Supervision, Sanctions, and Leadership as Determining Factors of Employee Work Discipline at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City

Pengawasan, Sanksi, dan Kepemimpinan sebagai Faktor Penentu Disiplin Kerja Pegawai Dinas Perhubungan Kota Binjai

Muhammad Diva Alfiazli[1], Sri Rahayu[2*]

Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi[1,2]

srirahayu@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id[2]

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City with the aim of examining the influence of work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership on employee work discipline in performing their duties. The population consists of 75 permanent employees, and the sampling technique used was a saturated sample, resulting in a total of 75 respondents. The type of data used is primary data, with secondary data serving as the data source. Data collection techniques included literature studies, surveys, and observations. The data analysis techniques used were multiple linear regression, classical assumption tests, and hypothesis testing. The results of the study show that work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership have a positive and significant influence—both partially and simultaneously—on employee work discipline at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City. There is a moderate correlation between work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership with employee discipline. Employee work discipline can be explained by work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership by 43.5%, while the remaining 56.5% can be explained by other variables not examined in this study.

Keywords: Work Supervision, Punitive Sanctions, Leadership, Work Discipline

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini dilakukan pada Dinas Perhubungan Kota Binjai dengan tujuan untuk menguji pengaruh pengawasan kerja, sanksi hukuman, dan kepemimpinan terhadap disiplin kerja pegawai dalam melaksanakan tugasnya. Populasi penelitian berjumlah 75 pegawai tetap, dengan teknik pengambilan sampel menggunakan sampel jenuh sehingga jumlah responden adalah 75 orang. Jenis data yang digunakan adalah data primer dengan data sekunder sebagai data pendukung. Teknik pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui studi pustaka, survei, dan observasi. Teknik analisis data yang digunakan meliputi regresi linier berganda, uji asumsi klasik, dan uji hipotesis. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pengawasan kerja, sanksi hukuman, dan kepemimpinan berpengaruh positif dan signifikan, baik secara parsial maupun simultan, terhadap disiplin kerja pegawai pada Dinas Perhubungan Kota Binjai. Terdapat hubungan yang bersifat sedang antara pengawasan kerja, sanksi hukuman, dan kepemimpinan dengan disiplin kerja pegawai. Disiplin kerja pegawai dapat dijelaskan oleh variabel pengawasan kerja, sanksi hukuman, dan kepemimpinan sebesar 43,5%, sedangkan sisanya sebesar 56,5% dijelaskan oleh variabel lain yang tidak diteliti dalam penelitian ini.

Kata Kunci: Pengawasan Kerja, Sanksi Hukuman, Kepemimpinan, Disiplin Kerja

1. Introduction

Employees represent one of the most critical human resources for organizations in achieving their long-term goals, as their performance and discipline directly determine organizational success and sustainability. However, workplace discipline often varies across employees due to differences in motivation, personal background, and adherence to organizational norms. When employees neglect discipline, such as by arriving late, being absent without valid reasons, or failing to comply with established rules, the organization suffers from

reduced productivity and weakened effectiveness. Evidence from the Department of Transportation of Binjai City demonstrates a consistent increase in absenteeism between 2021 and 2023, indicating a pressing issue of declining employee discipline that requires systematic investigation.

The growing absenteeism at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City reflects weaknesses in supervision, sanctions, and leadership, which are central determinants of workplace discipline. Supervision is essential to monitor and correct employee behavior, while sanctions ensure compliance by deterring misconduct. Leadership, meanwhile, sets the tone for workplace culture, where positive role modeling and fairness can motivate employees to follow organizational rules (Hapsari, Murtini, & Ninghardjanti, 2023; Hermayanti et al., 2022; Kurniawan, Hermanto, & Susanto, 2022). Without effective integration of these factors, employees may disregard rules, perceiving them as non-binding, which undermines organizational performance and accountability.

