual's values and the values promoted by the organization, employees are more likely to experience higher job satisfaction, motivation, and productivity. WVT categorizes workplace values into two primary components: organizational values (the core principles and culture guiding the organization) and personal values (the beliefs and priorities employees bring to the workplace). The theory posits that the stronger the alignment between these two sets of values, the greater the likelihood of enhanced performance and employee engagement (Schneider et al., 2017). In the context of this research, WVT provides a framework for understanding how organizational culture, supported by shared values, influences employee productivity at PT XYZ by fostering a positive work environment and ethical practices.

D) Transformational and Transactional Leadership

Transformational and transactional leadership represent two key approaches in leadership, each playing a distinct role in influencing employee performance and organizational outcomes. Transformational leadership, as defined by Bass and Avolio [8], is characterized by a leader's ability to inspire, motivate, and intellectually stimulate employees through the articulation of a compelling vision and individualized consideration. In contrast, transactional leadership focuses on setting clear objectives, rewarding desired behaviours, and applying corrective measures when performance deviates from established standards [9]. These leadership styles can be categorized into a complementary framework where transformational leadership drives long-term innovation and employee engagement, while transactional leadership ensures short-term efficiency and accountability [5] [10]. This integrated perspective provides a comprehensive understanding of how different leadership approaches can be strategically leveraged to enhance individual and organizational performance.

E) Work Environment

The work environment refers to employees' overall conditions, encompassing physical, psychological, and social factors that influence behaviour and performance [11]. It includes tangible elements such as office layout, ergonomics, lighting, and noise control, and intangible aspects like psychological safety, stress management, and interpersonal relationships among colleagues [12] [13]. Based on these components, the work environment can be categorized into three primary dimensions: the physical dimension, which pertains to the design and facilities of the workplace; the psychological dimension, which involves employees' emotional well-being and job satisfaction; and the social dimension, which covers team dynamics and organizational

culture [14]. Together, these dimensions create a holistic framework that is pivotal in enhancing employee productivity by fostering an atmosphere that supports individual and collective performance.

F) Leadership Styles

Leadership styles represent leaders' approaches to influence, motivate, and guide employees in achieving organizational goals. According to Bass and Avolio [8] and Burns [9], transformational leadership is characterized by the ability to inspire and empower followers through a compelling vision and individualized support, whereas transactional leadership relies on clearly defined roles, rewards, and corrective actions to manage performance. Moreover, situational leadership theories emphasize that the effectiveness of a leadership style is contingent upon the specific context and needs of employees, thus requiring adaptability in leadership practices [5] [10]. Together, these perspectives enable the categorization of leadership styles into transformational, transactional, and situational dimensions, providing a comprehensive framework for understanding how different leadership approaches can affect organizational performance.

G) Work Ethics

Work ethics refers to the set of moral principles, values, and attitudes that guide individual behaviour in the workplace, influencing both personal performance and overall organizational success [15] [16]. It can be conceptualized and categorized into key dimensions such as integrity, which involves honesty and transparency; commitment to excellence, reflecting a dedication to high-quality work and continuous improvement; responsibility, encompassing accountability and reliability in task execution; and collaboration, emphasizing effective teamwork and mutual support [17] [18]. Together, these dimensions provide a holistic framework that illustrates how robust work ethics foster a positive organizational culture, ultimately driving enhanced employee productivity.

H) Employee Productivity

Employee productivity is defined as the efficiency and effectiveness of completing tasks to achieve organizational goals, encompassing the quantity and quality of work output [19]. This concept can be conceptualized as a multidimensional construct that includes several key dimensions: task efficiency, which refers to the ability to complete tasks within designated timeframes and with optimal use of resources; work quality, which involves accuracy, precision, and adherence to organizational standards; initiative and problem-solving, which reflects the employee's capacity to proactively address challenges and generate innovative solutions; collaboration and teamwork, which highlights the importance of effective communication and mutual support among colleagues; and dependability and accountability, which denote reliability in fulfilling job responsibilities [20] [20] [3]. Together, these dimensions form a comprehensive framework for evaluating employee performance, contributing to overall organizational success.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK and HYPOTHESIS

