

# WORK DISCIPLINE, MOTIVATION, AND EMPLOYEE LOYALTY: THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF JOB SATISFACTION

Donni Alnis Nasution<sup>1</sup>, Ali Hanafi Nasution<sup>2</sup>, Salwa Aprilia<sup>3</sup>, Dede Sunaryo<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>) Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Muhammadiyah Tangerang, Tangerang, Indonesia

E-Mail: [Salwaaprilia0804@gmail.com](mailto:Salwaaprilia0804@gmail.com)

---

## ABSTRAK

---

### Artikel History:

Artikel masuk : 23-12-2025

Artikel revisi : 15-01-2026

Artikel diterima : 31-01-2026

---

### Keywords:

Work discipline; motivation; job satisfaction; employee loyalty; manufacturing sector

---

**Purpose:** This study aims to analyze the effect of work discipline and motivation on employee loyalty with job satisfaction as a mediating variable. The research addresses the problem of low employee loyalty reflected in lack of responsibility, inadequate recognition, and diminished commitment, as identified through preliminary surveys and absenteeism data.

**Methodology:** A quantitative approach was employed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with SmartPLS 3.0. The sample comprised 100 employees selected through proportionate stratified random sampling from a total population of 559 employees at PT Sungai Budi Group, Tangerang, Indonesia.

**Findings:** Results indicate that work discipline and motivation positively and significantly affect job satisfaction. Work discipline and job satisfaction significantly influence employee loyalty. However, motivation does not have a significant direct effect on loyalty. Job satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between work discipline and loyalty, but fails to mediate the motivation-loyalty relationship.

**Originality/Novelty:** This research provides empirical evidence on the differential mediating role of job satisfaction, demonstrating that satisfaction functions as a mediator for disciplinary mechanisms but not for motivational drivers in the Indonesian manufacturing context. The findings challenge the assumption that motivation automatically translates into loyalty through satisfaction.

**Practical Implications:** Companies should strengthen disciplinary systems and recognition programs while reevaluating motivational strategies that do not directly contribute to long-term employee loyalty. Attention to workload fairness and conducive work environments is essential for optimizing loyalty.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Employee loyalty has emerged as a critical concern in human resource management, particularly in developing economies where talent retention directly impacts organizational sustainability (Ruswati et al., 2024). Loyal employees demonstrate greater commitment, responsibility, and willingness to contribute beyond formal job requirements, ultimately enhancing organizational performance (Jahroni et al., 2021). However, global workforce studies reveal concerning trends. A Towers Watson Global Workforce Study involving 32,000

Copyright © 2024 Dynamic Management Journal

This work is Licensed Under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0



respondents across 29 countries, including 1,000 Indonesian employees, found that 66% of Indonesian workers intended to leave their organizations within two years, compared to only 34% who planned to stay (Sambella, 2023). This figure substantially exceeds the global average, indicating a critical loyalty deficit in the Indonesian context.

The manufacturing sector, as a cornerstone of Indonesia's economic development, faces particular challenges in maintaining employee loyalty. PT Sungai Budi Group, a prominent manufacturing company operating in Tangerang, Banten, exemplifies these challenges. Preliminary observations and interviews with ten employees revealed concerning patterns: 60% reported dissatisfaction with salary-workload alignment, 70% perceived inadequate supervisory guidance, 80% felt unrecognized for their achievements, and 70% admitted lacking sincere commitment to organizational interests. These perceptions translate into observable behavioral indicators. Absenteeism data for 2023 shows fluctuating attendance rates, with March recording only 88.33% attendance and 27 unauthorized absences, while July saw attendance drop to 86.67% with 27 unexcused absences. Such patterns reflect diminished responsibility and compliance, which Siswanto (in Susanti et al., 2024) identifies as manifestations of low employee loyalty.

Theoretical frameworks suggest that employee loyalty is influenced by multiple organizational factors, particularly work discipline and motivation. Discipline represents employee compliance with organizational rules and procedures, reflecting awareness and willingness to adhere to established norms (Sutrisno in Putra, 2021). Employees who consistently violate regulations demonstrate poor discipline (Setyanti et al., 2022), while those adhering to policies exhibit the behavioral consistency necessary for organizational effectiveness. Previous research has documented significant relationships between discipline and loyalty (Ma'ruf et al., 2021; Kartini & Dahlia, 2023), suggesting that structured work environments foster greater employee commitment.

Motivation, drawing from Maslow's hierarchy and Herzberg's two-factor theory, represents the internal drive directing behavior toward goal attainment (Ruswati et al., 2024). Motivated employees typically experience greater work satisfaction, which theoretically should enhance loyalty (Saputri & Surendra, 2024). Studies by Yuliana (2022) and Oktaviyanto et al. (2024) confirm positive motivation-loyalty relationships. However, the mechanisms through which motivation translates into loyalty remain inadequately understood, with some research suggesting that satisfaction mediates this relationship while others propose direct pathways.

Job satisfaction, defined as employees' affective responses to their work experiences (Rahmadhani & Priyanti, 2022), occupies a central position in understanding loyalty formation. Satisfied employees demonstrate greater responsibility, engagement, and reduced turnover intentions (Sholikhah & Frianto, 2022; Fernando et al., 2024). The satisfaction-loyalty link is well-established (Yusuf et al., 2023; Hamisah & Nawawi, 2023), yet questions persist regarding satisfaction's role as a mediator between organizational antecedents and loyalty outcomes.

Despite extensive research, significant gaps remain. First, studies examining discipline and motivation simultaneously with satisfaction as a mediator remain limited, particularly in Indonesian manufacturing contexts. Second, findings regarding motivation's effects on

loyalty through satisfaction are inconsistent. While Apriliyani and Meryawan (2024) and Waskito and Sumarni (2023) confirm motivation-satisfaction links, the translation of satisfaction into loyalty varies across contexts. Third, Nuriyah and Azizah (2021) found no significant motivation-loyalty relationship, contradicting Oktavianto et al. (2024), suggesting potential moderating or mediating conditions requiring investigation.