Previous studies consistently emphasize the importance of supervision as a determinant of employee discipline. Effective supervision ensures that organizational standards are communicated, monitored, and enforced, leading to improved adherence to work procedures (Hermayanti et al., 2022; Maharani & Suhermin, 2018). When supervision is weak or inconsistent, employees are more likely to deviate from rules and exploit the absence of accountability mechanisms. Research in both public and private organizations highlights that monitoring not only enhances compliance but also signals to employees that their contributions are valued and their performance is integral to organizational success (Hapsari et al., 2023).

Sanctions represent another critical mechanism for shaping workplace discipline. When applied fairly and proportionately, sanctions deter employees from engaging in deviant or non-compliant behavior (Chen, Wu, Chen, & Teng, 2018; Jaeger, Eckhardt, & Kroenung, 2021; Nagin, 2013). Studies in both organizational and criminological contexts show that the severity, certainty, and timing of sanctions play a significant role in reducing misconduct (Buckenmaier & Dimant, 2021; Song, Choi, & Kim, 2021). In Indonesian contexts, sanctions are also found to motivate compliance and reinforce fairness within organizations when applied consistently (Arrasyid, Hermanto, & Wahyulina, 2022; Kalaiwaenen, Handoko, & Sunaryo, 2021). Conversely, when sanctions are arbitrary or selectively enforced, employees perceive injustice and are more likely to repeat violations.

Leadership plays a vital role in shaping discipline through role modeling, communication, and ethical behavior. Leaders who demonstrate fairness, consistency, and ethical integrity influence employee discipline positively (Mayer, Kuenzi, & Greenbaum, 2011; Mayer, Aquino, Greenbaum, & Kuenzi, 2012). Ethical leadership has been shown to reduce misconduct by fostering a culture of compliance and setting clear behavioral expectations (Ng & Feldman, 2015; Li, Li, & Liang, 2022). On the other hand, abusive or weak leadership contributes to deviant behavior and a decline in work discipline (Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2008). Local evidence from Indonesian organizations also shows that leadership combined with effective supervision and sanctions significantly enhances employee compliance with work regulations (Kurniawan et al., 2022).

Although previous research has established the roles of supervision, sanctions, and leadership in influencing discipline, most studies have been conducted in either corporate or educational institutions, or they have focused on single determinants rather than integrating all three factors simultaneously (Maharani & Suhermin, 2018; Hermayanti et al., 2022). International studies often highlight ethical leadership or deterrence theory in Western organizational contexts (Ng & Feldman, 2015; Nagin, 2013), but fewer studies explore their combined effects in Indonesian public sector institutions. This creates a research gap in understanding how supervision, sanctions, and leadership interact to influence discipline in a governmental agency setting, particularly in regional transportation departments.

The novelty of this research lies in its integrated approach to analyzing supervision, sanctions, and leadership simultaneously as determinants of work discipline in the context of a local government agency in Indonesia. While previous research has tended to isolate one or two variables, this study captures the combined and simultaneous effects of these three crucial factors. Furthermore, by focusing on the Department of Transportation of Binjai City, this study contributes new empirical evidence to the discourse on employee discipline in public sector organizations, which has received comparatively less scholarly attention compared to private corporations (Arrasyid et al., 2022; Kurniawan et al., 2022).

Based on the above, this study aims to examine the effects of supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership on employee work discipline at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City. Specifically, it seeks to analyze both the partial and simultaneous effects of these factors on discipline, while also identifying the extent to which they contribute to explaining variations in employee behavior. By addressing the identified research gap and applying an integrated framework, this research aspires to provide both theoretical contributions to organizational behavior studies and practical recommendations for enhancing discipline in Indonesian public sector organizations.