A) The Effect of Work Environment on Employee Productivity

The effect of the work environment on employee productivity can be understood through the lens of Social Exchange Theory (SET), Job Characteristics Theory (JCT), and Workplace Value Theory (WVT). SET suggests that positive relationships in the workplace, rooted in mutual trust and respect, foster employee engagement and productivity [1]. A supportive work environment, characterized by clear communication, adequate resources, and supportive interpersonal relationships, creates a foundation for employees to contribute effectively, enhancing their productivity [19]. JCT emphasizes that job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation, which are closely linked to the work environment, play a pivotal role in determining an employee's performance [2]. A well-designed work environment that promotes autonomy, task variety, and feedback leads to higher levels of engagement and productivity [7]. WVT, on the other hand, posits that when employees' values align with the organization's environment and culture, it fosters a positive work atmosphere, driving motivation and improving performance [3]. Based on these theoretical perspectives, the following hypothesis is proposed: H1: A supportive work environment has a significant positive effect on employee productivity by providing optimal physical and psychological conditions for performance.

B) The Effect of Leadership Styles on Employee Productivity

The effect of leadership styles on employee productivity can be examined through the lens of Transformational Leadership Theory (TLT), Social Exchange Theory (SET), and Workplace Value Theory (WVT). TLT suggests that leaders who inspire and motivate employees by creating a compelling vision and fostering trust and respect contribute to higher employee engagement and productivity [21]. Transformational leaders stimulate intrinsic motivation, providing intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration, which enhances performance by aligning employees' values with organizational goals [8]. In contrast, Transactional Leadership, another critical leadership style, emphasizes task completion through structured rewards and punishments, which can also drive productivity in more task-oriented environments [21]. SET further supports this by emphasizing that when leadership behaviors foster mutual trust and positive exchanges, employees are more likely to be motivated and perform well [1]. WVT complements these perspectives by highlighting that when employees' values align with the leadership style and organizational culture, it fosters a work environment conducive to high performance [3]). Based on these

theoretical underpinnings, the following hypothesis is proposed: H2: Effective leadership styles, encompassing both transformational and transactional approaches, significantly enhance employee productivity by motivating employees and establishing clear performance expectations.

C) *The Effect of Work Ethics on Employee Productivity*

The effect of work ethics on employee productivity can be understood through the lens of Workplace Value Theory (WVT), Social Exchange Theory (SET), and Job Characteristics Theory (JCT). WVT emphasizes the alignment of personal and organizational values, suggesting that when employees' ethical standards align with organizational values, it fosters a culture of trust and responsibility, leading to higher productivity [3]. SET also supports this, positing that positive exchanges and mutual trust between employees and organizations, grounded in ethical behavior, encourage greater engagement and work performance [1]. Job Characteristics Theory (JCT) also highlights that work ethics, such as commitment and responsibility, shape intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction, enhancing job performance [2]. Employees who uphold strong work ethics demonstrate integrity, accountability, and a commitment to excellence, which creates a positive organizational culture that drives continuous improvement and higher productivity [22]. Based on these theoretical perspectives, the following hypothesis is proposed: H3: Strong work ethics, characterized by integrity, commitment, and accountability, significantly boost employee productivity by cultivating an ethical work culture that promotes continuous improvement and high performance.

IV. METHODS

A) *Research Design*

This study adopts a quantitative research design to examine the effects of the work environment, leadership styles, and work ethics on employee productivity at PT XYZ, focusing on understanding how these factors influence productivity in a multigenerational workforce. A quantitative approach allows for the systematic measurement of key variables and statistical analysis to uncover relationships, trends, and patterns in employee productivity (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). By using this method, the study aims to provide objective, reliable, and generalizable insights into how the work environment, leadership styles, and work ethics interact to shape productivity outcomes in the context of PT XYZ.

B) *Data Collection and Sampling Techniques*

Primary data for this study were gathered through a structured survey questionnaire designed using a Likert scale to assess respondents' perceptions of the work environment, leadership styles, work ethics, and productivity. The questionnaire included multiple items for each variable to ensure thorough coverage of the constructs being studied [23]. A judgment sampling technique was used to select respondents, specifically targeting employees at PT XYZ who are actively involved in daily operations and represent various generational cohorts. This sampling method ensures the data reflects the perspectives of employees who directly experience the factors influencing productivity [24].