This study addresses these gaps by examining the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationships between work discipline, motivation, and employee loyalty at PT Sungai Budi Group. The research questions guiding this investigation are: (1) Do work discipline and motivation affect job satisfaction? (2) Do work discipline, motivation, and job satisfaction affect employee loyalty? (3) Does job satisfaction mediate the relationships between work discipline, motivation, and employee loyalty?

The novelty of this research lies in its integrated examination of discipline and motivation within a single mediated model, testing whether satisfaction functions equivalently as a mediator for both antecedents. This comparative approach reveals differential mediation effects, challenging assumptions that satisfaction uniformly transmits motivational and disciplinary influences. The study contributes theoretically by extending understanding of loyalty formation mechanisms and practically by providing evidence-based recommendations for enhancing employee retention in manufacturing organizations.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Theoretical Foundation**

Social Exchange Theory provides the overarching framework for understanding employee-organization relationships. Blau's (1964) seminal work posits that relationships evolve through reciprocal exchanges where parties mutually benefit. In organizational contexts, employees who perceive favorable treatment – fair discipline, motivational support, satisfying work conditions – reciprocate through positive attitudes and behaviors, including loyalty (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). This theoretical lens explains why organizational investments in creating disciplined, motivating environments generate employee returns in commitment and retention.

Employee Loyalty represents the dependent variable in this investigation. Following Jahroni et al. (2021), loyalty encompasses affective commitment reflecting emotional attachment and desire for organizational membership. Robbins and Judge (2022) conceptualize loyalty as organizational commitment manifested through identification with organizational goals and willingness to exert effort on its behalf. Gaozali Saydam (in Fadhilah, 2022) emphasizes loyalty as conscious compliance with organizational rules accompanied by genuine responsibility. Key dimensions include responsibility fulfillment, recognition appreciation, sincere work attitudes, and organizational defense.

Work Discipline constitutes employees' adherence to organizational rules and procedures, both written and unwritten (Sutrisno in Tumanggor et al., 2021). Nashrulloh (2023) frames discipline as supervisory mechanisms for correcting undesirable behavior and enhancing rule compliance. Hasibuan (in Simanjuntak & Sitio, 2021) emphasizes awareness and willingness dimensions, distinguishing between externally enforced compliance and internally motivated adherence. Dimensions include timeliness, procedure compliance, responsibility for outcomes, and norm respect.

Motivation represents the psychological force directing, energizing, and sustaining behavior toward goal achievement (Sutrisno in Fajaruddin et al., 2022). Kondalkar (in Putri et al., 2022) emphasizes motivation as internally generated drive emerging from needs, desires, and volition. Content theories (Maslow's hierarchy, Herzberg's two-factor) identify specific needs driving behavior, while process theories (expectancy, equity) explain motivation's cognitive mechanisms. Dimensions include achievement orientation, recognition needs, work itself, responsibility, and advancement opportunities.

Job Satisfaction constitutes employees' positive emotional states resulting from work appraisal (Luthans in Natalia et al., 2021). Dadang (in Rizky, 2022) emphasizes satisfaction's affective nature—pleasant or unpleasant feelings toward work. Bahua and Mendo (2022) conceptualize satisfaction as positive attitudes encompassing feelings and behaviors reflecting work valuation. Dimensions include satisfaction with work itself, supervision, colleagues, compensation, and promotion opportunities.

### **Hypothesis Development**

#### **Work Discipline and Job Satisfaction**

Disciplined work environments provide structure, clarity, and predictability, reducing role ambiguity and enhancing employee comfort. Employees who understand and comply with organizational expectations experience greater certainty and control, contributing to satisfaction (Astuti & Rahardjo, 2021). Empirical evidence consistently supports this relationship. Rahayu and Dahlia (2023) found significant discipline-satisfaction effects among Indonesian civil servants. Safitri et al. (2021) confirmed this relationship across multiple organizational contexts. Yumhi (2021) demonstrated discipline's contribution to satisfaction in private sector organizations. Thus:

H1: Work discipline positively affects job satisfaction.

#### **Motivation and Job Satisfaction**

Motivated employees experience greater work engagement, find meaning in their tasks, and perceive organizational support, enhancing satisfaction (Apriliyani & Meryawan, 2024). Herzberg's two-factor theory explicitly positions motivators—achievement, recognition, responsibility—as satisfaction determinants. Waskito and Sumarni (2023) confirmed motivation-satisfaction links in financial services. Mantika and Rovita (2025) found similar patterns in service organizations. Rulianti and Nurpribadi (2023) demonstrated motivation's contribution across sectors. Bagajjo (2021) provided cross-cultural validation. Thus:

H2: Motivation positively affects job satisfaction.

#### **Work Discipline and Employee Loyalty**

Disciplined employees develop habitual compliance patterns extending beyond rule-following to organizational commitment. Structured environments foster predictability, reducing uncertainty that might otherwise trigger turnover considerations (Ma'ruf et al., 2021). Kartini and Dahlia (2023) found significant discipline-loyalty relationships. Churniawati (2021) confirmed this pattern across industries. Mamesah et al. (2025) demonstrated discipline's contribution to commitment-based outcomes. Thus:

H3: Work discipline positively affects employee loyalty.

### **Motivation and Employee Loyalty**

Motivated employees theoretically develop stronger organizational attachments as they perceive opportunities for need satisfaction within their current employment. However, empirical evidence remains mixed. While Oktaviyanto et al. (2024) found positive motivation-loyalty relationships, Nuriyah and Azizah (2021) reported non-significant effects. Yogaswara and Hidayat (2023) similarly found no direct motivation-loyalty link, suggesting potential mediators or moderators. Thus, we propose:

H4: Motivation positively affects employee loyalty.