2. Literature Review
Supervision and Work Discipline

Supervision is one of the most important managerial functions in ensuring that employees adhere to organizational rules and regulations. Effective supervision can enhance discipline by monitoring employee behavior, providing guidance, and implementing corrective actions when deviations occur. Previous studies highlight that clear and consistent supervision positively influences discipline across various organizational contexts. For instance, Riska, Mulyani, and Rismansyah (2023) found that direct and structured supervision significantly improves employee discipline at the South Sumatra Provincial Office of Cooperatives and SMEs. Similarly, Ruwaeda, Burhauddi, and Parawi (2021) reported that supervision practices at BPJS Kabupaten Luwu Utara played a crucial role in shaping employees' adherence to work norms. In another study, Nisawati (2024) emphasized that supervision is essential for maintaining discipline among employees at PT PLN (Persero) ULP Lemah Abang, showing that strict monitoring leads to reduced violations of workplace rules.

Other evidence also supports the claim that supervision improves organizational discipline and performance. Novandri, Rahayuningsih, and Anwar (2023) revealed that supervision, along with motivation, significantly enhances employee discipline at PT XYZ. Likewise, Rahmat, Agustini, and Nada (2023) found that supervision and internal control mechanisms were positively associated with improved discipline at the Kecamatan Cilegon Office. These studies consistently show that supervision is a determinant factor in maintaining discipline, which in turn influences overall organizational performance.

Sanctions and Discipline Enforcement

Sanctions act as deterrent mechanisms that regulate employee behavior through consequences for misconduct. The effectiveness of sanctions depends on their fairness, clarity, and consistency in application. Research conducted by Supriyanto and Mu'in (2024) showed that legal sanctions were effective in improving work discipline among employees at PT Bintang Kreasi Aroma. Similarly, Niswah and Fu'ad (2024) found that both supervision and sanctions significantly affected work discipline, with motivation serving as an intervening variable, indicating the importance of integrating punitive measures with positive reinforcement. Ritonga, Suyar, and Anggreni (2023) also demonstrated that sanctions, alongside supervision and compensation, strongly influenced employee discipline at the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and the Medan City Spatial Planning Office.

In addition, Maharani and Suhermin (2018) highlighted that sanctions, when combined with motivation and job satisfaction, had a substantial effect on discipline, suggesting that disciplinary enforcement must be balanced with employee well-being. These findings suggest that sanctions remain a vital component of disciplinary systems, especially when applied consistently and proportionally across employees.

Leadership and Employee Discipline

Leadership behavior plays a central role in influencing discipline through role modeling, fairness, and guidance. Leaders who demonstrate commitment to organizational rules and treat employees equally foster a culture of discipline and accountability. For example, Sutihat et al. (2024) showed that leadership and supervision together significantly influenced employee discipline in Curug District, Serang City. Rinjani et al. (2023) also found that leadership combined with supervision improved both discipline and employee performance at the Education Service of Musi Rawas District. Similarly, Yuliantini, Marlapa, and Kurniawan (2019) revealed that leadership, supervision, and sanctions collectively enhanced discipline at PT Charisma Blessing Initiative.

These studies confirm that leadership not only directs but also inspires employees to comply with organizational standards. Without effective leadership, even well-designed supervision and sanction systems may not achieve optimal results, as employees are less likely to internalize discipline without consistent modeling from their leaders.

Integrated Effects on Discipline and Performance

Research suggests that the combination of supervision, sanctions, and leadership provides the strongest framework for maintaining employee discipline. Rahayu (2018) emphasized the dual role of motivation and discipline in enhancing employee performance at PT Langkat Nusantara Kepong, underscoring the interconnectedness of various management practices. Similarly, Merentek (2022) found that both supervision and discipline had a direct impact on employee performance at Hotel Merpati in Pontianak. This indicates that discipline not only ensures compliance but also contributes to higher performance outcomes when supported by managerial interventions.

Moreover, the interplay of supervision, sanctions, and leadership has been widely recognized in contemporary organizational studies. Siregar, Agustin, and Muarmadani (2020), although focusing on entrepreneurship, highlighted how managerial control, motivation, and education influence discipline and eventual success. Sari (2019) extended this perspective by linking service quality with satisfaction, indirectly showing how structured management systems—comparable to supervision and sanction mechanisms—shape desired organizational outcomes.