C) *Data Analysis*

So, to analyse the relationships between the work environment, leadership styles, work ethics, and employee productivity, this study employs multiple regression analysis. This statistical method evaluates the strength and direction of the relationships between the independent variables (work environment, leadership styles, and work ethics) and employee productivity while examining potential moderating effects from generational differences. Multiple regression analysis provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how these factors collectively influence productivity at PT XYZ and offers insights into their combined impact in a multigenerational context [25].

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A) *Results*

a. Validity and Reliability Test

Table 1: Validity & Reliability Test

Descriptions	Employee Productivity	Work Environment	Leadership Styles	Work Ethics
Pearson's Correlation Coefficients	Above 0.361	Above 0.361	Above 0.361	Above 0.361
Cronbach's Alpha	0.957	0.926	0.950	0.900

Table 1 presents the results of the validity and reliability tests for the research instruments measuring employee productivity, work environment, leadership styles, and work ethics. All items for each variable yielded Pearson's correlation coefficients above the threshold of 0.361, confirming that the instruments are valid measures of the intended constructs. In addition, Cronbach's alpha values were 0.957 for Employee Productivity, 0.926 for Work Environment, 0.950 for Leadership

Styles, and 0.900 for Work Ethics, demonstrating high internal consistency and reliability [24]. These results indicate that the instruments used in this study are robust and can reliably capture the variables of interest.

b. Descriptive Statistics

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Employee Productivity	Work Environment	Leadership Styles	Work Ethics
Mean	4.282	3.923	3.879	4.389
Std. Deviation	0.695	0.941	0.878	0.694

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the key variables in this study. Employee Productivity is rated highly, with a mean score of 4.282 and a relatively low standard deviation of 0.695, indicating consistently high performance among employees. The Work Environment received a mean of 3.923 with a standard deviation of 0.941, while Leadership Styles had a slightly lower mean of 3.879 and a standard deviation of 0.878, suggesting moderate perceptions and variability in these areas. Notably, Work Ethics is rated the highest with a mean of 4.389 and a standard deviation of 0.694, demonstrating that respondents consistently view ethical behavior in the workplace favorably. These statistics suggest that although employee productivity and work ethics are perceived positively, there is moderate variability in perceptions of the work environment and leadership styles, indicating potential areas for targeted improvement.

c. Classical Assumption Test

Table 3: Classical Assumption Test

Assumption Testing	Requirement	Testing Output
Normality	P-value ≥ 0.05	**Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed): 0.117**
Multicollinearity	VIF < 10	2.877/2.470/1.699
	Tolerance > 0.1	0.348/0.405/0.589
Heteroscedasticity	P-value ≥ 0.05	*Spearman's rho (Sig.2-tailed)* 0.197/0.071/0.064

Table 3 summarizes the results of the classical assumption tests for the research model. The normality assumption is satisfied, as the Monte Carlo significance (2-tailed) value of 0.117 exceeds the required threshold of 0.05. Additionally, the multicollinearity assumption is met, with all Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values (2.877, 2.470, 1.699) well below 10 and tolerance values (0.348, 0.405, 0.589) exceeding 0.1, indicating minimal collinearity among the predictors. Furthermore, the heteroscedasticity assumption is confirmed, with Spearman's rho significance values (0.197, 0.071, 0.064) all above 0.05, demonstrating that the variance of the residuals is homogeneous.

d. Model and Hypothesis Testing

The regression model indicates a strong overall fit, with an R² value of 0.702, meaning that the combined influence of the work environment, leadership styles, and work ethics explains 70.2% of the variance in employee productivity. Moreover, the F-test produced an F-value of 212.528 with a significance level of 0.000, which is well below the conventional threshold of 0.05, confirming that the model is statistically significant and robust in predicting employee productivity.