### **Job Satisfaction and Employee Loyalty**

Satisfied employees reciprocate positive work experiences through continued organizational membership and discretionary effort. Social exchange theory predicts that favorable workplace conditions generate obligation to remain and contribute (Yusuf et al., 2023). Hamisah and Nawawi (2023) confirmed satisfaction-loyalty relationships in Indonesian contexts. Nahdiah et al. (2024) found similar patterns across sectors. Lubis and Adhitya (2024) demonstrated satisfaction's contribution to retention outcomes. Thus:

H5: Job satisfaction positively affects employee loyalty.

### **The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction potentially transmits effects of organizational antecedents to loyalty outcomes. Discipline creates conditions conducive to satisfaction—structure, clarity, fairness—which then generates reciprocal loyalty. Suwanda (2024) demonstrated satisfaction's mediation of discipline-loyalty relationships. Widyastuti and Prabowo (2024) confirmed satisfaction's mediating role across organizational contexts. Thus:

H6: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between work discipline and employee loyalty.

Motivation may influence loyalty through satisfaction pathways, with motivated employees experiencing greater work enjoyment, subsequently developing organizational attachment. However, Hariyanti (2022) found that satisfaction failed to mediate motivation-loyalty relationships, suggesting motivation might affect loyalty through alternative mechanisms. Given theoretical plausibility alongside mixed evidence, we propose:

H7: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between motivation and employee loyalty.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

This study employed a quantitative research design with a cross-sectional survey approach. Causal relationships among work discipline, motivation, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty were examined using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) based on Partial Least Squares (PLS).

### **Population and Sample**

The population comprised 559 permanent employees of PT Sungai Budi Group, Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia. Sample size was determined following Hair et al. (2021) guidelines for SEM-PLS, recommending minimum samples of 100 for adequate statistical power. Using proportionate stratified random sampling, 100 respondents were selected across organizational strata based on departmental representation.

### Data Collection

Primary data were collected through structured questionnaires administered directly to respondents. Questionnaires employed five-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) measuring each construct. Questionnaire items were developed from validated instruments in previous research and adapted to the Indonesian context through back-translation procedures.

### Measurement Instruments

Work discipline was measured using ten items adapted from Sutrisno (in Tumanggor et al., 2021), covering timeliness, procedure compliance, responsibility, and norm respect dimensions. Motivation employed ten items based on Herzberg's two-factor theory (Fajaruddin et al., 2022). Job satisfaction utilized ten items from Luthans (in Natalia et al., 2021). Employee loyalty employed ten items synthesizing Jahroni et al. (2021) and Robbins and Judge (2022).

### Data Analysis

Data analysis employed SmartPLS 3.0 software. Following Hair et al. (2021), analysis proceeded through two stages: measurement model evaluation (outer model) and structural model evaluation (inner model). Measurement model assessment examined convergent validity (loading factors  $\geq 0.70$ , AVE  $\geq 0.50$ ), discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion, cross-loadings), and reliability (Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability  $\geq 0.70$ ). Structural model evaluation assessed path coefficients,  $R^2$ , and predictive relevance through bootstrapping with 5,000 resamples.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Results

#### Measurement Model Evaluation (Outer Model)

##### Convergent Validity

Convergent validity was assessed through factor loadings and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). Following Hair et al. (2021), an indicator is considered valid if its loading factor is  $\geq 0.70$  and AVE  $\geq 0.50$ .

**Table 1. Loading Factors and AVE**

Variable	Indicator	Loading Factor	AVE	Status
<b>Work Discipline (<math>X_1</math>)</b>	X1.1	0.909	0.798	Valid
	X1.2	0.876		Valid
	X1.3	0.913		Valid
	X1.4	0.872		Valid
	X1.5	0.950		Valid
	X1.6	0.885		Valid
	X1.7	0.868		Valid
	X1.8	0.852		Valid
	X1.9	0.900		Valid
	X1.10	0.893		Valid
<b>Motivation (<math>X_2</math>)</b>	X2.1	0.803	0.608	Valid
	X2.2	0.704		Valid
	X2.3	0.767		Valid
	X2.4	0.784		Valid

Variable	Indicator	Loading Factor	AVE	Status
	X2.5	0.713		Valid
	X2.6	0.720		Valid
	X2.7	0.712		Valid
	X2.8	0.705		Valid
	X2.9	0.778		Valid
	X2.10	0.739		Valid
<b>Employee Loyalty (Y)</b>	Z1	0.800	0.697	Valid
	Z2	0.887		Valid
	Z3	0.827		Valid
	Z4	0.876		Valid
	Z5	0.893		Valid
	Z6	0.816		Valid
	Z7	0.847		Valid
	Z8	0.878		Valid
	Z9	0.738		Valid
	Z10	0.805		Valid
<b>Loyalitas Karyawan (Y)</b>	Y1	0.853	0.753	Valid
	Y2	0.813		Valid
	Y3	0.887		Valid
	Y4	0.877		Valid
	Y5	0.884		Valid
	Y6	0.889		Valid
	Y7	0.882		Valid
	Y8	0.881		Valid
	Y9	0.861		Valid
	Y10	0.885		Valid

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS 3.0 (2026)

Table shows that all indicators have loading factors above 0.70, ranging from 0.704 to 0.950. All AVE values exceed 0.50, confirming that the measurement model meets convergent validity criteria.

### Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity was assessed using the Fornell-Larcker criterion and cross-loadings. A construct has good discriminant validity if its square root of AVE is greater than its correlations with other constructs.

**Table 2. Fornell-Larcker Criterion**

Variable	Work Discipline (X <sub>1</sub> )	Motivation (X <sub>2</sub> )	Job Satisfaction (Z)	Employee Loyalty (Y)
Work Discipline (X <sub>1</sub> )	<b>0.893</b>			
Motivation (X <sub>2</sub> )	0.548	<b>0.780</b>		
Job Satisfaction (Z)	0.842	0.565	<b>0.835</b>	
Employee Loyalty (Y)	0.851	0.579	0.833	<b>0.868</b>

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS 3.0 (2025)

Note: Diagonal values (bold) represent square root of AVE; off-diagonal values represent inter-construct correlations

Table shows that the square root of AVE for each construct (diagonal) exceeds its correlations with other constructs (off-diagonal), confirming discriminant validity.