Taken together, the reviewed literature demonstrates that supervision, sanctions, and leadership are integral determinants of employee work discipline. While prior research confirms their individual impacts, there is still a need for integrated studies that explore their simultaneous effects, particularly in government institutions such as the Department of Transportation of Binjai City. This research therefore contributes by addressing that gap and offering empirical evidence on how these three factors jointly shape work discipline in the public sector.

3. Research Method

This study employs a quantitative associative approach to examine the influence of supervision, disciplinary sanctions, and leadership on employee work discipline. The research was conducted at the Department of Transportation of Binjai City from September to December 2024, with a population of 75 permanent employees, all of whom were selected as the sample

through a census technique. The data collected consisted of primary data in the form of questionnaires and direct observation, as well as secondary data from official documents and relevant literature. The variables studied include independent variables (supervision, disciplinary sanctions, leadership) and a dependent variable (work discipline), all measured using a Likert scale.

Data collection was carried out through literature study, questionnaire surveys, and observation. The operational definitions of the variables were constructed based on relevant theories, such as Hasibuan (2018) for work discipline, and Merentek (2022), Maharani & Suhermin (2018), as well as Sinambela (2019) for the other variables. Each variable was broken down into several indicators, which formed the basis for the research instrument. Data processing was conducted using SPSS, involving tests for validity and reliability to assess the quality of the questionnaire, along with classical assumption tests such as normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity to ensure the regression model's feasibility.

Data analysis was performed using multiple linear regression to determine both the simultaneous and partial effects of the independent variables on work discipline. The F-test was used to examine the simultaneous influence, while the t-test assessed the partial effects. Additionally, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was used to determine the extent to which the model explains the dependent variable. The interpretation of coefficients follows the categorization provided by Priyatno (2019), ranging from very low to very strong.

4. Results and Discussion
Validity and Reliability Test

Validity and reliability tests were conducted to ensure that the research instrument used in this study is both accurate and consistent in measuring the intended variables. The validity test was applied to determine whether each questionnaire item was able to appropriately measure the construct being studied, using the corrected item-total correlation (r-count) compared to the r-table value of 0.224. Meanwhile, the reliability test was conducted to examine the internal consistency of the questionnaire items by employing Cronbach's Alpha, with a minimum acceptable threshold of 0.6.

Table 1. Validity and Reliability Test

Variable	Item	r-count	Cronbach's Alpha
Work Supervision (X1)	Work_Supervision_1	0.753	0.839
	Work_Supervision_2	0.654	
	Work_Supervision_3	0.627	
	Work_Supervision_4	0.734	
	Work_Supervision_5	0.449	
Punishment Sanctions (X2)	Punishment_Sanction_1	0.743	0.811
	Punishment_Sanction_2	0.478	
	Punishment_Sanction_3	0.595	
	Punishment_Sanction_4	0.503	
	Punishment_Sanction_5	0.683	
Leadership (X3)	Leadership_1	0.763	0.788
	Leadership_2	0.314	
	Leadership_3	0.675	
	Leadership_4	0.334	
	Leadership_5	0.836	
Work Discipline (Y)	Work_Discipline_1	0.686	0.885
	Work_Discipline_2	0.722	

Work_Discipline_3	0.484	
Work_Discipline_4	0.659	
Work_Discipline_5	0.588	
Work_Discipline_6	0.613	
Work_Discipline_7	0.745	
Work_Discipline_8	0.745	

The results of the validity test indicate that all questionnaire items across the four variables—Work Supervision (X1), Punishment Sanctions (X2), Leadership (X3), and Work Discipline (Y)—achieved r-count values greater than the r-table value (0.224). This means that each item is declared valid and capable of representing the variable it measures. Furthermore, the reliability test results demonstrate that all variables obtained Cronbach's Alpha coefficients above the minimum threshold (X1 = 0.839, X2 = 0.811, X3 = 0.788, Y = 0.885), confirming that the instrument is reliable. These findings imply that the questionnaire items are not only valid in capturing the constructs but also reliable in producing consistent responses from participants.