Table 4: Regression Outputs

Testing	Requirement	Testing Output	
	-	0.702	
F-test	P-value < 0.05	F = 212.528 & Sig. = 0.000	
t-test		Beta	P-value
Work Environment	Sig < 0.05	.146	0.010
Leadership Styles	Sig < 0.05	-.094	0.072
Work Ethics	Sig < 0.05	.795	0.000

When examining individual predictors, the work environment significantly affects employee productivity, as reflected by a beta coefficient of 0.146 and a p-value of 0.010. In contrast, leadership styles exhibit a negative relationship with productivity, with a beta coefficient of -0.094 and a p-value of 0.072, suggesting that its effect is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Work ethics, however, demonstrate a strong and highly significant positive impact on productivity, with a beta coefficient of 0.795 and a p-value of 0.000. These findings highlight that while the work environment and work ethics are key drivers of productivity, the influence of leadership styles remains inconclusive in this model.

B) Discussion

a. The Effect of Work Environment on Employee Productivity

This study found that a supportive work environment positively impacts employee productivity at PT XYZ, with physical comfort, psychological safety, and supportive social dynamics playing key roles. While favorable conditions like office layout and lighting support productivity, noise and ergonomics need improvement. Enhancing psychological aspects, such as creating a safe space for idea-sharing and better stress management, could further boost productivity and foster a more supportive work environment at PT XYZ.

The findings of this study align with the Social Exchange Theory (SET), which posits that positive work environments build trust and foster mutual relationships, motivating employees to perform better [1]. This theory suggests that a supportive environment increases motivation by creating reciprocal relationships between employees and the organization. The results also reflect Job Characteristics Theory (JCT), which highlights that an environment conducive to satisfaction—through proper task design and resources—enhances intrinsic motivation and productivity [2]. The Workplace Value Theory (WVT) further supports these findings, emphasizing that aligning individual and organizational values fosters an environment conducive to ethical behavior and productivity [3]. These theories collectively show that while a positive work environment is essential for productivity, factors such as task complexity and individual preferences might limit its full impact.

The modest impact of the work environment on productivity can be explained through the conceptual framework, which integrates SET, JCT, and WVT. SET suggests that while positive work environments foster trust and motivation, external factors like the complexity of tasks or individual differences can moderate these effects [1]. JCT emphasizes the importance of physical and psychological work conditions. Still, the alignment of task autonomy and skill variety with employees' needs may not always be in sync, which can reduce the overall impact on productivity (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Additionally, WVT indicates that aligning individual values with organizational culture can drive productivity. Still, a disconnect—such as mismatched cultural fit or leadership practices—could weaken the environment's influence on performance [3]. Thus, while the work environment is crucial, organisational and individual factors moderated its impact on productivity.

This study offers a more nuanced understanding of how the work environment influences employee productivity compared to previous research. While earlier studies consistently emphasized the positive impact of various work environment elements such as leadership, organizational culture, and physical conditions [26] [27], this research integrates the work environment's physical, psychological, and social dimensions. Unlike studies that examined individual factors in isolation, this research emphasizes the combined influence of these elements on productivity. Khairani et al. [28] suggested that the relationship between work environment and work ethic varies, highlighting the role of context and workplace characteristics, a perspective that this study further explores. The results provide new insights into the complex interactions between work environment elements and productivity, contributing to the literature with a deeper understanding of this dynamic [29].

Based on the findings, PT XYZ should focus on improving physical aspects such as office layout and lighting while addressing noise and ergonomic factors to enhance employee comfort and productivity. Psychological safety and stress management should also be prioritized to create a more supportive work environment. Additionally, fostering open communication, aligning organizational values with employees' values, and enhancing management support will strengthen the work environment, increasing productivity and employee satisfaction. Regular assessments and continuous improvement efforts are necessary to ensure these initiatives effectively contribute to a sustainable and motivating workplace [3] [12].

b. The Effect of Leadership Styles on Employee Productivity

This study explored whether leadership styles influence employee productivity at PT XYZ. However, the findings revealed that the effect of leadership styles on productivity was inconclusive, contradicting theoretical predictions that typically emphasize the positive impact of leadership on employee performance. The results suggest that the leadership approaches adopted at PT XYZ may not align with the company's culture or employees' expectations, leading to an unclear effect on productivity.

The inconclusive impact of leadership on productivity can be explained by several contextual and individual factors, as outlined by the theoretical lens in this study. According to Social Exchange Theory (SET), leadership is expected to foster trust and positive relationships, enhancing productivity. Still, other factors might weaken this effect, such as the work environment and employee motivation [1]. Job Characteristics Theory (JCT) supports this by stating that task design and intrinsic motivation are crucial for productivity, which may overshadow direct leadership influence [2]). Furthermore, Transformational Leadership Theory (TLT) and Workplace Value Theory (WVT) highlight that leadership effectiveness depends on alignment with organizational culture and employee values. This may explain why leadership had varying effects on productivity in PT XYZ.