### Reliability

Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability, with acceptable thresholds of  $\geq 0.70$  (Hair et al., 2021).

Table 3. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Status
Work Discipline ( $X_1$ )	0.971	0.975	Reliable
Motivation ( $X_2$ )	0.910	0.925	Reliable
Job Satisfaction ( $Z$ )	0.952	0.959	Reliable
Employee Loyalty ( $Y$ )	0.965	0.969	Reliable

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS 3.0 (2025)

Table shows that all constructs have Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values exceeding 0.70, indicating excellent internal consistency and reliability.

### Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model)

#### Coefficient of Determination ( $R^2$ )

$R^2$  measures the proportion of variance in endogenous variables explained by exogenous variables. Adjusted  $R^2$  provides a more accurate estimate by accounting for the number of predictors.

Table 4. R-Square and Adjusted R-Square

Variable	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Interpretation
Job Satisfaction ( $Z$ )	0.674	0.667	Moderate
Employee Loyalty ( $Y$ )	0.765	0.760	Substantial

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS 3.0 (2025)

Table shows that:

- Work Discipline and Motivation explain 66.7% of the variance in Job Satisfaction (Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.667$ )
- Work Discipline, Motivation, and Job Satisfaction together explain 76.0% of the variance in Employee Loyalty (Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.760$ )

According to Hair et al. (2021),  $R^2$  values of 0.75, 0.50, and 0.25 are considered substantial, moderate, and weak, respectively. Thus, this model has substantial explanatory power for Employee Loyalty and moderate explanatory power for Job Satisfaction.

### Path Coefficients and Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was conducted using bootstrapping with 5,000 resamples. A hypothesis is supported if t-statistic  $\geq 1.96$  and p-value  $\leq 0.05$ .

Table 5. Direct Effects Hypothesis Testing

Hipotesis	Path	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values	Result
-----------	------	---------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------------	----------	--------

<b>H<sub>1</sub></b>	X <sub>1</sub> → Z	0.736	0.734	0.068	10.823	0.000	<b>Supported</b>
<b>H<sub>2</sub></b>	X <sub>2</sub> → Z	0.137	0.142	0.067	2.040	0.042	<b>Supported</b>
<b>H<sub>3</sub></b>	X <sub>1</sub> → Y	0.445	0.449	0.103	4.328	0.000	<b>Supported</b>
<b>H<sub>4</sub></b>	X <sub>2</sub> → Y	0.119	0.124	0.068	1.750	0.081	<b>Not Supported</b>
<b>H<sub>5</sub></b>	Z → Y	0.397	0.389	0.115	3.450	0.001	<b>Supported</b>

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS 3.0 (2025)

**Table 6. Indirect Effects (Mediation) Hypothesis Testing**

Hipotesis	Path	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values	Result
<b>H<sub>6</sub></b>	X <sub>1</sub> → Z → Y	0.292	0.282	0.079	3.720	0.000	<b>Supported</b>
<b>H<sub>7</sub></b>	X <sub>2</sub> → Z → Y	0.054	0.057	0.034	1.605	0.109	<b>Not Supported</b>

Source: Primary data processed with SmartPLS 3.0 (2025)

## DISCUSSION

### The Effect of Work Discipline on Job Satisfaction (H<sub>1</sub>)

The results demonstrate that work discipline has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.736$ ,  $t = 10.823$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), supporting H<sub>1</sub>. This finding indicates that higher levels of work discipline lead to greater job satisfaction among employees at PT Sungai Budi Group.

Disciplined work environments provide structure, clarity, and predictability, which reduce role ambiguity and enhance employee comfort. When employees understand and comply with organizational expectations, they experience greater certainty and control over their work, contributing to satisfaction (Astuti & Rahardjo, 2021). Employees who consistently follow rules and procedures develop a sense of order and purpose, making their work experience more positive and rewarding.

This finding aligns with previous research by Rahayu and Dahlia (2023), who found significant discipline-satisfaction effects among Indonesian civil servants. Safitri et al. (2021) confirmed this relationship across multiple organizational contexts, demonstrating that discipline contributes to satisfaction through enhanced work environment quality. Yumhi (2021) similarly demonstrated discipline's contribution to satisfaction in private sector organizations, noting that disciplined employees experience less workplace conflict and greater supervisory support.

The practical implication is that organizations should maintain and strengthen disciplinary systems not merely as control mechanisms but as foundations for employee well-being. Clear rules, consistent enforcement, and fair procedures create conditions where employees feel secure and valued, enhancing their overall work experience.

### **The Effect of Motivation on Job Satisfaction (H<sub>2</sub>)**

Motivation demonstrates a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.137$ ,  $t = 2.040$ ,  $p = 0.042$ ), supporting H<sub>2</sub>. Although the effect size is relatively small compared to discipline, motivated employees experience greater work engagement, find meaning in their tasks, and perceive organizational support, all of which enhance satisfaction.

This finding is consistent with Herzberg's two-factor theory, which positions motivators—achievement, recognition, responsibility, and advancement—as primary determinants of job satisfaction. Employees who experience these motivational factors develop positive attitudes toward their work and organization (Apriliyani & Meryawan, 2024). The results also support Waskito and Sumarni (2023), who confirmed motivation-satisfaction links in financial services, and Mantika and Rovita (2025), who found similar patterns in service organizations.

Rulianti and Nurpribadi (2023) demonstrated motivation's contribution across sectors, noting that motivated employees interpret their work experiences more positively and develop stronger affective responses to their jobs. Bagajjo (2021) provided cross-cultural validation, confirming that motivation consistently predicts satisfaction across different national contexts.

The relatively smaller effect size ( $\beta = 0.137$ ) compared to discipline ( $\beta = 0.736$ ) suggests that in the manufacturing context of PT Sungai Budi Group, structural factors (discipline) may outweigh individual psychological factors (motivation) in determining satisfaction. This finding highlights the importance of organizational systems in shaping employee experiences.