Classic Assumption Test Results

The normality test was carried out using three approaches, namely the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the P-Plot graph, and the histogram method. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test produced a significance value of 0.898, which is greater than the threshold of 0.05. This indicates that the residuals are normally distributed and fulfill the normality assumption. In addition, the P-Plot method shows that the data points are distributed closely along the diagonal line, confirming the normal distribution of the regression residuals. The histogram method also supports this conclusion, as the distribution of the data forms a bell-shaped curve, further reinforcing that the regression model meets the normality assumption.

The multicollinearity test was then performed to identify whether there was a correlation among the independent variables. The results indicate that all independent variables, namely work supervision (X1), punishment sanctions (X2), and leadership (X3), have tolerance values greater than 0.1 and VIF values below 10. These findings confirm that the regression model does not suffer from multicollinearity, meaning that the independent variables are free from strong intercorrelation and can be used simultaneously in the model.

Furthermore, the heteroscedasticity test was conducted using the Glejser method and the scatterplot method. The Glejser test results show that all independent variables have significance values greater than 0.05 (work supervision = 0.183, punishment sanctions = 0.779, and leadership = 0.172). This suggests that there are no heteroscedasticity symptoms in the regression model. The scatterplot method also supports this finding, where the distribution of residual points appears scattered randomly without forming a clear or systematic pattern. Thus, it can be concluded that the regression model does not experience heteroscedasticity problems, ensuring the stability of the error variance across observations.

Multiple Linear Regression Results

The following presents the results of the multiple linear regression analysis between the independent variables (work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership) and the dependent variable (work discipline) based on the tabulation of respondents' answers:

Table 2. Multiple Linear Regression Results

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)
Work Supervision_X1	0.767	0.144	0.516

Punishment Sanctions_X2	0.320	0.162	0.203
Leadership_X3	0.139	0.133	0.104

Table 2. above shows the results of the multiple linear regression test, yielding the following regression equation:

$$Y = 8.179 + 0.767 X_1 + 0.320 X_2 + 0.139 X_3$$

The explanation is as follows:

1. The constant value (**a**) is 8.179 and is positive, meaning that employee work discipline will increase by 8.179 assuming the values of the independent variables (work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership) remain constant (zero).
2. **Work supervision (X_1)** has a coefficient value of 0.767 and is positive, meaning that each increase of one unit in work supervision will increase employee work discipline by 0.767 (or 76.70%).
3. **Punitive sanctions (X_2)** has a coefficient value of 0.320 and is positive, meaning that each increase of one unit in punitive sanctions will increase employee work discipline by 0.320 (or 32%).
4. **Leadership (X_3)** has a coefficient value of 0.139 and is positive, meaning that each increase of one unit in leadership will increase employee work discipline by 0.139 (or 13.90%).

Hypothesis Testing Results

a. Partial Test Results (t-test)

The following presents the partial testing results between the independent variables (work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership) and the dependent variable (employee work discipline), based on the processing of respondents' tabulated answers:

Table 2. Partial Test Results

Model	t	Sig.
Work Supervision_X1	5.317	0.000
Punishment Sanctions_X2	1.974	0.014
Leadership_X3	1.869	0.024

In this study, the sample size was n = 75, resulting in a t-table value of 1.665 at a significance level of 0.05. Based on Table 4.14, the partial test results can be explained as follows:

1. Work supervision has a positive and significant partial effect on work discipline at the Binjai Department of Transportation (t-value > t-table, 5.317 > 1.665 at sig. 0.000 < 0.05). Therefore, research hypothesis H1 is accepted.
2. Punitive sanctions have a positive and significant partial effect on work discipline at the Binjai Department of Transportation (t-value > t-table, 1.947 > 1.665 at sig. 0.014 < 0.05). Therefore, research hypothesis H2 is accepted.
3. Leadership has a positive and significant partial effect on work discipline at the Binjai Department of Transportation (t-value > t-table, 1.869 > 1.665 at sig. 0.024 < 0.05). Therefore, research hypothesis H3 is accepted.