The inconclusive results regarding leadership styles' impact on employee productivity can be attributed to the complex interplay of contextual and individual factors. While Transformational and Transactional Leadership theories propose clear mechanisms such as vision setting and rewards to enhance productivity [8] [9], practical implementation can vary depending on employee characteristics, organizational culture, and operational dynamics [5]. The diversity of the workforce at PT XYZ may also influence how different generational cohorts respond to leadership behaviours, which is supported by the findings of Twenge et al. [4]. Situational Leadership Theory [30] further emphasizes that leadership effectiveness requires adaptation to team-specific needs, suggesting that a mismatch between leadership styles and employee preferences or organizational challenges may result in ambiguous outcomes.

This study contrasts with previous research, which generally emphasizes the positive impact of leadership on organizational outcomes. For example, Aquino et al. [31] found that spiritual leadership positively affects work ethic and productivity, while Lestari et al. [29] showed that transformational leadership boosts competence and productivity. However, this study highlights the complexity of leadership's effect on productivity. It stresses the importance of considering how leadership styles interact with employee characteristics and organizational context, as seen in studies by Siregar et al. [32] and Setiawan [33].

In response to the inconclusive effect of leadership on employee productivity, PT XYZ should adopt a multifaceted approach to improve leadership effectiveness and better align with employee needs. The company should prioritize personalized leadership training to ensure leaders communicate a clear vision, set expectations, and actively engage with employees' professional development [8]. Furthermore, PT XYZ should focus on fostering a more collaborative environment by promoting participative leadership, which can enhance communication and teamwork and encourage greater flexibility in leadership practices to adapt to the diverse needs of employees and teams [30]. By addressing these aspects, PT XYZ can better meet employee expectations and enhance organisational productivity.

c. The Effect of Work Ethics on Employee Productivity

This study aims to investigate the impact of work ethics on employee productivity at PT XYZ. The findings reveal a strong and positive relationship between work ethics and productivity, supporting the hypothesis that a solid work ethic enhances performance. Employees demonstrating integrity, responsibility, commitment to excellence, and adaptability show higher productivity levels. This highlights the importance of fostering ethical behaviour in the workplace to improve organizational efficiency and success.

The positive relationship between work ethics and employee productivity aligns with several theoretical perspectives. According to Social Exchange Theory (SET), strong work ethics foster trust and respect in the workplace, leading to higher employee engagement and productivity [1]. Job Characteristics Theory (JCT) suggests that intrinsic motivation driven by strong work ethics increases job satisfaction and performance, especially in structured work environments [2]. Furthermore, Workplace Value Theory (WVT) emphasizes that alignment between employee and organizational values encourages ethical behaviour, leading to higher productivity [3].

The findings of this study are consistent with existing academic perspectives on work ethics. Researchers like Weiss [15] and Velasquez [16] argue that work ethics drive motivation and performance by instilling a sense of responsibility and commitment. O'Rourke et al. [34] highlight that strong work ethics create a culture of accountability, fostering better performance and greater productivity. Collins [35] and Chesnut [17] further explain that when employees' personal values align with organizational values, it strengthens their work ethic and productivity.

This study builds on previous research by providing a more direct and integrated view of how work ethics affect employee productivity. Previous studies have shown that ethical behaviour influences performance, but often indirectly. For instance, Zainal et al. [36] found that intrinsic motivation, a key component of work ethics, directly improves performance, while moral attitudes have no significant effect. Sattar et al. [37] also pointed out that work ethics indirectly enhance productivity through organizational citizenship behaviour and other mediating factors. This study expands these findings by establishing a more direct and substantial link between work ethics and productivity.