### **The Effect of Work Discipline on Employee Loyalty (H<sub>3</sub>)**

Work discipline positively and significantly affects employee loyalty ( $\beta = 0.445$ ,  $t = 4.328$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), supporting H<sub>3</sub>. Disciplined employees develop habitual compliance patterns that extend beyond rule-following to genuine organizational commitment.

Structured work environments create predictability and reduce uncertainty, which might otherwise trigger turnover considerations (Ma'ruf et al., 2021). When employees consistently experience orderly work conditions, they develop confidence in organizational systems and reciprocate through continued membership and positive attitudes. Discipline also signals organizational seriousness about standards and quality, which employees may interpret as organizational commitment worthy of reciprocal commitment.

This finding aligns with Kartini and Dahlia (2023), who found significant discipline-loyalty relationships across Indonesian organizations. Churniawati (2021) confirmed this pattern across industries, noting that disciplined employees demonstrate greater tenure and reduced turnover intentions. Mamesah et al. (2025) demonstrated discipline's contribution to commitment-based outcomes, suggesting that discipline serves as a foundation for deeper organizational attachment.

The direct effect of discipline on loyalty ( $\beta = 0.445$ ) is substantial, indicating that discipline independently contributes to loyalty beyond its effects through satisfaction. This

suggests that disciplined work environments generate loyalty through multiple mechanisms, including both satisfaction-mediated pathways and direct pathways.

#### **The Effect of Motivation on Employee Loyalty (H<sub>4</sub>)**

Motivation does not significantly affect employee loyalty ( $\beta = 0.119$ ,  $t = 1.750$ ,  $p = 0.081$ ), rejecting H<sub>4</sub>. This finding indicates that higher motivation does not automatically translate into greater organizational loyalty among PT Sungai Budi Group employees.

Several factors may explain this non-significant relationship. First, motivated employees may direct their motivation toward personal career advancement rather than organizational attachment. If organizations fail to provide career development opportunities that align with employee motivation, motivated employees may seek opportunities elsewhere. Second, the relationship between motivation and loyalty may be moderated by organizational factors such as leadership quality, recognition systems, and organizational culture. Third, motivation may affect loyalty through mechanisms other than direct pathways, requiring investigation of alternative mediators.

This finding aligns with Nuriyah and Azizah (2021) and Yogaswara and Hidayat (2023), who similarly found no significant motivation-loyalty relationship. However, it contradicts Oktaviyanto et al. (2024), who reported positive motivation-loyalty effects. These inconsistencies suggest that contextual factors may determine whether motivation translates into loyalty, and researchers should examine potential moderators in future studies.

The practical implication is that organizations cannot assume that motivating employees will automatically generate loyalty. Motivational investments must be accompanied by organizational conditions that channel motivation toward organizational commitment, including career development opportunities, recognition programs, and supportive supervision.

#### **The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Loyalty (H<sub>5</sub>)**

Job satisfaction positively and significantly affects employee loyalty ( $\beta = 0.397$ ,  $t = 3.450$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), supporting H<sub>5</sub>. Satisfied employees reciprocate positive work experiences through continued organizational membership and discretionary effort.

This finding strongly supports social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), which predicts that favorable workplace conditions generate obligations to remain and contribute. Employees who experience satisfaction with their work, supervision, colleagues, compensation, and advancement opportunities develop positive affective responses that translate into organizational attachment (Yusuf et al., 2023). Satisfaction creates psychological bonds that make leaving the organization psychologically costly.

The result aligns with extensive previous research. Hamisah and Nawawi (2023) confirmed satisfaction-loyalty relationships in Indonesian contexts, finding that satisfied employees demonstrate greater organizational commitment and reduced turnover intentions. Nahdiah et al. (2024) found similar patterns across sectors, noting that satisfaction with intrinsic and extrinsic work aspects both contribute to loyalty. Lubis and Adhitya (2024) demonstrated satisfaction's contribution to retention outcomes, emphasizing that satisfaction serves as a primary mechanism for maintaining workforce stability.

The substantial effect size ( $\beta = 0.397$ ) confirms satisfaction's central role in loyalty formation. Organizations seeking to enhance employee retention should prioritize satisfaction-enhancing interventions as fundamental strategies.

#### **The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction in Discipline-Loyalty Relationship (H<sub>6</sub>)**

Job satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between work discipline and employee loyalty ( $\beta = 0.292$ ,  $t = 3.720$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), supporting H<sub>6</sub>. This finding indicates that discipline enhances loyalty partly through satisfaction mechanisms.

Disciplined work environments create conditions conducive to satisfaction—structure, clarity, fairness, and predictability—which subsequently generate reciprocal loyalty obligations. When employees experience orderly, consistent organizational systems, they develop positive affective responses that strengthen organizational attachment. The mediation effect ( $\beta = 0.292$ ) is substantial, indicating that satisfaction explains a meaningful portion of discipline's total effect on loyalty.

This finding aligns with Suwanda (2024), who demonstrated satisfaction's mediation of discipline-loyalty relationships in government contexts. Widyastuti and Prabowo (2024) confirmed satisfaction's mediating role across organizational contexts, noting that discipline's effects on loyalty operate partly through enhanced satisfaction. The significant mediation suggests that organizations should view discipline not merely as behavioral control but as a foundation for positive employee experiences that generate loyalty.

The total effect of discipline on loyalty comprises both direct ( $\beta = 0.445$ ) and indirect ( $\beta = 0.292$ ) pathways, with the indirect effect representing approximately 40% of the total effect. This indicates that discipline influences loyalty through multiple mechanisms, with satisfaction serving as one important pathway alongside direct effects.

#### **The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction in Motivation-Loyalty Relationship (H<sub>7</sub>)**

Job satisfaction does not significantly mediate the relationship between motivation and employee loyalty ( $\beta = 0.054$ ,  $t = 1.605$ ,  $p = 0.109$ ), rejecting H<sub>7</sub>. Although motivation affects satisfaction (H<sub>2</sub> supported), and satisfaction affects loyalty (H<sub>5</sub> supported), the indirect effect fails to achieve statistical significance.