b. Simultaneous Test Results (F-test)

The following presents the results of the simultaneous test between the independent variables (work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership) and the dependent variable (employee work discipline), based on the processing of respondents' tabulated answers:

Table 3. Simultaneous Test Results (ANOVA)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	431.642	3	143.881	19.990	0.000
Residual	511.024	71	7.198	–	–
Total	942.667	74	–	–	–

b. Simultaneous Test Results (F-test)

In this study, the number of samples was n = 41, where the degrees of freedom (df1) = k − 1 = 4 − 1 = 3, and (df2) = n − k = 75 − 4 = 71, resulting in an F-table value of 2.73 at a 0.05 significance level. Meanwhile, the calculated F-value was 19.990 with a significance level of 0.000. From the table above, it can be concluded that work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership, simultaneously have a significant influence on employee work discipline in the organization (F-value > F-table, 19.990 > 2.73 at sig. 0.000 < 0.05). Thus, research hypothesis H4 is accepted.

c. Coefficient of Determination (R^2) Test Results

The following presents the results of the coefficient of determination test based on the processing of respondents' tabulated answers:

Table 4. Coefficient of Determination (R^2) Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	0.677[a]	0.458	0.435

Table 4 shows a determination coefficient value of R = 0.677, indicating a fairly strong correlation between work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership with employee work discipline. The R^2 value = 0.435 means that employee work discipline at the Binjai City Department of Transportation can be explained by work supervision, punitive sanctions, and leadership by 43.5%, while the remaining 56.5% can be explained by other variables not studied.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that job supervision, disciplinary sanctions, and leadership each play an important role in strengthening employee work discipline. Job supervision is proven to have a positive impact, as employees tend to comply with organizational rules when they know their performance is consistently monitored. This aligns with the study of Hermayanti et al. (2022), who emphasized that close and continuous supervision enhances discipline by ensuring accountability in task execution. Similarly, Nisawati (2024) and Riska et al. (2023) also highlighted that supervision not only minimizes negligence but also creates a culture of responsibility within public sector organizations.

Disciplinary sanctions are also found to positively influence employee work discipline. The application of fair and consistent sanctions serves as a corrective mechanism and a form of reinforcement that guides employees toward compliance. Arrasyid et al. (2022) and Niswah and Fu'ad (2024) found similar evidence that sanctions strengthen employee commitment to organizational norms when applied proportionally and transparently. This perspective is further supported by Supriyanto and Mu'in (2024), who argued that legal or formal sanctions are essential in creating order and preventing recurring violations.

Leadership, as another significant factor, influences discipline through role modeling and authority. Effective leaders set behavioral standards that employees are inclined to follow. Rinjani et al. (2023) and Sutihat et al. (2024) noted that leadership effectiveness lies in the ability to communicate expectations clearly, enforce regulations consistently, and demonstrate

personal discipline as an example for subordinates. This is in line with Yuliantini et al. (2019), who asserted that leadership combined with supervision and sanctions has a stronger collective effect on discipline compared to when each variable operates individually.

When considered simultaneously, job supervision, sanctions, and leadership create a comprehensive mechanism for enforcing discipline. This resonates with the findings of Kurniawan et al. (2022) and Maharani and Suhermin (2018), who stressed that organizations that combine structured supervision, fair sanctions, and exemplary leadership are more successful in fostering disciplined work behavior. Consistent with Kalaiwaenen et al. (2021), the integration of these factors strengthens organizational control while also motivating employees to align with institutional goals.

Taken together, the findings reinforce the notion that discipline in the workplace is not solely dependent on one factor but rather emerges from the interaction of multiple organizational practices. The results support previous research while extending its applicability to the context of government organizations, highlighting the importance of supervision, sanctions, and leadership in shaping employee behavior.