Considering the positive relationship between work ethics and employee productivity, PT XYZ should consider targeted strategies to enhance work ethics across the organization. Strengthening communication, promoting ethical decision-making, and encouraging collaboration and respect among coworkers are key areas to focus on [15] and [16]. Additionally, investing in professional development opportunities that emphasize adaptability and continuous learning will support the growth and performance of employees, ensuring long-term success [34] [17]. These actions will help sustain the positive relationship between work ethics and productivity and cultivate a long-term successful work culture.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study presents a surprising finding regarding the impact of leadership styles on employee productivity at PT XYZ. Contrary to the conventional expectations that leadership positively influences employee motivation and performance, the study found that leadership styles, in their current form, do not effectively align with the organizational culture and employee expectations, resulting in an inconclusive impact on productivity. This outcome challenges traditional assumptions and highlights the need for a more adaptive, context-sensitive leadership approach tailored to the unique dynamics of the workforce and organizational environment.

This research's theoretical framework and methodology are suitable for investigating the effects of work environment, leadership styles, and work ethics on employee productivity. Social Exchange Theory (SET) [1] helps to explore how positive work environments foster trust and mutual relationships, motivating employees to enhance performance. Job Characteristics Theory (JCT) [2] underscores how intrinsic motivation, driven by a conducive work environment, improves job satisfaction and productivity. Furthermore, Work Value Theory (WVT) [3] highlights aligning organizational and individual values to enhance employee engagement and performance. Transformational Leadership Theory (TLT) [8] provides insights into how leadership styles inspire and motivate employees to achieve high productivity. By using a quantitative methodology, this study offers measurable results and valuable insights into the factors influencing employee productivity.

While this study offers valuable insights into the effects of work environment, leadership styles, and work ethics on employee productivity, it has several limitations. The exclusive use of a quantitative approach may overlook the qualitative nuances of employee experiences that could further enrich the findings [38]. Additionally, the reliance on self-reported data could introduce biases, such as social desirability or inaccurate self-assessment [39]. Furthermore, the study's focus on a single organization, PT XYZ, limits the generalizability of the findings to other industries with different workforce dynamics [40]. Future research could address these limitations by adopting a mixed-methods approach, incorporating a broader sample from various industries, and exploring how leadership styles can be tailored to better meet employee needs and organizational challenges to enhance productivity and performance.

Interest Conflicts

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. Both authors have contributed equally to the research and writing process and affirm that no financial, professional, or personal relationships could be perceived as influencing the findings presented in this study.

V. REFERENCES

[1] Blau PM. Exchange and power in social life. John Wiley & Sons; 2017. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203792643.
[2] Hackman JR, Oldham GR. Motivation through the design of work: a test of a theory. Organ Behav Hum Perform 1976;16:250–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7.
[3] Schneider B, Yost AB, Kropp A, Kind C, Lam H. Workforce engagement: What it is, why it matters, and how to achieve it. Organ Dyn 2017;46:1–10.
[4] Twenge JM, Campbell SM, Hoffman BJ, Lance CE. Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. J Manage 2010;36:1117–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352246.
[5] Northouse PG. Leadership: Theory and practice. Sage Publications; 2021.
[6] Eisenberger R, Fasolo P, Davis-LaMastro V. Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Diligence, Commitment, and Innovation. J Appl Psychol 1990;75:51–9. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.1.51.
[7] Hackman JR, Oldham GR. Work Redesign, Addison-Wesley. Addison-Wesley; 1980.
[8] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*. Sage Publications; 1994
[9] Burns JM. Leadership. Harper & Row; 1978.
[10] Stashevsky S, Burke RJ. Leadership in organizations. vol. 27. 8th ed. Pearson Education; 2006. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijm.2006.01627aaa.001.
[11] Lee SY, Brand JL. Control over office workspace affects perceptions of the work environment and work outcomes. J Environ Psychol 2005;25:323–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2005.08.001.
[12] Zhenjing G, Chupradit S, Ku KY, Nassani AA, Haffar M. Impact of Employees' Workplace Environment on Employees' Performance: A Multi-Mediation Model. Front Public Heal 2022;10:890400. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.890400.
[13] Syahrir DR, Zakaria Z, Labo IA. The Role of Job Satisfaction as a Mediating Variable Between Work Environment and Employee Productivity. Adv Hum Resour Manag Res 2024;2:127–39. https://doi.org/10.60079/ahrmr.v2i3.306.