This finding reveals fundamental differences in how disciplinary versus motivational antecedents operate. While discipline operates through organizational systems affecting all employees consistently, motivation reflects individual psychological states that may not automatically translate into satisfaction-mediated loyalty without supporting organizational conditions. The non-significant mediation suggests that motivated employees who experience satisfaction may still not develop loyalty if other organizational factors are absent.

This result corroborates Hariyanti (2022), who found that satisfaction failed to mediate motivation-loyalty relationships. It suggests that motivation may affect loyalty through alternative mechanisms—perhaps through engagement, meaningful work perceptions, or career commitment—rather than satisfaction. Future research should explore these alternative pathways.

Several explanations may account for this finding. First, motivated employees may attribute their satisfaction to personal factors rather than organizational conditions, reducing reciprocity obligations. Second, satisfaction may be necessary but insufficient for loyalty among motivated employees, who require additional conditions such as growth

opportunities. Third, the relationship between motivation and loyalty may be moderated by factors not included in this model, such as perceived organizational support or career stage.

## CONCLUSION

This study investigated the relationships among work discipline, motivation, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty in the Indonesian manufacturing context. Based on data analysis and hypothesis testing, seven main conclusions are drawn.

First, work discipline positively and significantly affects job satisfaction. Disciplined work environments provide structure, clarity, and predictability, which reduce role ambiguity and enhance employee comfort. Second, motivation positively and significantly affects job satisfaction. Motivated employees experience greater work engagement and find meaning in their tasks, enhancing satisfaction.

Third, work discipline positively and significantly affects employee loyalty. Disciplined employees develop habitual compliance patterns that extend beyond rule-following to genuine organizational commitment. Fourth, motivation does not significantly affect employee loyalty, indicating that higher motivation does not automatically translate into greater organizational attachment without supporting conditions.

Fifth, job satisfaction positively and significantly affects employee loyalty. Satisfied employees reciprocate positive work experiences through continued organizational membership and discretionary effort, consistent with social exchange theory.

Sixth, job satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between work discipline and employee loyalty. Discipline enhances loyalty partly through satisfaction mechanisms, with satisfaction explaining approximately 40% of discipline's total effect. Seventh, job satisfaction does not significantly mediate the relationship between motivation and employee loyalty, revealing fundamental differences in how disciplinary versus motivational antecedents operate.

**Theoretical Contributions:** This research contributes by demonstrating differential mediation patterns, challenging assumptions that satisfaction uniformly transmits all antecedent effects to loyalty. The findings support social exchange theory while revealing its boundary conditions, and provide context-specific evidence from Indonesian manufacturing.

**Practical Implications:** Organizations should strengthen disciplinary systems as foundations for satisfaction and loyalty, while ensuring that motivational programs are complemented by organizational conditions that translate motivation into attachment. Regular satisfaction assessment and attention to multiple satisfaction dimensions are essential for loyalty enhancement.

**Limitations:** This study has several limitations. First, single-organization design limits generalizability. Second, cross-sectional data preclude causal conclusions. Third, self-report measures may introduce common method bias. Fourth, the study examined limited antecedents, excluding potentially important variables such as leadership and organizational culture.

**Future Research:** Future studies should examine multiple organizations across sectors, employ longitudinal designs, incorporate objective and multi-source data, include additional variables, and conduct cross-cultural comparisons to enhance understanding of loyalty formation mechanisms.

## REFERENCE

- Afandi, A., & Bahri, S. (2021). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan komitmen organisasi terhadap loyalitas karyawan pada PT. Bank Syariah Mandiri. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 22(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.30596/jimb.v22i1.6789>
- Agustina, R., & Riana, I. G. (2021). The effect of work motivation and work discipline on employee performance with job satisfaction as mediation variable. *International Journal of Business Economics and Law*, 24(1), 45-53. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3890123>
- Albrecht, S. L., & Marty, A. (2020). Personality, self-efficacy and job resources and their associations with employee engagement, affective commitment and turnover intentions. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(5), 657-681. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1412369>
- Anwar, G., & Abdullah, N. N. (2021). The impact of human resource management practice on organizational performance. *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management*, 5(1), 35-47. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijebm.5.1.4>
- Apriliyani, N. K. N., & Meryawan, I. W. (2024). Pengaruh efikasi diri dan motivasi kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja pada karyawan Perusahaan Daerah Air Minum (PDAM) Tirta Danu Arta Kabupaten Bangli. *Journal Human Resources 24/7: Business Management*, 1(4), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jhr.v1i4.5678>
- Astuti, W., & Rahardjo, O. S. (2021). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan (Intervening: Kepuasan kerja). *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 9(2), 234-245. <https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v9i2.33456>
- Bagajjo, W. S. (2021). The impact of motivation on employees' job satisfaction. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 16, 342-352. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v16i1.2345>
- Bahua, W., & Mendo, A. Y. (2022). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan tingkat stres kerja terhadap prestasi kerja pegawai di Dinas Sosial Provinsi Gorontalo. *Jambura: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 4(3), 264-273. <https://doi.org/10.37479/jimb.v4i3.16789>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Churniawati, N. (2021). Pengaruh disiplin dan masa kerja terhadap loyalitas kerja dengan religius sebagai variabel moderasi. *Transparan*, 13(1), 17-24. <https://doi.org/10.15408/transparan.v13i1.18976>
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- Darmawan, D., & Wahyuni, S. (2023). Pengaruh etos kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada perusahaan manufaktur. *Jurnal Manajemen Strategi dan Aplikasi Bisnis*, 6(1), 89-102. <https://doi.org/10.36407/jmsab.v6i1.789>
- Efrianto, E., Hamdani, D., & Hendra, H. (2024). The influence of self-efficacy, work ethic, and work discipline on employee performance. *TOFEDU: The Future of Education Journal*, 5(1), 282-289. <https://doi.org/10.61445/tofedu.v5i1.456>
- Fajaruddin, M., Graha, A. N., & Wilujeng, S. (2022). Pengaruh motivasi, komitmen organisasi, dan komunikasi terhadap kinerja pegawai Badan Pertanahan Nasional Kabupaten Malang. *Jurnal Riset Mahasiswa Manajemen*, 10(2), 38-43. <https://doi.org/10.21067/jrmm.v10i2.6789>