5. Conclusion

This study concludes that job supervision, disciplinary sanctions, and leadership each play an important role in shaping employee work discipline at the Binjai City Department of Transportation. Effective supervision ensures that employees remain accountable and focused on their duties. Fair and consistent sanctions function as corrective measures that encourage adherence to organizational rules. Leadership, meanwhile, influences discipline through guidance, authority, and the ability to set an example. When these three factors operate together, they create a comprehensive system that strengthens employee discipline and supports the achievement of organizational goals.

Future studies are encouraged to explore additional factors that may influence work discipline, such as motivation, organizational culture, or job satisfaction, to provide a more holistic understanding of employee behavior. Expanding the scope to other government institutions or private organizations could also enrich the generalizability of the findings. Moreover, adopting qualitative or mixed-method approaches may capture deeper insights into employee perspectives and contextual dynamics that quantitative analysis alone cannot fully reveal.

References

Arrasyid, H., Hermanto, & Wahyulina, S. (2022). Pengaruh pemberian sanksi terhadap disiplin dan motivasi kerja pegawai Organisasi Perangkat Daerah (OPD) Kabupaten Lombok Barat. *Journal on Education, 4*(4), 2040–2050.

Buckenmaier, J., & Dimant, E. (2021). Efficient institutions and effective deterrence: On timing, uncertainty, and magnitude of sanctions. *Review of Law & Economics, 17*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11166-021-09352-x

Chen, X., Wu, D., Chen, L., & Teng, J. K. L. (2018). Sanction severity and employees' information security policy compliance: Investigating mediating, moderating, and control variables. *Information & Management, 55*(8), 1049–1060. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2018.05.011

Hapsari, A. A. R., Murtini, W., & Ninghardjanti, P. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi, komunikasi, dan pengawasan terhadap disiplin kerja karyawan. *JIKAP: Jurnal Informasi dan Komunikasi Administrasi Perkantoran, 7*(1), 73–78.

Hermayanti, I., Rismawati, I., Martini, M., Rosdamayanti, Y., Ristiani, R., & Ramadiah, S. T. (2022). Pengaruh pengawasan melekat terhadap disiplin kerja pegawai bidang pertanahan

pada Dinas Perumahan, Kawasan Permukiman dan Pertanahan Kabupaten Sumedang. *Journal of Regional Public Administration, 7*(2).

Jaeger, L., Eckhardt, A., & Kroenung, J. (2021). The role of deterrability for the effect of multi-level sanctions on information security policy compliance: Results of a multigroup analysis. *Information & Management, 58*(3), 103318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2020.103318

Kalaiwaenen, Handoko, B., & Sunaryo. (2021). Pengaruh punishment dan pengawasan terhadap disiplin kerja dan lama bekerja sebagai variabel kontrol. *Jurnal JaManku, 2*(2), 19–30.

Kurniawan, R., Hermanto, & Susanto, A. (2022). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, pengawasan dan hukuman terhadap kedisiplinan kerja pegawai Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Bima. *Scientific Journal of Reflection: Economic, Accounting, Management and Business, 5*(2).

Li, J., Li, C., & Liang, J. (2022). How leaders restrict employees' deviance: An integrative framework based on interactional justice and self-sanctions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13,* 942472. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.942472

Maharani, S. A., & Suhermin. (2018). Pengaruh pengawasan atasan, pemberian sanksi, motivasi dan kepuasan kerja terhadap disiplin kerja. *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Manajemen, 7*(1), 1–16.

Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R. L., & Kuenzi, M. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership, and why does it matter? *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(1), 151–171. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2008.0276

Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., & Greenbaum, R. L. (2011). Examining the link between ethical leadership and employee misconduct: The mediating role of ethical climate. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0794-0

Merentek, F. S. (2022). Analisis pengaruh pengawasan dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada Hotel Merpati di Pontianak. *Jurnal Bisma, 6*(9), 2010–2020.