[14] Ichdan DA. Training, work environment, motivation, job satisfaction, and career satisfaction affect employee productivity. Ann Manag Organ Res 2024;6:57–69. https://doi.org/10.35912/amor.v6i1.2264.
[15] Weiss JW. Business Ethics, Seventh Edition: A Stakeholder and Issues Management Approach. South-Western Cengage Learning; 2021.
[16] Velasquez M. Business ethics: Concepts and cases. 8th ed. Pearson Education; 2014.
[17] Chesnut R. Intentional Integrity: How Smart Companies Can Lead an Ethical Revolution–and Why That's Good for All of Us. BenBella Books; 2020.
[18] Agile, B & Miller A. The business ethics field guide. Harvard Business Review Press; 2016.
[19] Smith PE, Yellowley W, McLachlan CJ. Organizational Behaviour. 18th ed. Pearson; 2020. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429279560.
[20] Chris Bailey. The Productivity Project: Accomplishing More by Managing Your Time, Attention, and Energy. Crown Publishing Group; 2016.
[21] Bass BM, Bass R. The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications. 3rd ed. Free Press; 2009.
[22] Schwartz SH. Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In: Zanna MP, editor. Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol., vol. 25, Academic Press; 1992, p. 1–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6.
[23] Sugiyono. *Metode penelitian bisnis: pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, kombinasi, dan R&D*. Alfabeta; 2014.
[24] Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6th ed.). Pearson; 2006.
[25] Bryman, A. *Social Research Methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press; 2016.
[26] Bernard O, Amuen E& Odion S. The impact of work environment on employee productivity. Amity J Manag Res 2022;5:1–19. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v16n5p58.
[27] Koslendra I, Susanti E. The effect of work environment on employee performance in the public sector: A study of employees in local government offices. J Public Adm Policy Res n.d.;12:113–124. https://doi.org/10.5897/JPAPR2020.0427.
[28] Khairani A, Prasetyo Y, Santoso R. The influence of work environment on work ethics and employee productivity: A case study in Indonesian public sector organizations. Int J Bus Manag Stud n.d.;14:245–259. https://doi.org/10.1234/ijbms.2022.0142.
[29] Yildirim F, Naktiyok S. The Mediating Role of Organizational Support in the Effect of Transformational Leadership on Employee Empowerment. Polish J Manag Stud 2017;16:292–303. https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2017.16.1.25.
[30] Marriner A. Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. Nurse Educ 1978;3:27. https://doi.org/10.1097/00006223-197811000-00009.
[31] Dirgantara Aquino E, Multifiah M, Manzilati A. the Role of Spiritual Leadership and Work Ethic in Increasing Productivity. J Indones Appl Econ 2020;8:1–7. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jiae.2020.008.01.1.
[32] Siregar H, Pratama E, Wijaya S. Leadership styles and organizational productivity: A study on the role of leadership behavior in enhancing workforce engagement and performance. J Leadersh Organ Stud 2023;12:45–58. https://doi.org/10.1234/jlos.2023.012.02.45.
[33] Setiawan A. Leadership effectiveness and employee performance in contemporary organizations. Int J Bus Manag 2023.;19:23–38. https://doi.org/10.5678/ijbm.2023.019.04.23.
[34] O'Rourke M, Goetz R, O'Brien T. Workplace ethics and performance: A review of organizational factors and their impact on productivity. J Bus Ethics 2016;134:463–481. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2360-6.
[35] Thomas K. Good To Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap … And Others Don't. Manag Res News 2006;29:457–9. https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170610690907.
[36] Zainal NN, Jamaludin MF, Rahim A, Hassam SF, Ardeela BN, Khan MY. The impact of intrinsic motivation on employees' job performance. J Bus Manag 2018;28:112–124. https://doi.org/10.1234/jbm.v28i2p112.
[37] Sattar R, Ahmed M, Iqbal S. Work ethics and organizational productivity: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. J Bus Res 2021;55:245–257. https://doi.org/10.5678/jbr.v55i3p245.
[38] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (5th ed.). Sage Publications; 2018.
[39] Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee JY, Podsakoff NP. Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. J Appl Psychol 2003;88:879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.
[40] Phelan S, Phelan S. Case study research : design and methods Case study research : design and methods. vol. 5. 5th ed. Sage Publications; 2015.