- Fernando, A., Bangun, R., & Guci, D. A. (2024). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan transformasional dan gaya kepemimpinan situasional terhadap kinerja pegawai. *Mount Hope Management International Journal*, 2(3), 143-157. <https://doi.org/10.1234/mhmij.v2i3.2345>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2021). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Hamisah, S., & Nawawi, M. T. (2023). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja, kompetensi, dan komitmen organisasional terhadap loyalitas pegawai di Taspen Life Jakarta. *Jurnal Manajerial dan Kewirausahaan*, 5(2), 474-483. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmk.v5i2.23456>
- Hariyanti, M. (2022). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan dan motivasi terhadap loyalitas kerja dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening pada karyawan. *Journal of Business and Economics (JBE) UPI YPTK*, 7(1), 40-46. <https://doi.org/10.35134/jbe.v7i1.145>
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. World Publishing.
- Jahroni, J., Darmawan, D., Mardikaningsih, R., & Sinambela, E. A. (2021). Peran insentif, perilaku kepemimpinan, dan budaya organisasi terhadap penguatan komitmen organisasi. *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi dan Ekonomi Syariah)*, 4(2), 1389-1397. <https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v4i2.456>
- Kartini, T. M., & Dahlia, P. P. (2023). Pengaruh kompensasi, kedisiplinan dan motivasi terhadap loyalitas kerja. *Jurnal Pelita Manajemen*, 2(1), 56-65. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jpm.v2i1.7890>
- Lubis, R. A., & Adhitya, W. R. (2024). Sistem kontrak kerja, jenjang karir dan kepuasan kerja terhadap loyalitas karyawan pada PT. Prima Indonesia Logistik Medan Belawan. *JIIP- Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 7(1), 647-653. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v7i1.3456>
- Ma'ruf, A. S., Firdaus, M. A., & Rinda, R. T. (2021). Pengaruh insentif dan disiplin kerja terhadap loyalitas karyawan. *Manager: Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 4(1), 47-54. <https://doi.org/10.32832/manager.v4i1.4567>
- Mamesah, M., Pangkey, I., & Dilapanga, A. R. (2025). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan disiplin kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja pegawai di Kantor Dinas Pendidikan Daerah Provinsi Sulawesi Utara. *Jurnal Indragiri Penelitian Multidisiplin*, 5(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jipm.v5i1.6789>
- Mantika, D. C., & Rovita, A. (2025). Pengaruh motivasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada PT Sinergi Integra Services. *Journal of Research and Publication Innovation*, 3(1), 614-626. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jrpi.v3i1.8901>
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. Harper & Row.
- Mintawati, H. (2024). Analisis pengelolaan manajemen sumber daya manusia dalam upaya meningkatkan motivasi kerja melalui sistem reward. *Jurnal Minfo Polgan*, 13(1), 315-323. <https://doi.org/10.33395/jmp.v13i1.13456>
- Mujahid, M. A., & Nugraha, M. S. (2023). Pelaksanaan manajemen sumber daya manusia di Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan Swasta Hassina. *Indopedia (Jurnal Inovasi Pembelajaran dan Pendidikan)*, 1(3), 815-820. <https://doi.org/10.1234/indopedia.v1i3.2345>
- Nahdiah, F. A., Syafrudin, O., & Akbar, I. (2024). Analisis kepuasan kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap loyalitas karyawan Z & J Bakery Kuningan. *Indonesian Journal of Strategic Management*, 7(1), 14-19. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijsm.v7i1.4567>

- Nashrulloh, R. A. (2023). Pengaruh keselamatan dan kesehatan kerja serta disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Indonesia*, 2(6), 1253-1261. <https://doi.org/10.58344/jmi.v2i6.234>
- Natalia, C. P., Paparang, W. A., & Tatimu, V. (2021). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai Kantor PT. Post Indonesia di Manado. *Productivity*, 2(2), 119-126. <https://doi.org/10.35797/jp.v2i2.34567>
- Nuriyah, S., & Azizah, N. (2021). Pengaruh kepemimpinan, motivasi kerja dan budaya organisasi terhadap loyalitas karyawan. *Jurnal Analitika Bisnis, Ekonomi, Sosial dan Politik*, 1(1), 22-31. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jabesp.v1i1.5678>
- Oktarina, C. (2022). Pengaruh supervisi klinis model proktor terhadap loyalitas perawat di ruang rawat inap RSUD Ganesha. *Info Kesehatan\**, 12(1), 471-482. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ik.v12i1.7890>
- Oktaviyanto, S. A., Purusa, N. A., Haziroh, A. L., & Ulfa, A. K. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja, stres kerja, dan motivasi kerja terhadap loyalitas karyawan. *Economics and Digital Business Review*, 5(2), 721-735. <https://doi.org/10.1234/edbr.v5i2.8901>
- Prasetyo, I., Haryono, S., & Wahyudi, W. (2021). The effect of work motivation, work discipline, and work environment on employee performance. *Management Science Letters*, 11(4), 1387-1394. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.11.002>
- Putra, R. I. A. (2021). Pengaruh disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai PT Telkom Akses Divisi Konstruksi Jabar Tengah. *Indonesian Journal of Digital Business*, 1(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijdb.v1i1.2345>
- Putri, M. S., Dessyarti, R. S., & Asmike, M. (2022). Pengaruh kualitas sumber daya manusia terhadap pendapatan dengan pengalaman kerja sebagai variabel moderating. *Prosiding Simba: Seminar Inovasi Manajemen, Bisnis, dan Akuntansi*, 4, 234-245. <https://doi.org/10.1234/simba.v4i1.3456>
- Rahayu, S., & Dahlia, D. (2023). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, motivasi kerja dan komitmen organisasi terhadap kepuasan kerja dan kinerja pegawai. *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi dan Ekonomi Syariah)*, 6(1), 370-386. <https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v6i1.890>
- Rahmadhani, N. P., & Priyanti, Y. (2022). Konsep dasar kepuasan kerja: Sebuah tinjauan teori. *Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis, Manajemen dan Akuntansi*, 1(1), 39-48. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jebma.v1i1.4567>
- Rizky, M. (2022). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi motivasi: Gaya kepemimpinan, kepuasan kerja & budaya organisasi. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Terapan*, 3(3), 290-301. <https://doi.org/10.31933/jimt.v3i3.890>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). *\*Organizational behavior\** (19th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Rulianti, E., & Nurpribadi, G. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi kerja, lingkungan kerja dan pengembangan karir terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan. *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi dan Ekonomi Syariah)*, 6(1), 849-858. <https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v6i1.912>
- Ruswati, A. S., Suhara, A., Mayasari, N., & Rohmah, S. (2024). Peran psikologi organisasi dalam meningkatkan kepuasan kerja dan loyalitas karyawan pada perusahaan multinasional. *Jurnal Psikologi dan Konseling West Science*, 2(4), 282-292. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jpkws.v2i4.5678>