Nagin, D. S. (2013). Deterrence: A review of the evidence by a criminologist for economists. *Annual Review of Economics, 5*(1), 83–105. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-072412-131310

Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2015). Ethical leadership: Meta-analytic evidence of criterion-related and incremental validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(3), 948–965. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038246

Nisawati, I. (2024). The effect of supervision on work discipline of biller office at PT PLN (Persero) ULP Lemah Abang. *Jurnal Ekobis Dewantara, 7*(3), 930–942.

Niswah, U., & Fu'ad, E. N. (2024). Pengaruh pengawasan dan sanksi terhadap disiplin kerja dengan motivasi sebagai variabel intervening (CV. Mubarokfood Cipta Delicia Kudus). *Entrepreneur: Jurnal Bisnis Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan, 5*(1), 115–130.

Novandri, A., Rahayuningsih, N., & Anwar, S. (2023). Pengaruh pengawasan dan motivasi terhadap disiplin kerja pada karyawan PT XYZ. *Jurnal Investasi, 9*(1), 36–44.

Rahayu, S. (2018). Pengaruh motivasi dan disiplin terhadap prestasi kerja karyawan di PT Langkat Nusantara Kepong Kabupaten Langkat. *Jurnal Manajemen Tool, 9*(1).

Rahmat, B., Agustini, F., & Nada, N. Q. (2023). Pengaruh pengawasan dan control pegawai terhadap disiplin kerja di Kantor Kecamatan Cilegon Kota Cilegon. *Primanomics: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis, 21*(3), 1–10.

Rinjani, R. R., Paleni, H., Citra, B., Rinace, A., & Aprianto, R. (2023). Leadership and supervision on work discipline and its impact on employee performance at Service Education Musi Rawas District. *International Conference on Business, Economics & Management for Sustainable Future, July 18.*

Riska, M., Mulyani, A., & Rismansyah. (2023). Pengaruh pengawasan terhadap disiplin kerja pegawai pada Dinas Koperasi, UKM Provinsi Sumatera Selatan. *Jurnal Manivestasi, 5*(1), 104–118.

Ritonga, I. M., Suyar, A. S., & Anggreni, M. (2023). The effect of quality of work life, sanctions, compensation satisfaction and supervision on employee work discipline at the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Medan City Spatial Planning / National Land Agency. *Jurnal Sains dan Teknologi, 5*(1), 366–375.

Ruwaeda, Burhauddi, & Parawi, H. E. (2021). Pengaruh pengawasan terhadap disiplin kerja pegawai BPJS Kabupaten Luwu Utara. *KIMAP, 2*(1), 1–14.

Sari, D. S. (2019). Analisis product quality and service quality terhadap customer satisfaction (Studi empiris rumah makan di Kota Medan). *Jurnal Manajemen Tools, 11*(1), 45–55.

Siregar, N., Agustin, R. R., & Muarmadani. (2020). Analisis motivasi usaha dan pendidikan kewirausahaan terhadap keberhasilan usaha Bina UKM Center Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi Medan. *Jurnal Manajemen Tools, 12*(1), 144–155.

Song, M., Choi, J., & Kim, J. (2021). Do deterrence mechanisms reduce cyberloafing when it is an observed workplace norm? A moderated mediation model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(9), 4480. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18094480

Supriyanto, & Mu'in, M. (2024). Pengaruh pengawasan dan sanksi hukum terhadap disiplin kerja karyawan pada PT Bintang Kreasi Aroma. *Master Manajemen, 2*(2), 144–156.

Sutihat, Wahyuni, A. D. S., Komalasari, & Maliki, B. I. (2024). The influence of supervision and leadership on employee work discipline in Curug District Serang City. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sosiologi dan Humaniora, 15*(1), 72–80.

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2008). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(4), 721–732. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.721

Yuliantini, T., Marlapa, E., & Kurniawan, W. (2019). The effect of leadership, supervision and imposition of sanctions (punishment) against employee work discipline of PT Charisma Blessing Initiative. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development, 10*(20), 98–109.