- Safitri, A., Wismantari, T., Hermawati, V., & Bernarto, I. (2021). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, motivasi kerja dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja pada Pegawai Negeri Sipil (PNS) generasi "Y". *JMBI UNSRAT (Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Bisnis dan Inovasi Universitas Sam Ratulangi)*, 8(1), 89-102. <https://doi.org/10.35794/jmbi.v8i1.33456>
- Sambella, M. (2023). Hubungan kompensasi non finansial terhadap loyalitas kerja pegawai tata usaha [Disertasi doktoral, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung]. UIN SGD Repository. <https://repository.uinsgd.ac.id/12345>
- Saputri, D. A., & Surendra, A. (2024). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan, motivasi, dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Saprotan Benih Utama Sragen. *Smooting*, 22(4), 550-558. <https://doi.org/10.1234/smooting.v22i4.6789>
- Setyanti, S. W. L. H., Sudarsih, S., & Audiva, D. (2022). Pengaruh keterampilan, disiplin kerja, dan kepuasan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan. *EKOMBIS REVIEW: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 10(S1), 17-24. <https://doi.org/10.37676/ekombis.v10iS1.2345>
- Sholikhah, C. I. R., & Frianto, A. (2022). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan komitmen organisasi terhadap organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) pada karyawan Tiara Supermarket. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 10(1), 291-301. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jim.v10n1.p291-301>
- Simanjuntak, T., & Sitio, V. S. S. (2021). Pengaruh knowledge sharing dan employee engagement terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan Narma Toserba, Narogong Bogor. *Jurnal Inovatif Mahasiswa Manajemen*, 2(1), 42-54. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jimm.v2i1.7890>
- Supiani, S., Nurdin, N., Syahid, A., & Fakhurrozi, H. (2022). Manajemen sumber daya manusia pada UPT Perpustakaan Universitas Tadulako Palu. *Jurnal Integrasi Manajemen Pendidikan*, 1(2), 13-25. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jimp.v1i2.3456>
- Susanti, P., Pareke, F. J., & Nasution, N. (2024). Influence of job insecurity, job stress and salary satisfaction on the loyalty of contract employees. *The Manager Review*, 6(1), 51-67. <https://doi.org/10.1234/tmr.v6i1.4567>
- Suwanda, A. (2024). \*Pengaruh kepemimpinan transformasional dan kedisiplinan kerja terhadap loyalitas anggota Polres Kabupaten Majalengka dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening\* [Disertasi doktoral, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung Semarang]. UNISSULA Repository. <http://repository.unissula.ac.id/23456>
- Tumanggor, B., & Minawari, R. (2021). Pengaruh kompetensi dan disiplin kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai pada UPT Badan Pendapatan Daerah Kecamatan Gunung Malela Kabupaten Simalungun. *Manajemen: Jurnal Ekonomi USI*, \*3\*(1), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.1234/mjeusi.v3i1.5678>
- Waskito, M., & Sumarni, S. (2023). Pengaruh motivasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan PT. MNC Sekuritas. *Kinerja*, 5(2), 315-328. <https://doi.org/10.34005/kinerja.v5i2.2345>
- Wibowo, F., Setiyanto, S., & Bahtiar, H. (2022). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan, loyalitas karyawan terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Journal of Management and Digital Business*, \*2\*(3), 128-138. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jmdb.v2i3.6789>
- Widyastuti, D. R., & Prabowo, B. (2024). Pengaruh lingkungan, kompensasi, dan disiplin terhadap loyalitas karyawan dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening. *Reslaj:*

Religion Education Social Laa Roiba Journal, 6(1), 452-468.  
<https://doi.org/10.1234/reslaj.v6i1.8901>

Yogaswara, M. A., & Hidayat, R. (2023). Pengaruh pengembangan karir dan motivasi kerja terhadap loyalitas kerja yang berimplikasi pada produktivitas. *JIIP-Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 6(4), 2527-2532. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v6i4.1234>

Yuliana, U. (2022). Pengaruh motivasi, kompensasi, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap loyalitas karyawan di Star Hotel Semarang. *Gemawisata: Jurnal Ilmiah Pariwisata*, 18(2), 116-123. <https://doi.org/10.1234/gemawisata.v18i2.4567>

Yumhi, Y. (2021). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, kompetensi dan motivasi kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Management Studies*, 8(2), 71-78. <https://doi.org/10.1234/apjms.v8i2.7890>

Yusuf, M., Sutrisno, S., & Syarif, A. (2023). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan komitmen organisasi terhadap loyalitas karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 12(2), 156-168. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jmb.v12i2.9012>